

**THE COMPETITIVENESS OF INDIAN HIGHER EDUCATION
GOVERNANCE: A COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY**

Sharadindu Pandey,

IIFM main building,

Nehru Nagar, Bhopal (MP), India PIN-462003,

Email: dsp.gbu@gmail.com

1. Structured Abstract:

1. Purpose: The purpose of this research to highlight the significance of governance as leadership, in higher education and to generate suggestive measures for governance and legal reforms towards responsible and self-governance.
2. Design/methodology/approach: The study chooses exploratory research design. It relies on comparative case study method for data collection. It uses the internal data of two higher institutions, the reference institution has already achieved the end point where another institution wants to be. The study used BEEM (Building strengths, eliminating weakness, exploiting opportunities and Minimising threats) as analytical framework for classifying all aspects of the governance.
3. Findings (mandatory): The study compares the governance aspects related to board constitution which can represent the stakeholders and feel motivated to raise their concerns and ends, structure of the board how board explores the issues and place of system of constant follow ups either participative style or through consultative style, procedure of the board related to ensuring agenda setting process, indicators to summarize the progress, put in place its various resolutions, notes and ratings. The study explores how boards of higher educational institutions needs to be more outcome oriented, as they are dealing with the public good.
4. Research limitations/implications: The research is limited to the governance parameters it selected and data it obtained from organizational sources. Research cannot access and analyse the data which is confidential in nature.
5. Practical implications: Policy makers of higher education and not-for-profit institutions may think of devising some framework which can ensure effectiveness of governance at the same level of company form, if not more than that. The boards of such institutions are also responsible for developing volunteer framework for effective and responsible governance practices.
6. Social implications: The higher education system in a country like India which has big work force needs to be competitive and effective to save the social cost of not developing them intellectually, emotionally and psychologically.
7. Originality/value: The comparative analysis of governance brings out those areas where practices needs to be common and where governance practices needs to be amenable as per the requirement of the context.

Key words: higher education, governance, board constitution, board structure, board procedures, outcome orientation of the board

1. Introduction

A recently released QS world university ranking-2018 indicates that the spread of the elite higher education institution is still uneven across globe. Despite enviable economic growth rate and the large size of the economy, none of the Indian institution found place among top 100. To make higher education competitive in India, the Government of India has started to rank the society (both private and government societies) run management institutions through its framework called NIRF (National Institutional Ranking Framework), since 2016. The framework provides the participation of higher educational institution as a matter of choice (NIRF, 2017). In 2017, 542 Indian management institutes participated in the exercise and got ranks accordingly. That was one of the prominent external driver for the management institutes to mind their performance and reputation at the national level. The participation in the ranking framework is crucial for the institutes to manage their public, peer and employer perceptions. The education governance in India already had got accreditation system in place, which was later made mandatory for all institutions. But due to multiple accreditation agencies [National Board of Accreditation (NBA) and National Accreditation and Assessment Agency (NAAC)] in India, regulating different kind of management schools (University based, independent and Government run apex institutes of management) and lack of relative and compiled rating by the accreditation agencies, the evaluation system existed before was not that competitive. However, this can be considered as second most important external driver to have performance control. Recently Government of India has notified a framework to prepare 10 private and 10 government institution to find place in world ranking. This institute of eminence (IOE) framework appears to be an attempt to imbibe global orientation among Indian higher educational institutions.

The leaders of higher education i.e. Europe and North America had taken early steps in making their higher education competitive (Bologna Declaration, 1999) by taking tangible measures. Fullan and Scot (2009) mentioned that it requires turn around leadership, pro-activeness and system which can hold the promise to meet the expectations of various constituencies representing stakeholders. The researcher of Indian Institute of Management Udaipur (Majumdar, Rana and Sanan, 2015) explored the sustainability performance of corporate India and prepared the rank of top 100 companies on their sustainability performance. They found that these companies are reasonably strong on governance. The company sector of India has passed through governance reforms and professionalization of board structure and secretarial function. The company secretaries act, 1980 in India was promulgated to create the professionals who can advise companies in procedural matters, provide assistance and internal

