

## Promoting Excellence (A)

Mr. Bishnoi was wondering what action he should take on a letter dt. 15.4.2013, received from Prof. Pragyan, a former faculty of the IMX Institute. The letter was in a way disturbing as the issues highlighted seemed significant to manage academic excellence of this premier Institute, promoted by Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India. The letter read as below:

“Sir, I wish to bring to your kind attention an unfortunate situation of denial to Prof. Pathak, senior most faculty (see exhibit 1) his due (elevation to HAG scale) and arrears due to him and others, by shifting the date of implementation from 18.8.2009 to 1.10. 2012 (ostensibly to favour a young professor/ solve the problem caused by tie up of 4 younger professors due to chunking in their promotion date). It, however, does not seem proper, logical and justified. There could be many other, better ways of solving the issue. I can give details if the Board of Governors (BoG) wishes to consider reversal of date of implementation. If due care as suggested is not taken the BoG may face even intriguing situation in very near future as the present Directors finish their terms”.

### Background of the Case

Government of India announced pay revision on the basis of recommendations of 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. MHRD issued notification on 18.8.2009 for implementation w.e.f. 1.1.2006. The professors' pay scale was revised from Rs. 18400-22400 to Rs. 53000-67000. The notification included inter-alia the following:-

- a) Allowing Grade pay of Rs. 10500 p.m. to Professors who had been in the scale of Rs. 18400- 22400 and,
- b) Allowing up to 40% of the posts of Professors at any given point of time an Academic Grade Pay (AGP) of Rs. 12000/- p.m. after completion of six years of regular service in AGP of 10500/-p.m. subject to performance evaluation based upon research, publications, Ph.D. supervision, teaching and consultancy services etc.

BoG of IMX in its meeting on Oct. 7, 2009, approved the same for implementation in toto (i.e. with effect from 1.1.2006) and the Institute released part arrears as advised by MHRD in above notification and settled final payment in September 2009 (as per the notification issued by MHRD in this regards) without any condition or change in the date of implementation (i.e. 1.1.2006)

With regard to part (b) above, while some Institutions under MHRD announced implementation of the same on seniority basis. IMX did not take any action for implementation of AGP of 12000/- until March 2010. If it had done so AGP of Rs. 12000/- would have been awarded to those who had completed 6 years regular service as on 1.1.2006 and thereafter as they become eligible.

On 15.3.2010 MHRD issued another notification that the services rendered by the Professors in pre revised scale of Rs. 18400-22400 will be counted for granting AGP of Rs.12000/-.

---

Copyright © 2016. The case is prepared by Ruchi Srivastava PGDM, Interior Designer Bangalore as a basis for class discussion rather than illustrating correct or incorrect handling of administrative situations

Vide an order dt. 26.8.2010 MHRD notified that the movement from AGP of Rs. 10500/- to Rs. 12000 will be with effect from 18.8.2009 and not w.e.f. 1.1.2006.

On Sept. 15, 2010, MHRD issued yet another notification that AGP of Rs. 12000/- is abolished and a new HAG scale of Rs. 67000- 79000 without any grade pay. It would be effective from 18.8.2009.

### **Performance Review Committee**

In May 2010, the Director appointed a Performance Review Committee (PRC) to work out criteria for performance to give eligible professors AGP of Rs. 12000/-. The Committee comprised Dr. Bisaria, a senior academician expert, who was also member of the BoG, and four other professors, including Prof. Pathak, Dean (Academic Affairs) and Prof. Bose, Dean (Dev and Resource Mobilisation), and two professors Dr. Devanandan and Dr. Mukri. The Committee expeditiously submitted its report (see exhibit 2) in August 2010. Although the Dean (Academic Affairs) dissented on many issues e.g., not covering all the academic activities, not covering the entire period of service (as notified by MHRD) but only last six years, excessive weightage given to teaching etc. (for discussions in the Committee see case Promoting Excellence “B”), his dissent was not recorded. Also, though the terms of reference to the Committee did not indicate any suggestion to change the date of implementation, (which was to be 1.1.2006 before MHRD changed it to 18.8.2009, on 28.8.2010), the PRC in its report dt. Aug. 10, 2010 also suggested that the Board may implement AGP of Rs. 12000/- from any other date.

