

GOOD GOVERNANCE

Enhancing the capabilities of technical education in India

EXPERT ADVISORY GROUP PROGRESS REPORT ON GOVERNANCE DEVELOPMENT

1. After completing their governance self-reviews, TEQIP institutions are asked to draw up governance development plans to set out the actions they plan to take to make further progress on implementing good governance as described in the **Good Practice Guide**. <http://www.teqipgoodgovernance.in/good-practice-guide-governing-bodies.html>
2. As at mid-June 2014, the EAG has received 25 governance development plans. It is very welcome that all of the 9 TEQIP institutions in Tamil Nadu have prepared such plans, as have 9 institutions in Maharashtra. The remaining plans come from Karnataka, West Bengal and from centrally funded institutions. It is disappointing that governance development plans have not yet been received from the remaining States.
3. The plans received so far show considerable variety in format and content. It was originally proposed that governance development plans should define priorities for action at individual, institutional and systems level; and the response from Maharashtra in particular follow that pattern. Over recent months the EAG has been working closely with BVBCET Hubli to pilot an approach based even more closely on the self-review, thereby embedding the priorities into a strategic institutional planning process. The outcome is the **combined self-review and development plan for BVBCET Hubli** (which can be viewed on the good governance website: http://www.teqipgoodgovernance.in/SR_GDP%282%29_%20BVBCET%20Hubli%201%20May%202014.pdf)
4. The EAG commend this model and its format to those institutions, which have either completed a priorities template, or yet to complete their governance development plans.
5. Among the features of the Hubli model are a rigorously self-critical approach to analysing existing practice in the self-review; a clear definition of actions to be taken to make progress; and an explicit timetable setting out target dates for completing those actions. BVBCET have also prepared a more detailed **action plan**. The content of governance development plans may vary between institutions, but the Hubli approach to implementation is a valuable example for others.
6. It is possible to identify a number of possible shared priorities from the development plans, which are available so far. The analysis below follows the structure set out in Annex 4 of the **Good Practice Guide**, which is the basis for both self-reviews and development plans.
7. On Primary Accountabilities, it is clear that many institutions have the opportunity to establish internal systems, for example on personnel management and on risk assessment, which go significantly further than their existing arrangements and which could be overseen by their governing bodies. The development priorities, which have included suggestions for action at the systems level, raise the important opportunity for SPFUs and others at the State level to identify and share good practice. Some of the development plans and priorities also emphasise the need for greater financial and managerial autonomy to create the conditions for such institutional developments to flourish.

8. Two more examples where the sharing of good practice would support development are: benchmarking institutional performance, and the challenge to institutions to develop systems to monitor the head of the institution's performance. Many institutions have said that they cannot start to benchmark until more reliable data is available. There are many forms of benchmarking, however, and institutions could begin by comparing (and benchmarking) what they do, and have achieved, with that of comparable institutions in India and internationally. A good example of such practice is the College of Engineering in Pune, which carried out a gap analysis taking IIT Bombay as its benchmark institution.
9. On Openness and Transparency, there are opportunities for very early progress, recognised in several development plans, on publishing annual reports and making available information on the governing body itself. BVBCET Hubli and other institutions are planning to introduce a register of interests for the members of its governing body: this is another measure, which the EAG commends to all institutions. As this is not a common practice in Indian institutions sample templates are available on the Good Governance website at:
http://www.teqipgoodgovernance.in/Blank_REGISTER%20OF%20INTERESTS%20FORM.pdf
10. On Key Attributes, the EAG will raise with the appropriate authorities a number of issues about the current norms for membership of governing bodies. Institutional development plans can focus on ensuring that roles are clearly defined and that governing bodies meet regularly (this should be at least four times a year as specified in the TEQIP-II PIP), and that attendance records of members are made available.
11. On Effectiveness and Performance Review, a significant number of institutions have no plans to invest in induction and development experiences for governing bodies. This seems, to the EAG, to be missing a valuable opportunity to improve the impact of governing bodies. Regular effectiveness reviews of that impact are also potentially valuable, and should be included in development plans.
12. Finally, on Regulatory Compliance there are relatively few new initiatives proposed in the development plans because the existing requirements are described as being met. Those institutions, which have yet to complete the accreditation process, are committed to carrying it through.
13. For more information on governance development and examples of governance development generic needs and governance development plans - see the website information at: <http://www.teqipgoodgovernance.in/governance-development.html>
14. We encourage more institutions to submit governance development plans that indicate clearly their commitment to governance improvement and management capacity enhancement, reminding them that all references to governing bodies are to the governing body of the whole institution. Some institutions seem to have set up so-called 'governing bodies' to oversee the TEQIP project. Such committees or groups should not be called 'governing bodies' to avoid confusion with the institutional governing body.
15. The most active institutions working to develop and improve governance practice will be invited to share their experience at specially convened learning forums in October, which will be jointly facilitated by the EAG and IIMs participating in the TEQIP Management Capacity Enhancement Programme. The outcomes of these forums will be shared widely.