auditing with respect to matter of principles [Section 2 (2) (C)]. A company secretary under the section 205 (1) of the company's act, 2013 has to report to the board about the compliances of the company law and all other laws applicable on the companies. A company secretary is supposed to cover only the company form of the work organization leaving all other forms e.g. cooperative, societies etc. which are prevalent in the Indian higher education. As the scope of the sustainability practices is not limited by the legal compliances and the sustainable performance can also not be measured by compliance of the minimum standards. Therefore, independent initiatives or structural reforms have been taken to improve the performance of company governance. For example, as per section 177 of the India's company's act, every listed company in India shall have the audit committee, which shall have minimum three independent directors. With the help of company secretary institution and the provision of sustainability committees, the company form of ownership has somehow able to govern the sustainability performance control. On the other hand, the Indian higher education sector, which is largely run by the society registration act, 1860 (by Memorandum of Association) has no internal regulatory provision of ensuring or distinguishing the sustainable performance. Society is created through memorandum of association and registration, with the registrar of the society office situated at the different states of India (Sec. 1 and sec. 1 of society's act). Section 16 of the societies act provides for the governing body which shall frame the rules and regulation of the management.

The present study would further like to explore the implications that without the provision of chartered or professional secretarial assistance to ensure minimum standards/compliance and progressive board structures/protocols to upgrade the standards of the board of the society, (e.g. stipulation of some mandatory committees including sustainability committee), how can a governing board of higher educational society may be responsive to the call of performance and its reputational needs.

2. Literature Review

Reputation is the general performance driver for any business school for attracting admissions, graduation outcome and external income. The literature of the reputation of business school have focused on factors affecting top tier business schools (Siebert and Martin, 2013; p. 430). Quality is the performance variant, and quality of the business schools depends upon the quest of the stakeholders to evaluate it (Boyd et. Al, 2010 in their variance theory approach). Siebart and Martin (2013, p. 432) further explored the issue, whose interest business schools serve. They mention (p. 433) that management education is about the professional education where purpose is to improve the management practice. They further termed it 'parallel' to the law, medicine and

dentistry. The authors concluded by their arguments that reputation is the ‘socially constructed phenomenon’ and any reputation building exercise should accommodate the opinion of diverse stakeholders. So meeting out the expectations of the diverse stakeholders is about the sustainability of the business schools. It is notable that in the Indian context, the board structure is guided by the legislative acts.

In the literature of responsible institutions, Sionneau, Rabasso and Rabasso (2014) identified that GRH (Globally Responsible Humanism) culture at European business schools will keep them on top of reputational scores. Hence, the way out for reputation passes through the responsible management education. Recently Storey et al (2017) examined the field of responsible management education in the realm of sustainable development goals (SDG) of United Nations. Their study mentions (P. 95, 102) that the driver of business school behaviour is accreditation agencies like AMBA (Association of Master of Business Administration) etc. The accreditation standards like EQUIS [European Foundation for Management Development (EFMDs), a Quality Improvement System by its 2013 amendment stipulated that ethics, responsibility and sustainability (ERS) should have a criterion of evaluation of management schools. It urged the business schools to collaborate with civil society, government and public policy. Figuero and Raufflet (2015) performed systematic analysis of 63 articles on higher and management education, it strongly highlights (p. 30) that challenges of sustainability in the management education are organizational, terminological, capability related, pedagogical and individual ones. Further, Thomas and Peters (2012) looked upon to evolve the sustainable model of a business school. They observed that there is lot of attention on revenue generating activities of the business schools rather than effective resource consumption. They concluded that the financial short-termism is dangerous; sustainability and maximising the stakeholder’s value is more important.

While exploring the challenges of organizational sustainability, it is found that keeping in view the multiplicity of the stakeholders, the governing boards of higher educational institutions are constituted. Governing boards can be of two types consultative where chairperson and secretary resolve in consultation of internal and independent members. Participative where different standing committees are assigned and the task and resolutions are made in tandem of their recommendations. Unlike the company form where there is separate and professionally trained compliance officer and statutory committee for sustainability/ethical issues, governance of business schools in India are done on consultative basis, at large. To professionalize the secretarial function of the board, there is a CABS (Chartered Association of Business Schools) in

UK and ICSA (Institute of Chartered Secretaries and Administrators in Canada). The body helps its members to maintain world class standards. The CABS highlights the importance of the B schools in the economy. To quote CABS, 1 in every 5 university student of UK belongs to management education sector. The CABS has 120 business schools and other institutes of higher education. If someone to make the comparison of CABS with Indian version of AIMA (All India Management Association), then differentiating feature is that AIMA is a professional body but not chartered body like UK. AIMA does not derive any statutory power in the governance of management education in India. In India, the propagation of management education is taken care of AIMA and reputational survey is conducted by NIRF which works under the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