The performance evaluation scheme recommended by the Committee identified several criteria of performance, including many activities, which did not exist before the year 2003 like educational programmes for working executives and doctoral programme (which gave tremendous opportunities for guiding Ph.D. students and sharing research publication credits). Both of them boosted opportunities for engaging in teaching. The scheme however, did not consider many other academic activities that were assigned importance by the Directors and BoGs from time to time, between 1985 and 2003 like course material development, organizing conferences, research, conducting faculty development programmes etc. It laid major emphasis on the criteria and weightage to activities which were emphasized by the Institute from 2003 onwards, because earlier many faculty members were not doing enough work, even meeting the minimum work load requirements. Ironically weightage for some activities were different from the one used in faculty workload norms (WN). For example, for Chairmanship of TAC was 2 credit in WN, but it was 3 points in PRC. Likewise weightage for TAC membership was 0.25 credit in WN, which was given 1 point each in PRC. There was no weightage given for working papers/ attending conferences, which was 0.25 credit each in WN.

The reason forwarded for the same was that the Institute did not have records of performance of some faculty for the entire period from the day they were in the scale of Rs. 18400- 22400 . It was not fully true. The records were there, but the format and the details they covered were based upon the priorities and thrust given by the Institute and BoG from time to time as demanded by different stage of development of the Institute. The Institute did not have precise records of performance on the activities following a point system which did not exist before 2003. How could it have records on performance before 2003 following a system introduced in 2003, is a moot point. In any case if the information was not available in records, one could always ask for it, as done in case of promotion of internal candidates (see exhibit 11). The number of such cases was not many. The high performing members could not be denied the benefit of HAG scale on this count. The cut off norms were kept low so that benefit reached to larger number of people and everybody who had completed six years' service qualified for elevation.

The committee's recommendations were forwarded to the Director for consideration of the BoG. The recommendations were approved by the Board on 7.10.2010. The MHRD's concurrence was received on the above, which approved the norms subject to the condition (see exhibit 3) that government rules may be followed.

### **Assessment of Performance**

A Performance Assessment Committee (PAC) was then appointed in November 2010 to work out the details of performance of all the Professors. However, the work got stuck for certain reasons. Another PAC was appointed in April 2012 to do the job, which comprised three professors who were far junior to many professors being evaluated (see exhibit 1) and a young FA-Cum- CAO who was in Assistant Professor's scale. The PAC worked out the details and submitted recommendations on Monday June 11, 2012. The matter was put up to BoG on 16.6.2012, as any other item for consideration with the permission of the Chairman.

In the meantime a professor a representation was submitted by a senior professor of the Institute, outlining on his views on the recommendations of PRC. The BoG in its meeting decided that the matter should be referred to the same Committee (PRC). The matter was referred to Chairman of PAC for his consideration and recommendation.

The matter was brought for consideration of BoG on 29.9.2012, once again as any other item with the permission of Chairman. Board meeting was attended by, apart from the Chairman, 7 external Board members and 8 internal members including 2 faculty members, who were direct beneficiary of the HAG scale (see exhibit 4),

The BoG approved the same. The arrears thus were calculated and paid w.e.f. 1.10.2012 (i.e., over 3 years later from the date of implementation due i.e. 18.8.2009).

### **Consequences of Delay in Implementation**

The letter from Prof. Pragyan, (who was in friendly terms with most faculty members) also gave the following insights into the case:

The inadvertent delay on the part of the Institute in implementation of HAG pay scale and shifting of the date of implementation (without the re-concurrence of MHRD on this important matter), had resulted in:

- a) 40% of all the Professors who were on the rolls of the Institute as on 18.8.2009 and were awarded HAG scale were denied arrears of 3 years, (for no fault of theirs).
- b) The senior-most faculty of the Institute, Prof. Pathak, with over 25 years of distinguished service as professor, who had maximum, most diversified and relevant qualifications and experience in the Institute (see exhibit 5) being denied the HAG scale, having contributed more than any other professor in the overall development of the Institute's academics and administration at different stages of development of the Institute, as he had retired on 30.6.2011.
- c) I understand that all the Professors in the seniority list up to Prof. Mukri were awarded HAG scale by the Board. Ironically, by and large, all the professors who got the benefit of fitment in HAG scale by shifting the implementation date to 1.10.2012, would have got the same in December 2012 anyway (see exhibit 6), even if the date of implementation had been retained as 18.8.2009
- d) I also understand that later the Institute has awarded HAG scale to remaining two of the 13 professors in the seniority list (the professor at serial no. 13 and the senior most professor PP who was found

“not up to the mark” and thus refused award of the HAG scale by the Board), beyond the limit of 40% prescribed by the government (except Prof. Pathak, the senior most faculty at number 2 of seniority list, because he had retired in 2011).

