

Institutional Governance Review Template

The objective of an Institutional Governance Review is to assist institutions, using an evidence-based approach, in their self-assessment of current governance practice. A thorough review will indicate the level of effectiveness of institutional governance and the Governing Body, and identify action points for improvement. It will also indicate that:

- the conduct of the Governing Body is in accordance with the standards of behaviour that the public should rightfully expect
- the Governing Body and individual governors are exercising their responsibilities in the interests of the institution as a whole
- the review has been undertaken by a group who have internal and external credibility to undertake such an exercise.

Assessment scale and descriptors

This Institutional Governance Review Template is a tool based on the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies to assist institutions as they carry out their self-reviews. Institutions may choose to use this, or other tools to review their governance practice.

1	Clear evidence of very good practice in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for at least 75% of the relevant practices set out in the Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies.)
2	Some evidence of good practice in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for at least 50% of the relevant practices set out in the Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies.)
3	Not in place (Institutions may specify the expected date of completion if there are concrete plans in place for implementation. Also, specify if there are any practices in the Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies not yet relevant to your institution, or which are the responsibility of some other body. It is anticipated that these would be few in number.)

Supporting evidence

- **Provide a bullet point list of the strongest, clearest examples of evidence in support of your assessment against each question**

NB: In addition to reviewing Governing Body and other institutional documentation, valuable insights or verification of evidence can be gained from selected interviews, for example, with the Chair of the Governing Body, other members of the Governing Body, the Head of the Institution, management and administration staff, faculty and student representatives.

Completed templates (or other review mechanisms) should be ratified by the Governing Body, dated and signed by the Chair of the Governing Body.

INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE REVIEW TEMPLATE		SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
A PRIMARY ACCOUNTABILITIES		For additional information refer to the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies
SELF-REVIEW QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT	Examples of evidence (such as Governing Body Minutes & institutional documentation) indicate:
Has the Governing Body approved the institutional strategic vision, mission and plan - identifying a clear development path for the institution through its long-term business plans and annual budgets?	Enter assessment scale and provide a bullet point list of the strongest, clearest examples of evidence in support of your assessment against each question.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When, how, by whom, and to what degree, the strategic vision, mission and plan (with a clear development path through long-term business plans and annual budgets), have been discussed.
Has the Governing Body ensured the establishment and monitoring of proper, effective and efficient systems of control and accountability to ensure financial sustainability (<i>including financial and operational controls, risk assessment and management, clear procedures for managing physical and human resources.</i>)		<p>Institutional audits have been prepared, discussed and approved by the Governing Body.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Governing Body has discussed and approved the Annual budget Governing Body Sub-committees have met (give dates and minute references) and reported to the main Governing Body – including on financial and procurement risks assessed and discussed.
<p>Is the Governing Body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements?</p> <p>Are these benchmarked against other institutions (<i>including accreditation, and alignment with national and international quality assurance systems</i>) to show that they are broadly keeping pace with the institutions they would regard as their peers or competitors to ensure and enhance institutional reputation?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of clear institutional values, policies and processes for enhancing, as well as assuring, quality (<i>which are reflected in institutional practice and outcomes for education and research</i>) Evidence of external scrutiny of course programmes reporting to the Governing Body, actions taken and discussion by the Governing Body Governing Body discussion of benchmarking (comparison of performance with similar institutions) Accreditation alignment and Academic Board reporting to the Governing Body on effectiveness of quality assurance systems – including demonstration of improvements.
Has the Governing Body put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring the head of the institution's performance?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion and approval of the arrangements that have been put in place.

INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE REVIEW TEMPLATE		SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
B OPENNESS & TRANSPARENCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES		For additional information refer to the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies
SELF-REVIEW QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT	Examples of evidence (such as Governing Body Minutes & institutional documentation) indicate:
Does the Governing Body publish an annual report on institutional performance?	Enter assessment scale and provide a bullet point list of the strongest, clearest examples of evidence in support of your assessment against each question.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual reports (past & present) which include: key areas of performance linked to strategic mission/plan, the institution's annual accounts with the identification of key individuals, and a broad summary of the responsibilities and accountabilities that the Governing Body delegates to management, (or those that are derived directly from the instruments of governance) • Evidence of Governing Body discussion, approval and publication of annual report.
Does the Governing Body maintain, and publicly disclose, a register of interests of members of its governing body?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Register of Interests indicates whether the conduct of the Governing Body is evidence of the good practice highlighted in the Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies (members have completed the register of interests as part of the recruitment process; updating as appropriate).
Is the Governing Body conducted in an open a manner, and does it provide as much information as possible to students, faculty, the general public and potential employers on all aspects of institutional activity related to academic performance, finance and management?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All matters concerning the governance of the institution, including minutes of meetings, are available publicly, and on the institutional website • Governing Body discussion to ensure that marketing and reported information is truthful • Detailed student admission information (including use of any management quota) uses clear and transparent criteria, procedures and processes that are shared on the institutional website - to ensure public trust and confidence in the integrity of the processes regarding the selection and admission of students • Discussions with students and staff should indicate they have appropriate access to information about the proceedings of their governing body • Discussion and outcomes from reviews of the Governing Body are shared on the institutional website.

INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE REVIEW TEMPLATE		SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
C KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES		For additional information refer to the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies
SELF-REVIEW QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT	Examples of evidence (such as Governing Body Minutes & institutional documentation) indicate:
	Enter assessment scale and provide a bullet point list of the strongest, clearest examples of evidence in support of your assessment against each question.	
Are the size, skills, competences and experiences of the Governing Body, such that it is able to carry out its primary accountabilities effectively and efficiently, and ensure the confidence of its stakeholders and constituents?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size of the Governing Body is such that it is able to carry out its primary accountabilities effectively. • The balance of skills, experience and competences among governors, and serving on the governing body sub-committees, match the written job descriptions and person specifications for Governing Body members.
<p>Are the recruitment processes and procedures for governing body members rigorous and transparent?</p> <p>Does the Governing Body have actively involved independent members and is the institution free from direct political interference to ensure academic freedom and focus on long-term educational objectives?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent committee manages appointments (chaired by the Chair of the Governing Body) • Independent members are external to, and independent of, the institution.
Are the role and responsibilities of the Chair of the Governing Body, the Head of the Institution and the Member Secretary serving the governing body clearly stated?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and responsibilities for these posts are clearly stated in job descriptions, person specifications and institutional governance documentation (See Annex 1 example - <i>Role Description for Chairs of Governing Bodies</i>)
Does the Governing Body meet regularly? Is there clear evidence that members of the governing body attend regularly and participate actively?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The governing body meets at least 4 or 5 times a year with each member attending 3-4 meetings (no delegates or substitutes) • Governing Body members allocated to serve on sub-committees attend most meetings and are actively involved in the work of these committees – reporting back regularly to the main Governing Body.

INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE REVIEW TEMPLATE		SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
D EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES		For additional information refer to the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies
SELF-REVIEW QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT	Examples of evidence (such as <i>Governing Body Minutes & institutional documentation</i>) indicate:
Does the Governing Body keep their effectiveness under regular review and in reviewing its performance, reflect on the performance of the institution as a whole in meeting its long-term strategic objectives and its short-term indicators of performance/success?	Enter assessment scale and provide a bullet point list of the strongest, clearest examples of evidence in support of your assessment against each question.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governing body effectiveness is measured against the institution's statement of primary accountabilities, the institution's strategic objectives and compliance with the Good Governance Guidelines • Structures and processes have been revised as part of the governing body's ongoing regular review processes.
Does the Governing Body ensure that new members are properly inducted, and existing members receive opportunities for further development as deemed necessary?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a record of induction and development activities undertaken for all Governing Body members (including dates/ type of activity/costs and funding source if appropriate.)

INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE REVIEW TEMPLATE		SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
E REGULATORY COMPLIANCE		For additional information refer to the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies
SELF-REVIEW QUESTIONS	ASSESSMENT Enter assessment scale and provide a bullet point list of the strongest, clearest examples of evidence in support of your assessment against each question.	Examples of evidence (such as <i>Governing Body Minutes & institutional documentation</i>) indicate:
<p>Does the Governing Body ensure regulatory compliance* and, subject to this, take all final decisions on matters of fundamental concern to the institution.</p> <p>Does the regulatory compliance include demonstrating compliance with the ‘not-for-profit’ purpose of education institutions?</p> <p>Has there been accreditation and/or external quality assurance by a national or professional body? If so, give details: name, status of current accreditation etc.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List regulations with which compliance is expected • Compliance with the statutes, ordinances and provisions regulating their institution, including compliance with the regulations by Statutory bodies, such as the AICTE and UGC, as well as regulations laid out by the State government and affiliating university (if any) • Current AICTE approval for all the undergraduate and postgraduate programmes being conducted (institutions should not be conducting any unapproved programmes) • Current affiliation /academic autonomy / degree granting authority • Sending in the mandatory disclosure to AICTE • Ensuring the fee structure is within the permissible limits set by the Fee Fixation Committee of the State/UT • Respecting the admission rules for that State • Progress in compliance with any strictures passed by the AICTE.

About the Expert Group authoring this Guide

Professor M. Anandkrishnan serves as Chairman of Board of Governors at Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur since 2007. He was the first Science Counselor at the Embassy of India Washington, D.C. (1974 to 1978) and served in the United Nations Centre for S&T for Development from 1978 to 1989 and as Vice-Chancellor of Anna University for two terms from 1990 to 1996. He was Vice-Chairman of the Tamil Nadu State Council for Higher Education from 1996 to 2002 and concurrently the Advisor to the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu on Information Technology and e-Governance. He was Chairman, Madras Institute of Development Studies from 2003 to 2008.

Ms. Jannette Cheong is a World Bank consultant, former head of International Collaboration and Development, and associate director for Quality Assessment, Higher Education Funding Council for England, and Her Majesty's inspector for Further and Higher Education. She has also acted as a facilitator and advisor to international initiatives and collaborations and worked in partnership with international and national organizations.

Sir Andrew Cubie is the Chair of the Scottish Credit and Qualification Framework, Chairman of the Board of the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education in the UK, and senior independent director for Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education, Scotland, and contributor to the EU and U.S. governance seminar programs on higher education. He has also acted as former Chair of Edinburgh Napier University and of the Committee of Chairs of UK Universities Governing Bodies.

Professor R. Natarajan served as Chairman of the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) from 2001 to 2004. He took a position as an Assistant Professor at the Indian Institute of Technology, Madras in 1970, promoted to professor in 1975, Dean of Student Affairs in 1988, Chairman of the Institute's Centre for Continuing Education in 1990, Head of its Department of Mechanical Engineering in 1993 and Director of the Institute in 1995.

Mr. Subramanian Ramadorai is a Chief Executive Officer and Managing Director of Tata Consultancy Services (TCS) Limited. Mr. Ramadorai joined as a trainee engineer at Tata Consultancy Services in 1972 and has over 32 years of experience. He is responsible for overall corporate responsibilities, leads on community and environment issues. He received Padma Bhushan in January 2006 for his commitment and dedication to IT industry, and has received various awards for his excellent leadership. Achievements include the recognition as the sixth most influential IT leader in the world by Computer Business Review in July 2006, as the "IT Man of the year" for 2004 by Dataquest and etc.