To coordinate the higher educational institutions in India is performed by multiple agencies; a parliament of India constituted body called UGC (University Grants Commission) which ensures minimum standards in research and education in degree granting institutions, a parliament of India constituted body called AICTE (All India Council for Technical Education) for ensuring minimum standards in diploma granting institutions, institutions tagged as 'Institute of National Importance' directly enacted by special act of parliament regulate on its own and Indian Institutes of Management, which is governed by the Government of India. Unlike CABS, these multiple institutions have multiple standards of management education and some of these standards are bare minimum. To upgrade the standards, the national agencies for accreditation are in place but their rating are based on objective assessment of institutions rather perceptual survey of stakeholders. In India, there is accreditation at course/programme level and at institutional level. NAAC (National Accreditation and Assessment Board) is the Government of India's recognised body for the institutional accreditation. It has prepared a manual in which 'Governance, leadership and management' has been kept as a criterion of effectiveness. This category has key indicators, which include institutional vision and leadership, strategy development and deployment, faculty empowerment strategies, Financial management and resource mobilization and IQAS (Internal Quality Assurance System).

In the absence of UK and Canada kind of chartered association, the professional governance and secretarial assistance is not available for Indian higher education institutions. It may be paradoxical that institutionalization is professional in the company form and non-professional in the society run organizations, where accountability to the stakeholder is greater than former. It is also notable here that unlike the company structure where management function and direction function are separated, the boards of business school have generally common board for

‘management’ and ‘direction’, however, the academic boards e.g. senate or academic councils are different. Conheady et al. (2015) studied 699 Canadian firms to know whether effective board leads to firm performance. The study concluded that it is difficult to develop index for board performance, however there is positive association between board’s effectiveness and firm’s performance. Ramakrishnan (2012) also took this question of high performing board and concluded that to be effective, boards should have sound processes to develop to execute and oversee the implementation of the strategy. He further emphasized that mere compliance orientation is not enough and they need to create accountable structures. McIntyre et al. (2007) has already suggested the model of performance of board output. He suggested environmental scanning, monitoring managers as fiduciary of stockholders, advising the CEO and top management on strategic issues, feedback and guidance to CEO, facilitating and acquisitioning of resources critical to firm’s success including financing, extending network of contacts, acting as external source of knowledge and participating in succession planning.

In the literature of non-company form of governance, Chareonwongsak (2017) investigated whether board’s motivation plays any role in the competitive performance of the cooperatives in Thailand. He performed questionnaire based survey on the board members and concluded that motivation of the board members significantly affects the performance of the cooperatives. He also determined the factors of the motivation. The factors include board authority and function, board composition, board meeting and quality, board member’s skill, transparency in evaluation and compensation setting process and financial compensation. Further, in the literature of the not for profit governance, there is a study by Arshad et al. (2014). This study indicates that there is a need of specific framework for the governance of the not for profit organizations. He explored that self-governance model of the board is not good. They got partial support for their hypothesis that the professional qualification of the board members contributes in the effectiveness of the board. To propagate the professionalism in the board’s composition and the approach, the Australian Institute of Company Directors (2013) lay down 10 principles for the governance of the not for profit organizations (NFP). These principles are clarity to the roles and responsibilities (expectation of stakeholders), board’s composition (representation of stakeholders), purpose and strategy (professional approach), risk, organization performance (effective use of resources), board’s effectiveness (structures and processes, integrity and accountability, organization building, culture and ethics and stakeholders engagement. In Australia, there is an institution of ACNC governance (Australian Charities and Not-for-profit Commission). The commission has prepared governance standard guidelines. There are five standards stipulated by this commission are Demonstrability of the purposes,