“Is the Institute justified in denying Prof. Pathak his due? What message the Institute is giving to all for excellence? Is not it time to review decisions and go for a win-win solution for all?” Prof. Pragyan asked. “Were Prof. Pathak’s details properly presented to the BoG?” he wondered. He also wondered why the performance evaluation criteria were harsher for those senior professors who were selected for national assignments comparable to the Director of the Institute.

Taking to the case writer Prof. Pragyan said, “The fact that the Institute did not have record of performance of professors for the entire period of service has not happened just like that. Directors had a role in it. If proper records were maintained the truth would have come out – that a good number of faculty members who were patronized from different Directors from time to time, were not taking full load for years, not conducting open management development programmes (MDP) or engaging in new initiatives like launch of advanced/ new courses and programmes, organizing research based conferences, seminars. Very few were doing research or developing course material, conducting faculty development programmes etc. despite repeated reminders from the Board for over two decades. On the other hand some senior professors like Prof. Pathak and PP were vacating established courses for younger faculty members to help them settle down, but the latter stuck to them.

The situation changed a bit from the year 2004-05, after introduction of new workload norms and new monetary incentive system for sponsored MDPs and stricter enforcement through denial of payments if one did not meet the minimum workload requirements. But this led to more teaching/ training in less rigorous programmes at increasing scale and guiding doctoral students. Nothing else materially changed in terms of moving towards academic excellence.

We had great opportunity to change the course of action for moving towards academic excellence, when the government agreed to introduce performance based award of HAG scale to 40% of the professors. But the whole system seems to have been manoeuvred to perpetuate mediocrity. If one closely looks at the records of faculty members, it is disturbing. Don’t you see many faculty members doing more than 10 course credit work, when the faculty members were up in arms when the government asked to teach 4 courses. Something is being compromised somewhere” he concluded

Questions:

- Q1. Why MHRD had introduced the scale?
- Q2. What is consequence of changing the date of implementation?
- Q3. Is Institute right in changing the date of implementation? Why?
- Q4. Have there been any other mistakes in implementation of HAG scale?
- Q5. Do you think the contention that “if the date of implementation was not changed then a junior will supersede a senior professor” is true? Is the reality opposite?
- Q6. Who all would have got HAG scale by Oct. 1, 2012 if the same was awarded w.e.f. 18.8.2009 in view of exhibit 6?
- Q7. Comment on performance evaluation scheme given in exhibit 2.
- Q8. As member of the Board what course of action Mr. Bishnoi should follow?
- Q9. What action Prof. Pragyan/ Prof. Pathak should take, if Mr. Bishnoi does not respond?

## **Promoting Excellence (A1)**

### **RTI Enquiry**

Since no reply was received nor any action followed for over 3 months, Prof. Pragyan was intrigued as the issue seemed to be important. By chance he came across RTI Act, through a friend and thought of seeking the information on implementation of HAG scale from the Institute under RTI.

However, Prof. Pathak told Prof. Pragyan that Mr. Bishnoi was an old friend and he would have taken action if there was any mistake. Prof. Pragyan was intrigued as he knew that Prof. Pathak had been a good performer, always ahead of time for furthering academic agenda of the Institute, engaging in new/advanced activities like research, open and sponsored MDPs, literature development, faculty development, organizing conferences, even if he had to surrender courses that he established for the youngsters (exhibit 7). His performance as Director of a sister institute under MHRD too had been impressive. Ironically, soon after retirement he was asked by the Board of IMX to develop proposal for faculty development centre of the institute. Even on June 16, 2012, the day Board had decided to shift the date of implementation instead of 18.8.2009 (thus denying him consideration of HAG scale), he was invited to make a presentation to Minister of HRD during the Board meeting for a Common Website of all the IIMs.

