

**An Institutional Governance Review Tool**

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 (GB). It will also indicate that:

- the conduct of the GB is in accordance with the standards of behaviour that the public should rightfully expect
- the GB 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 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.

<b>1</b>	Clear Evidence of <b>very good practice</b> in the quality and standards achieved ( <b>with 75% or above clear supporting evidence as per the Good Practice Guide</b> ).
<b>2</b>	<b>Some</b> evidence of good practice in the quality and standards achieved ( <b>up to 50% clear supporting evidence as per the Good Practice Guide</b> )
<b>3</b>	Not yet in place, or not appropriate for our institution ( <b>no supporting evidence available</b> )

Supporting evidence

Give at least two of the strongest examples that provide evidence in support of your assessment for each question.

**Completed templates (or other review mechanisms) should be ratified by the Governing Body and signed by the Chair of the Governing Body before being returned to the NPIU and SPFU representatives.** Completed templates will be shared with the TEQIP-II Governance Programme Group so that they can draw on common lessons.

**NAME OF INSTITUTION:**

**NAME OF CHAIR OF THE GOVERNING BODY:**

**SIGNED:**

**DATE:**

<b>INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE REVIEW TEMPLATE</b>  This template is based on the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies	<b>ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</b>  <b>NB: In addition to reviewing GB and Institutional documentation, institutions should complete the template following selected interviews with the Chair of the GB, other representatives of the GB, the Head of the Institution and members of the Institution's executive team, staff and student representatives.</b>
<b>A PRIMARY ACCOUNTABILITIES</b>		(For additional information see the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies)
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?		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When, 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.</li> </ul>
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> .		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> Institutional audits have been prepared, discussed and approved by the GB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GB has discussed and approved the Annual budget</li> <li>GB Sub-committees have met (give dates and minute references) and reported to the main GB – including on financial and procurement risks assessed and discussed.</li> </ul>
Is the governing body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements?  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?		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of external scrutiny of course programmes reporting to the GB, actions taken and discussion by the GB</li> <li>GB discussion of benchmarking (comparison of performance with similar institutions)</li> <li>Accreditation alignment and Academic Board reporting to the GB on effectiveness of quality assurance systems – including demonstration of improvements.</li> </ul>
Has the governing body put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring the head of the institution's performance?		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion and approval of the arrangements that have been put in place.</li> </ul>

<b>INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE REVIEW TEMPLATE</b>  This template is based on the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies	<b>ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</b>  <b>NB: In addition to reviewing GB and Institutional documentation, institutions should complete the template following selected interviews with the Chair of the GB, other representatives of the GB, the Head of the Institution and members of the Institution's executive team, staff and student representatives.</b>
<b>B OPENNESS &amp; TRANSPARENCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES</b>		(For additional information see the Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies)
Does the governing body publish an annual report on institutional performance?		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual reports (past &amp; 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 GB delegates to management, (or those that are derived directly from the instruments of governance)</li> <li>Evidence of GB discussion, approval and publication of annual report.</li> </ul>
Does the governing body maintain, and publicly disclose, a register of interests of members of its governing body?		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Register of Interests indicates whether the conduct of the GB 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).</li> </ul>
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?		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All matters concerning the governance of the institution, including minutes of meetings, are available publicly, and on the institutional website</li> <li>GB discussion to ensure that marketing and reported information is truthful</li> <li>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</li> <li>Discussions with students and staff should indicate they have appropriate access to information about the proceedings of their governing body</li> <li>Discussion and outcomes from reviews of the GB are shared on the institutional website.</li> </ul>

<b>INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE REVIEW TEMPLATE</b>  This template is based on the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies	<b>ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</b>  <b>NB: In addition to reviewing GB and Institutional documentation, institutions should complete the template following selected interviews with the Chair of the GB, other representatives of the GB, the Head of the Institution and members of the Institution's executive team, staff and student representatives.</b>
<b>C KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES</b>		(For additional information see the Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies)
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?		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The size of a governing body is between 14 – 20 members.</li> <li>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 GB members.</li> </ul>
Are the recruitment processes and procedures for governing body members rigorous and transparent?  Does the GB 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?		<b>Example of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An independent committee manages appointments (chaired by the Chair of the governing body)</li> <li>Independent members are external to, and independent of, the institution.</li> </ul>
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?		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roles and responsibilities for these posts are clearly stated in job descriptions, person specifications and institutional governance documentation.</li> </ul>
Does the governing body meet regularly? Is there clear evidence that members of the governing body attend regularly and participate actively?		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The governing body meets at least 4 or 5 times a year with each member attending 3-4 meetings (no delegates or substitutes)</li> <li>GB 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 GB.</li> </ul>

<b>INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE REVIEW TEMPLATE</b>  This template is based on the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies	<b>ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</b>  <b>NB: In addition to reviewing GB and Institutional documentation, institutions should complete the template following selected interviews with the Chair of the GB, other representatives of the GB, the Head of the Institution and members of the Institution's executive team, staff and student representatives.</b>
<b>D EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES</b>		(For additional information see the Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies)
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?		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> <li>Structures and processes have been revised as part of the governing body's ongoing regular review processes.</li> </ul>
Does the governing body ensure that new members are properly inducted, and existing members receive opportunities for further development as deemed necessary?		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a record of induction and development activities undertaken for all GB members (including dates/type of activity/costs and funding source if appropriate.)</li> </ul>
<b>E REGULATORY COMPLIANCE</b>		(For additional information see the Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies)
Does the governing body ensure regulatory compliance* and, subject to this, take all final decisions on matters of fundamental concern to the institution.  Does the regulatory compliance include demonstrating compliance with the 'not-for-profit' purpose of education institutions?  Has there been accreditation by a national body? If so, give details: name, status of current accreditation etc.		<b>Examples of evidence:</b> <i>GB Minutes &amp; institutional documentation indicate</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(List regulations with which compliance is expected)</li> <li>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)</li> <li>Current AICTE approval for all the UG and PG programs being conducted (institutions should not be conducting any unapproved programs)</li> <li>Current affiliation / academic autonomy / degree granting authority</li> <li>Sending in the mandatory disclosure to AICTE</li> <li>Ensuring the fee structure is within the permissible limits set by the Fee Fixation Committee of the State/UT</li> <li>Respecting the admission rules for that state</li> <li>Progress in compliance with any strictures passed by the AICTE.</li> </ul>