Accountability of its members, Compliance with laws, suitability of responsible persons and duties of responsible persons. Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada (2014) also prepared a non-authoritative document on the effectiveness principles for the NFP boards. These principles are understanding the legislative requirements and environment, designing the governance framework, setting the board's dynamics right, Monitoring, learning and improvement. In Indian context, CAPART (Council for Advancement of People's action and Rural Technology) identified three board areas where base level check of the volunteer sector governance may be done. These areas are identity, governance and disclosure. Indian Government's Ministry of Human Resource Development has also compiled themes for consultation in higher education. These themes include governance reforms for quality. The paper mentions that there is a dire need to reform governance from external regulation, certification and accreditation to institutional level. The paper also identified some of the governance reforms needed to be considered. The development of the minimum standards and quality norms are the one side of the agenda and the enforcement of these standards are the another side. The role of professionally qualified administrator or Chartered secretary may be key to the latter agenda. Unlike, Chartered Accountant's institution in India, there Company secretary institution in India, not Chartered secretary who could serve the general purpose. At global level, there already exists ICSA (Institute of Chartered Secretaries and Administrators) of Canada, UK, SCSGP (Society for Corporate Secretaries and Governance professionals) of USA, countries which are the global leaders of higher education. They cover NFP sector also, in addition to the company sector. Indian management education may have two kinds of reforms, either converting society form of the governance to the not-for-profit company form, where existing company law can provide professionals with chartered qualification or to expand the scope of Company secretary qualification to the chartered secretary qualification. The institutional governance of the eminent management institution of the world have adopted the separate reporting mechanism for board's vital functions like supervision and management of routine and statement on its responsibility or statement of sustainability or long term. In the company structure, the board has separate committee for it, which is led by the independent director. For an effective performance of the NFP board, the existence of the statutory committees is required. The promoters or members of the society may device performance appraisal system in the line of functioning of these committees and determine the accountability at individual and board's level.

Propositions:

1. The governance reform is an antecedent for attaining global eminence for Indian higher education
2. The Institute of Company Secretaries of India (ICSI) should be reframed as institute for chartered secretaries of India (in the line of Canada) to include Indian higher education and governance of large non-company sector for effective secretarial support
3. In the line of company governance reforms, the Indian higher educational governance requires some professional/statutory code or framework that will make the governance more accountable.

3. Methodology

The present study adopts comparative case study design. Based on the availability of the data (of last 10 years) i.e. minutes of the board and potential of global performance based on good national rank, and entrepreneurial nature of the institution due to new operation, small size, global vision and clarity in vision, the present study identifies IIT Bhuvneshwar (hereinafter IIT BBS) for exploring Indian higher educational governance. The reference case unit is McGill University of Canada, which is presently at the point where IIT BBS would like to be. McGill is selected due to its high global rank as well as availability of board minutes, information and annual report. The study unit is mainly the acts, charters, board minutes, annual reports and peer team/evaluation reports. The present study analysed 23 board minutes of IIT BBS of last 10 years. It also analysed latest available annual report of 2015-16. McGill University's closed session proceedings were not available. This study used the minutes of closed sessions proceedings and reports of its various standing committees. The BEEM (Building Strengths, Eliminating weakness, Exploiting opportunities and Minimising threats) analysis framework was used in this study. The parameters of the analysis are composition of the board, structure of the board, board procedure and outcome orientation. Further, outcome orientation of the board focussed on institutional vision and leadership, strategy development and deployment and faculty empowerment. Some of these parameters are used by the national accreditation agencies of India.

4. Finding and Analysis

Indian Institutes of Technology (IIT) is a system enacted by the parliament of India, where many institutes are located at different parts of the country. There is an IIT council which coordinates the affairs of all the IITs. The individual institutes have Board of Governors (BOG). IIT

Bhubaneswar society registered in year 2008. It is a new generation degree granting institute of India. The Indian parliament under the Institute of Technology (Amendment) act, 2012 includes IIT Bhuvneshwar (hereinafter, IIT BBS) as 'institute of national importance'. In India, there are 74 institutions which are declared as 'institutions of national importance'. Some of these institutions have potential to attain global eminence. The section 13 (1) of the above act describes the responsibilities and the functions of IIT BBS's Board of Governors. The responsibility of the board is general superintendence, direction and control of the affairs of the institute. The function includes, taking decisions on the question of the policy related to administration and the working of the institute, instituting courses of the study, making statute, appointing academic and other persons, considering, modifying and cancelling the ordinances, consider and pass resolutions on annual report and send the council the statement on the development plan and to appoint the committees which is necessary to perform the duties under this act.

McGill University is 32nd in the world as per QS world ranking of the universities, 2018. It runs 300 programmes of study. It has produced 142 Rhodes scholars and 12 Nobel laureates. It is 195 years of old university at Canada. It was set up in 1821. The King George IV of the England granted the royal charter in 1852. Like institute of national importance status in India, the Government granted it the status of 'Royal Institution for the Advance of learning'. Board of McGill university has final authority over the all-academic, business and financial affairs of the university. This is unlike IIT BBS where IIT Council and Govt. Ministry has roles to oversee. The tenure of the board member is 5 years rather than 3 years at IIT BBS.