Prof. Pragyan sought data from Prof. Pathak to work out the details and found that the latter was qualifying not only on various criteria used by the committee (see exhibit 7 A & B), but even on more rigorous evaluation covering the entire period of service (as stipulated by MHRD) rather than six years as done in case of others. This was despite the fact that many activities which he undertook that were impressed by the Directors / Board from time to time, were not included in the performance evaluation criteria developed by PAC.

- a) The RTI enquiry on the subject (to supply relevant minutes and agenda items of the Board meeting and whether re-concurrence of MHRD was taken for shifting the date of implementation) was refused by the CPIO maintaining that information solicited could not be supplied as it was against public and that Re-Concurrence from MHRD for postponing the date of implementation by 3 years was not required.

The CPIO however mentioned that Prof. Pragyan should apply to Appellate Authority, the Director, if he was not satisfied with the reply.

On appeal to supply relevant minutes and agenda items of the Board meeting, the Appellate Authority answered that he had gone through the reply sent by CPIO and he endorsed the same. The reply further said that “the date of implementation was postponed because if that was not done, a junior professor would have superseded a senior professor in the award of HAG scale and thus created an anomaly”. He also attached a copy of extracts of minutes of the BoG meeting held on 29.9.2012 (exhibit 8).

This intrigued Prof. Pragyan even more as the postponement of the date of implementation would make a junior professor supersede a senior professor (Prof. Pathak), The Appellate Authority however had not supplied Annexure (C) of the report of PAC which could have explained how (b) above could happen. Request to supply annexure (C) was not responded by the Appellate Authority.

On reference to Chief Information Commissioner of India, the Institute CPIO supplied Annexure (C) (exhibit 10) and a report after the Director left the Institute which revealed that the PAC had made certain assumptions (see para 2 of exhibit 10) which led to recommendation (b) above. The assumptions were made because the decisions of MHRD and Board were silent on the date of implementation.

The reply also had another annexure (exhibit 11), a note dt. 25.9.2012 in which a very senior expert Board member Dr. Bisaria, who had acted as Chairman of the PRC which developed performance criteria mentioned that he could not give his comments on the implication of change in the date of implementation as he did not have information on the subject. He also mentioned.....any date chosen for the purpose would benefit some and not benefit others..... and that in his opinion it is not proper to attribute motives in this matter.....The Board has chosen a date which in its wisdom is most appropriate. Thus almost justifying the recommendation of the performance appraisal committee for shifting the date of implementation to 2012.

The note also said that “since it is a case of Promotion, the criteria for eligibility have been laid down .....

This reply from CPIO further intrigued Prof. Pragyan because a professor of the Institute had informed the PAC Chairman way back on Sept. 21, 2010 about MHRD’s notification regarding the date of implementation. Also the Director had sent an email (see exhibit 12) to all the faculty members as late as May 16, 2012 (the report was submitted on June 11, 2012) which indicated that not only the Chairman, but all the members of the Committee, which perused the service data and recommended postponement of the date of implementation to 2012, knew the directive of MHRD and the Board regarding the date of implementation.

“Did the committee deliberately mislead the BoG and thus MHRD? Why it would do so?” Both Prof. Pragyan and Pathak were puzzled.

What intrigued them more was the fact that prima-facie even if the date of implementation was kept as 18.8.2009, the same professors would have got HAG scale even on 1.10.2012. They were however wondering over impact of some data on overall performance of Prof. Pathak and 13 faculty members in the seniority list upto Prof. Shailendra, which Prof. Pathak as Dean had collected in June 2011 to supply to the PAC, before he retired on June 30, 2011 (see exhibit 13).

### **Letter to the Chairman of the Institute**

On the advice of Prof. Pragyan, Prof. Pathak sent a letter on 24.10.14 (exhibit 14) to the Chairman of the Institute, pointing out the mistake in PAC report and requested to take corrective action. When reminded, after six months, the Chairman sent the following cryptic reply.

.....  
I don’t like the tone of this letter, particularly as I was trying to help you out in your request. I am informed by the Office of the Director, that what you have requested is not entirely in line with our/government rules.

I have had a discussion with all concerned and was trying to work your case around the rules which would help you out and would have been of benefit to you.

However, I am now going to ask the office to deal with it entirely as per our rules.

You will hear from the office eventually.