Table 1: A comparative performance of IIT BBS and McGill University

S.N.	Criterion	IIT BBS (2015-16)	McGill University (2012-13)
1	Student strength	1038 (4500 by 2022)	38779
2	Faculty Strength	100 (including one Chair faculty)	1674 tenured faculty, 163 endowed teaching/research chairs, 157 Canada research chairs allotted to McGill
3	Faculty-Student ratio	10.3	19.4
4	Proportion of Ph.D. students	36.4% (Integrated programme included)	10.9%
5	Journal publications	213	NA
6	Patents	3 granted, 5 filed	22
7	Research funding	27.50 crore Indian rupees	483.5 million Canadian dollar (~2508.73 crores in Indian rupees)
8	Proportion of international students	NA	21.4%
9	Ranking	18 (2017, National Ranking)	18 (2012 QS world university ranking)

4.1 Composition of the board: The statute of the McGill university was enacted in 1972. The statute provides the composition of the board. Principal or the vice chancellor is the ex-officio member of the board. There is maximum limit of the board members. It should be not more than 25. Out of which 12 have to be elected after the nomination by the committee concerned. These members are called ‘Members at large’. Five members of these members at large category should be ex-graduates of McGill University. Further to this, two shall be from McGill Alumni association, two members to be chosen from senate (once they become part of the board, they cease to exist the member of Senate), two are elected from the administrative and support staff, two are elected from the academic staff and one shall be from the student society, one from the McGill Association of continuing Education students, one is from campus student’s society. As per University’s statute, the board shall elect its chairman or the chancellor.

Unlike McGill university, IIT BBS has president of India as visitor and the chair of the board is nominated by the president of India. That means the chairman’s position is controlled by the Government. Like McGill University, the Director of IIT BBS is the ex-officio member of the board. Unlike the McGill university’s half of the members elected by the board, recommended by the nomination committee, the IIT BBS includes a person of repute to be nominated by the state where IIT BBS is located (IIT BBS is located in the state of Odisha). Two

professors are nominated by the Senate. Like McGill university, Senate is the body which oversees academic matters and works independently, in general. Four person are nominated by the council, which is again chaired by the government functionary i.e. Minister In-Charge. The general duty of the IIT council to coordinate the activities of all the IITs. It can advise on the matters of admission standards, recruitment standards, development plan, budget etc. IIT BBS board is mainly constituted by the 'members at large'. It is also notable here that the composition of the board is provided by the statute in the McGill University, where as in the IIT BBS, the composition of the board is provided in the act of the parliament. McGill University's board has the representation of greater kind of constituencies, autonomy of choose its own members, system of election rather than selection/nomination by the Government. Now the new regulatory framework which is called UGC (Declaration of Government institutions as institutions of eminence) guidelines, 2017 (hereinafter, IOE guidelines) mentions that institutes of national importance e.g. IIT BBS would continue to function under their respective acts. That means the IOE guidelines do not find the mention of changing the composition of the board to make it more representative of various kinds of stakeholders.

4.2 Structure of the board: McGill University provides various kind of committees, its modalities and term of reference. There is Audit committee, building and property committee, Committee to advice on the matter of social responsibility, executive committee, finance committee, Human Resource committee, Investment Committee and Nominating, Governance and Ethics Committee. IIT BBS statute mentions Building and works committee as well as Finance committee only. There is no provision of any other standing committee (s). Statute 2 (d) of IIT BBS provides that Senate is empowered to constitute permanent and other sub-committees but committee's jurisdiction should not exceed the senate's power. It is notable here that in both IIT BBS and McGill University, the Senate is the apex body of the academic matter. It is apparent that in IIT BBS system, there is no permanent mechanism, delegation or specialization o provide superintendence, direction and control in the matter of audit, social responsibility, investment, ethics, execution, Human resource etc. It is up-to the board to constitute the committee, if the issues are of such nature. The present study did not find the evidence of IIT BBS board constituting any such standing committees. All issues are explored by all the members collectively, in principle.