.....  
There was no information, however, on the matter thereafter.

#### Questions

- Q10. Could the decision of the Committee have been different if Prof. DRR was not member of the performance review committee?
- Q11. Was the issue resolved by changing the date of implementation to Oct.1, 2012?
- Q12. What had led to the “zero sum game” situation? What could be alternate course of action?
- Q13. What changes in the performance evaluation scheme may be necessary to help the institute moving towards excellence?
- Q14. Comment on the review by expert Board member, Chairman of the PAC (see exhibit 11)
- Q15. Comment on exhibit 14.
- Q16. Has Prof. Pathak been discriminated? What are its ramifications?
- Q17. Comment on the reply of the Chairman to Dr. Pathak’s letter.
- Q18. What could be long term implications of the same in light of discussions in Case (B).

Exhibit 1  
Seniority List of Professors

	Faculty Code	Area	DOJ	DOJ (Asst. Prof.)	DOJ (Asso. Prof.)	DOJ (Prof.)	Retired/Resigned
1	PPP	MKT	01-09-1986			01-09-1986	31-05-2013
2*	Pathak	SM	02-01-1986		02-01-1986	31-08-1987	30-06-2011
3	SNK	OM	31-01-1997			31-01-1997	31-08-2014
4*	Bose	DS	24-12-1990		24-12-1990	01-09-1998	31-08-2020
5	SKR	OM	29-06-1990		29-06-1990	01-09-1998	31-10-2019
6	BBB	IT	06-11-1996		06-11-1996	01-09-1998	31-07-2023
7*#	Devanandan	SM	17-09-1990	17-09-1990	09-11-1995	07-05-1999	31-05-2017
8*\$	Charlu	FA	01-08-1991	01-08-1991	30-09-1996	07-05-1999	31-12-2019
9	JKA	SM	01-07-1999			01-07-1999	31-08-2020
10\$	DRR	COMM	30-05-1985			28-07-2000	30-06-2020
11	MKB	DS	20-02-1995		20-02-1995	07-08-2001	31-01-2023
12	BA	DS	01-01-1997		01-01-1997	07-08-2001	31-07-2021
13*	Mukri	HRM	28-04-1997		28-04-1997	07-08-2001	30-06-2025
14	SSS1	HRM	19-03-1998		19-03-1998	07-08-2001	30-04-2024
15	NS	BE	12-11-2001			12-11-2001	31-07-2012
16	GKN	DS	06-02-2002			06-02-2002	30-11-2012
17	CD	HRM	01-11-1996	01-11-1996	07-05-1999	23-05-2003	30-09-2029
18	SSD	LAW	30-11-1999		30-11-1999	23-05-2003	31-07-2020
19	DKJ	MKT	01-09-1999			23-05-2003	15-05-2010
20	KN	MKT	24-11-1995		24-11-1995	27-05-2003	30-09-2016
21	PSS1	HRM	15-07-2005			15-07-2005	30-11-2015
22	AM	FA	06-09-2006			06-09-2006	30-04-2028
23	MKA	FA	19-11-1996	19-11-1996	07-08-2001	02-01-2007	31-07-2032
24	SGK	BE	15-09-1997	15-09-1997	07-08-2001	02-01-2007	31-05-2028
25	NNN	OM	21-04-2008			21-04-2008	31-10-2013
26	MDS	BE	23-09-1997	23-09-1997	23-05-2003	18-11-2009	30-11-2030
27	KP	HRM	03-04-2001	03-04-2001	02-11-2004	18-11-2009	31-08-2032
28	SKK1	ABM	20-04-2005		20-04-2005	18-11-2009	31-07-2030
29	SKK2	OM	08-07-2005		08-07-2005	18-11-2009	31-03-2031
30	KM	FA				07-02-2012	
31	AM	MKT				21-08-2012	
32	SKK3	ABM				20-12-2013	
33	PR	BE				20-12-2013	
34	AK	IT				20-12-2013	
35	TR	BE				20-12-2013	
36	KSS	BE				20-12-2013	

\* Members of the PRC Committee for Developing Scheme for Performance Evaluation  
(There was an External Expert Dr. Bisaria as Chairman of the Committee)

\$ Members of the Performance Appraisal Committee (PAC), Prof. Charlu being Chairman



## Exhibit 2

### Placement of Professors in the Higher AGP

#### Guidelines

The placement in the higher AGP (Rs 12,000) will be primarily based on seniority, subject to the fulfillment of certain conditions by the incumbents. These conditions are specified below.