4.3 Board procedures: McGill university board gets its secretarial assistance from secretary general who is a professional. The agenda items are planned minute wise. This reflects the planning of board time and advance commitment of the members to time needed. IIT BBS board

has to repetitively defer some agenda items due to paucity of time. IIT BBS board has to repetitively record that 'to circulate annual report in time so that members can read and generate opinion'. Board chairman is appointed by the Government. IIT BBS board members suggested the list of individuals for appointment of new chairman. Govt. of India has appointed peer review committee to do external audit. Audit committee of McGill university itself look after the function of external audit. This system helps the university's board to take proper ownership of the audit observation on routine basis rather than short format intermittent audit. There is no system in the IIT BBS board that whether all actions are in compliance of the extant rules and norms and even if these rules are not complied; few will be accountable rather than whole board. In McGill university's audit committee declares before the board that everything is in compliance of law/norms.

In India, the company governance has such system in place. A professionally qualified secretary can do such thing for Indian educational institution's boards too. There is a nominating, governance and ethics (NGE) committee at McGill University, which recommends orientation programme for each of the new members of the board. This programme is designed keeping in view the expertise and the interest of the members (2017). This ensures the individual participation and focus of the board rather than indulging deeply into every issues. Many issues before the board require due diligence rather than prior knowledge. Standing committee system channelizes the energy of the board. Majority of the board members of India are experts in their fields or administrator or governors in their respective field. They may not be aware about the best practices of the educational governance. NGE committee of McGill board was asked to study the best practice of the university governance (2017). The self-improving aspect was not much seen in IIT BBS governance. This feature is especially required when board has to comply with other authorities or to re-assert itself or exercise its own authority. Such kind of self-review can help the IIT BBS board to check its performance and quality and furnish suitable suggestions related to the size of the board, remuneration of the board, chair ship which are the function exercised by the IIT council or government of India. Though the McGill community receives regular updates about the board's meeting, however, only the open sessions with the board is made public. This is special feature of IIT BBS board to make public almost all of its closed session meeting. Another feature of the professionalization of the board procedure is its frequency. McGill board's frequency is mentioned in its statute, whereas IIT BBS board meets as per the requirement. Another important committee of the McGill's board is executive committee, in which principal or vice chancellor is the ex-officio member. IIT BBS board performs its executive function through board chairman, Director and Registrar.

4.4 Outcome Orientations

(i) Institutional vision and leadership

In 2010, IIT BBS resolved to develop vision document incorporating all inputs and concurrence to the suggestions given by the board members. These suggestions include achieving world class status (among top 100) in 10 years, inculcate the model of ‘promise and perform’, having a vision workshop, clear vision document not more than 5 pages, broad management structure by the Govt. instead of micro-managing the institute, performance oriented BOG and corporate style of functioning, Routine matter decided by Director/Chairman-BOG not to be discussed by BOG, diversity in student’s growth etc.

The institutional vision for IIT BBS is:

“We will be a high respected institute in the world for our distinctive knowledge”.

It now seems difficult to find place among world’s top 100, without going for global accreditation or routine internal/external review or intent to participate in global ranking. The visioning may have to serve dual purpose; one to motivate the institute community and another to show due diligence in achieving outcome. A development of metric or key performance indicator approach may tell that to what extent vision has been achieved. These indicators help to establish causality in the actions of the board. Presently, it is not measured at IITBBS, which actions increase effectiveness or which increased efficiency.

Table 2: A BEEM analysis on vision parameter of IIT BBS (based on BOG minutes)

Building Strengths	Eliminating Weakness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To formulate a scheme to admit 5-10% foreign students on supernumerary basis (2012), IIT Bombay is taking lead in coordination with IIT BBS as per gov’t. scheme (2016) To increase research students from 180 to 270 (2015) To develop entrepreneurial eco system/entrepreneurial park at the institute (2015) Student strength is 1050 and mandated is 2360 (2016) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopting systems of another IIT, which is oldest (2009) Provision of long term deputation (10 years) of the employees among central educational institutions (2011)
Exploiting opportunities	Minimizing threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolution to develop vision document (2010) Expressed accord with the new Director about vision of becoming great national institute (2015) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registrar (also the secretary of the board) should be appointed on tenure basis, three years extendable 2 more years (2011)