- A. For being eligible for AGP 12,000, a professor should:
1. have completed a minimum of six-year<sup>#</sup> period in the grade with AGP of Rs 10,500 or equivalent pre-revised grade as a full-time faculty member at the Institute.
  2. have taken a minimum workload of average six credits per annum for *the last six academic years<sup>#</sup>* as per the existing work credit norms of the Institute.
- B. In addition to the two conditions mentioned in Criterion A, that need to be fulfilled by all the candidates, any *three* out of the following five conditions should also be fulfilled to ensure that the concerned professor has been actively contributing towards research publications, Ph.D. supervision, teaching and consultancy etc after becoming a professor. He/she should
1. have a minimum average teaching feedback of 3.0 (on a 1-5 scale) for the *last six academic years<sup>#</sup> in those 18 courses* (with more than 20 students' registration) taught in the long-duration (more than 11 months) programs of the Institute, where his/her feedback was the best. The feedback for the *best 18 courses* is considered to give a benefit to those professors who have taught more than three courses per year.
  2. have a minimum 5 cumulative points over the complete period of service in 'AGP 10,500' grade or equivalent, based on the following scheme of computation of points:
    - a) 5 points for a research article/case published in A\* class journals (as prescribed for the publication awards).
    - b) 4 points for a research article/case published in A class journals
    - c) 3 points for a research article/case published in B class journals
    - d) 2 points for a research article/case published in C class journals
    - e) 2 points for publication of a case in a refereed journal/publication like HBP, IVY
    - f) 1 point for publication in a refereed conference proceedings or recognized list of Indian journals.
- Note: all these points for research / case studies shall be prorated equally among the authors in case of joint authorship, as per the work credit norms of the Institute.*
3. have a minimum 4 cumulative points over the complete period of service in 'AGP 10,500' grade or equivalent, based on the following scheme of computation of points:
    - a) 3 points for being the Chairman of Thesis Advisory Committee of a Doctoral student
    - b) 1 point for being the member of Thesis Advisory Committee of an Doctoral student
    - c) 1 point (or its fraction) for teaching one Doctoral course (or its fraction)
  4. have completed administrative assignments at the Institute with a minimum credit of two course equivalent over the complete period of service in 'AGP 10,500' grade or equivalent.
  5. have completed (where full funds have been received) consultancy or funded research assignments at the Institute with a minimum cumulative value of Rs 10 lakh to his/her own credit over the complete period of service in 'AGP 10,500' grade or equivalent.

*#The period of six years will only include the period when the concerned faculty member has been in the active service of the Institute as a professor [excluding extra-ordinary leave (EOL), if any]. However, an exception will be made for the period of EOL availed to take up a position of national importance as explained later. The period of sabbatical leave, if any, shall be excluded for Criteria A(2) and B(1).*

## **Modus operandi**

Those professors, who fulfill the two requirements prescribed in Criterion A, and any three of the five requirements prescribed in Criterion B, would be eligible for placement in the higher AGP (Rs 12,000). In case the number of higher AGP positions available (40% of full professors, rounded off to the nearest whole number) is less than the number of eligible professors, then the placement will be done in the order of seniority determined by the number of years served by the concerned professor in the 'AGP 10,500' grade or equivalent at the Institute (the tie, if any, shall be broken first by the total years of service as a regular faculty member at the Institute, and if it also results in a tie, then by the basic pay). The placement will be automatic, and will be done annually, based on the data available with the office of the Dean (AA). The Committee recommends the date of implementation of higher AGP (Rs 12,000) to be the same as the date of the revision of the pay of the faculty members by the Sixth Pay Commission (1 January 2006). ***However, the final decision about the date of implementation may be taken by the Board of Governors.***

If a professor (who is not in the higher AGP) serves in a position of national importance for a certain period (and avails EOL for it), then the Criterion A(1) will be modified for him/her to include this period in his 'period of service in the grade with AGP of Rs 10,500 or equivalent' at the Institute. His/her performance on the following modified Criteria A(2) and B, shall be reported to the Board of Governors for their decision about his/her placement in the higher AGP on his/her rejoining the duties at the Institute as a professor. The Board will decide whether,