(ii) Strategy development and deployment

IIT BBS has got some good collaboration with the foreign universities, however this approach was quite selective in nature, not broad based. McGill board (2017) reports its principal's remark that McGill participated in the meeting of American Association of the Universities. These platform of the association provides wider choices for the collaboration. IIT BBS board asked for more collaboration with the state (Odisha) industries to get more interface and graduation outcome. The industry interface at IIT BBS seemed selective. McGill board records that it participated in the round table where large number of industry representative participated. Such forums provide more visibility to the cutting edge research agenda of the higher educational institute. IIT BBS repetitively recorded to improve industry interface. Annual report is a very important document for any university. The principal of the McGill university read the annual report (2017) before the board and apprised how McGill is attracting research funds with respect to the peer institutions. The competitive perspective in IIT BBS board is confined to only adoption of administrative norms and systems rather than performance/outcome/end point focus. Chief executive of the university presents the progress report before its board. It is critical to know about post vision development exercise. IIT BBS progress report is mostly in qualitative terms. On the other hand, McGill University developed sixteen key performance indicator by which its monitors and summarised the performance of the university. These performance indicators could be designed representative of national and international ranking.

Table 3: A BEEM analysis of IIT BBS on strategy parameter (based on BOG minutes)

Building Strengths	Eliminating Weakness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of top 10 international Journal in each discipline and publishing 2 paper/year by the faculty (2010) • Guiding Ph.D. (2010) • Introducing compulsory 'term paper' course in undergraduate curriculum (2011) • Each faculty should have annual target to file 2 patents (2011) • Should start Post-doctoral programme (2011) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of honorary professor position to create linkage with the industry (2011) • To get over the challenge of inadequacy of consultancy projects by participating in national programmes (2015)
Exploiting opportunities	Minimizing threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOU with University of Massachusetts (2011), University of Buffalo and State University of New York (2012), SJTI Shanghia (2016) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested IIT council for NAB accreditation (2014) • Concerns to address

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benchmark with old IITs/IIMs to arrangement amenities for the students (2015) • Inviting all the industries of Odisha state for placement of students (2015) 	<p>student's feedback and unsatisfactory placements (2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal audit of Ph.D. programme (2016)
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

(iii) Faculty empowerment strategies

IIT BBS board resolved to make policy for endowment chair professor in relation with the proposal submitted by the MGM steel company to IIT BBS. The board deferred the MGM steel's proposal till the formulation of the policy. Later on, IIT BBS signed an MOU with the MGM steel company and reported to the board. In IIT BBS, the faculty rewards policy could not be approved. It is notable here that majority of the McGill faculty are on tenure basis, unlike the IIT BBS where faculty works on permanent basis. A permanent faculty are expected to take more ownership about the affairs of the institute. So in this connection, it is natural for them to develop some collective platform representing common issues. McGill board deals with this issue by having open sessions with the faculty members and other stakeholders. For adopting this practice, board members need to have more time and ownership for the institute.

Table 4: A BEEM analysis of IIT BBS on faculty empowerment parameter (based on BOG minutes)

Building Strengths	Eliminating Weakness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To fix target for the faculty for publications (2010) • IPR and consultancy policy should be prepared and placed before the board (2010) • Appointment of 3 foreign faculties as guest faculty (2010) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seed grant for new faculty increased from rupees 5 lacs to 10 lacs (2011) • To institute award for faculty publishing in top journals (2012), Proposal not approved (2013) • Inviting teachers from industry for imparting quality education (2015) • Coping up with the in-adequacies by govt and public construction agencies (2015) • Board warned low performing teaching faculty and set the benchmark of teaching performance (2016)

Exploiting opportunities	Minimizing threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resolve to make policy for endowment chair professors (2010) • Asking corporates for the faculty chairs (2011, 2012) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Felt a mechanism required to know the expectation of the faculty from board (2010) • To formulate long term programme for faculty to attain eminence (2012) • To improve teaching standards and encourage participative learning (2015) • Plagiarism by the faculty to be treated as per the service rules (2015) • Asking the referral of other IIT's practice to allow faculty forum of the institute to register under society's act (2015), Board deferred the agenda twice (2016)

5. Concluding Discussion

The finding and analysis indicates good support for the proposition that a progressive governance practices are required for Indian higher educational institutes who aspire to be globally ranked or move towards that direction. Unlike, the Indian case, where governance has three tiers Government, Council and Board, the Canadian model has only one tier that is board itself. Election model of board membership rather than nomination, existence of various standing committees to channelize and monitor the work, codify the board's duties and be accountable to that, include insiders to instil the sense of ownership as well as self-governance, and to professionalize the chair of the secretarial office to conduct well prepared and well guided board meetings and procedures are the progressive practices, which Indian higher education leaders and public policy makers can think about. The not-for profit sector is quite big and needs to be accountable due to its public source of funding and grants. The accountability of an organization starts from top i.e. its board and board's mind i.e. its secretary. The presents study invites future studies to explore larger implications of not-for-profit governance in education and other development sectors. It also calls for legal reforms required therefore.

6. References

1. Arshad, R. et al. (2014). Assessing Self-governance and value creation in not for profit organizations. *Procedia-Social and behavioural Sciences*, 145, 286-293.

2. Australian Institute for Company Director. Available at: <http://aicd.companydirectors.com.au/~media/cd2/resources/director-resources/nfp/pdf/nfp-principles-and-guidance-131015.ashx>, Accessed on October 1, 2017.
3. CAPART. Available at: <http://capart.nic.in/misc/notes/makhija-subgroupI.htm>, Accessed on October 3, 2017.
4. Charionwongsak, K. (2017). Enhancing Board's motivation for competitive performance of Thailand's cooperatives. *Journal of Co-operative organization and Management*, 5, 1-13.
5. Conheady, B. et al. (2015). Board effectiveness and firm performance in Canadian listed firms, *The British Accounting Review*, 47, 290-303.
6. EFMD. Available at: <http://www.efmd.org/blog/view/278-efmd-introduces-broader-coverage-of-ethics-responsibility-and-sustainability-to-equis>, Accessed on October 1, 2017.
7. European Association of Institutions of Higher Education. Available at: https://www.eurashe.eu/library/modernising-phe/Bologna_1999_Bologna-Declaration.pdf, Accessed on October 6, 2017.
8. Figueiro, P.S. and Raufflet, E. (2015). Sustainability in higher education: a systematic review with focus on management education. *Journal of Cleaner production*, 106, 22-33.
9. Fullan, M. and Scot, G. (2009). Turn around leadership in higher education, Wiley publishing.
10. Indian Institute of Technology, Bhuvneshwar. Available at: <http://www.iitbbs.ac.in/index.php>, Accessed on October 6, 2017.
11. Korac-Kakabadse, N. et al. (2001). Board governance and company performance: any correlations? *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*, 1, 24-3.
12. Majumdar, U. Rana, N. and Sanan, N. (2015). India's top companies for CSR and Sustainability, Available at: https://www.iimu.ac.in/upload_data/main_containts/about/Social-Responsibility/IIMU_CSR_REPORT.pdf, Accessed on October 6, 2017.
13. McGill University. Available at: <http://www.mcgill.ca/>, Accessed on October 6, 2017.
14. McIntyre, M.L. et al. (2007). The top team: examining board composition and firm performance. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*, 7 (5), pp.547-561.
15. Ministry of Corporate Affairs. Government of India, Available at: http://www.mca.gov.in/Ministry/actsbills/pdf/Societies_Registration_Act_1860.pdf, Accessed on October 1, 2017.

16. Ministry of Human Resource Development. Government of India, Available at: http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/upload_document/Themes_questions_HE.pdf, Accessed on October 1, 2017.
17. National Institutional Ranking Framework. Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, Available at: <https://www.nirfindia.org/About>, Accessed on October 4, 2017.
18. QS Quacquarelli Symonds Limited. Available at: <https://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2018>, Accessed on October 6, 2017.
19. Ramakrishnan, V. (2012). High performing boards: going beyond compliance. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 33 (2), 38 – 48.
20. Siebert, S. and Martin, G. (2013). Reputational challenges for business schools: a contextual perspective, *Education + Training*, 55 (4/5), 429-444.
21. Sionneau, B. et al. (2014). How European business schools can find their way, *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 5(2), 226-25.
22. Storey, M. et al. (2017). Responsible Management Education: Mapping the field in the context of SDGs, *The International journal of Management Education*, 15, 99-103.
23. The Canadian institute of Chartered Accountants (2011). Available at: <https://www.cpacanada.ca/-/media/site/business-and-accounting-resources/docs/20-questions-directors-of-not-for-profit-organizations-should-ask-about-human-resources.pdf>, Accessed on October 1, 2017.
24. Thomas, H. and Peters, K. (2012) A sustainable model for business schools, *Journal of Management Development*, 31 (4),377-38.
25. University Grants Commission. Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, Available at : https://www.ugc.ac.in/ugc_notices.aspx?id=1776, Accessed on September 16, 2017.