- a. the position in which he/she served is of national importance,
- b. his/her performance ***in that position has been good and,***
- c. he/she fulfils the following modified Criteria A(2) and B:
  - i) If he/she was a professor at the Institute for more than six years, then his/her performance on criteria A(2) and B would be measured for ***his/her total active years of service as a professor of the Institute***
  - ii) If he/she was a professor for less than six years, but his/her active service as a faculty member of the Institute is more than six years, then his/her performance on criteria A(2) and B would be measured for the six years immediately preceding his/her date of proceeding on EOL (even if he/she was only an Associate/Assistant Professor for a part of this period)
  - iii) If the total period of his/her active service as a faculty member of the Institute is less than six years (say y years), then Criteria A(2) and B(1) would be applied for this period, and Criteria B(2) to B(5) would be applied with prorated values (specified values multiplied by y divided by 6)

Based on the fulfillment of these modified criteria, the Board may decide to place the concerned professor in the higher AGP, and may ***create a supernumerary position for him/her, if required.*** The placement of such candidate would be done with retrospective effect from the date on which he/she fulfilled the requirements of the modified Criteria A and B.

Exhibit 3

Sub: Comments of MHRD on the Agenda of 102<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of BoG of IMX to be held on Oct. 7, 2010

ITEM NO.	ITEM	COMMENT OF MHRD
Item No. 102.5.2 of BoG	Norms and procedure for elevation of professors to Higher Academic Grade	May be considered for approval subject to the condition that GOI rules in the matter may be followed

Exhibit 4

Minutes of the 110<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the BoG Held on Sept. 29.9.2012

PRESENT

Members		Special Invitees	
1	Chairman*	1	Mukri
2	Dr.Bisaria*	2	HR
3	External Member*	3	SD
4	Shri Bishnoi*	4	FA-cum-CAO
5	External Member*		
6	External Member*		
7	Director		
8	DRR		
9	MA2		
10	Representative of MHRD*		
11	CAO- Secretary to BoG		

\*External Board Members

**Brief Profile of the Professor (Over 25 yrs in Academics)**

<u>Educational Qualifications</u>	<u>Teaching Experience</u>			<u>Research</u>			<u>Institution Building</u>			<u>Expert Member in National Bodies</u>	
<u>Experience</u> <b>41 yrs</b>	<b>PGP*</b>  <b>Best Teacher Award (Twice)</b>  <b>60</b>	<b>FPM</b>  <b>3+3</b>	<b>Other Long Duration Prog.</b>  <b>9</b>	<b>Doctoral</b>  <b>IFCI Award Winner</b>  <b>Thesis published as a Book in 1982 (Organisation &amp; Ownership)</b>	<b>Post Doctoral</b>  <b>18</b>  <b>MHRD Biggest Research Grant at any IIT/ IIM in 2002-03 (leading to 18 papers and 5 Conferences)</b>	<b>As Task Head/ Dean etc.</b> <b>16 Yrs</b>	<b>Institute Governance</b>		<b>AICTE/ AIU MHRD</b>	<b>Visitors/ Senate Nominee For</b>  <b>IITs/ IIMs/ Others</b>	
<u>Achievements</u>  <b>8</b>						<b>Others (mostly concurrently with above 17 years)</b>	<b>IIML Board Member 8 Yrs</b>	<b>Others</b> <b>3</b> <b>8 yrs</b>			
<b>Firsts</b>  <b>35</b>	<b>MDPs</b>			<b>Papers /Cases/ Course Material Written</b>			<b>Consulting (90 lakhs) 17 yrs</b>			<b>Professional Initiatives</b>	
	<b>Open</b>  <b>11</b>	<b>Sponsored</b>  <b>11</b>			<b>Papers</b>	<b>Cases</b>	<b>Orgn Specific</b>  <b>4</b>	<b>State Specific</b>  <b>4</b>	<b>National</b>  <b>4</b>	<b>Created Strategic Management Forum, the only Professional Body in the discipline in India</b> <b>1. 56 management teachers programmes (over 1500 participants) in 9 years</b>  <b>2. 16 Conferences</b>  <b>Without an office or staff, through collaboration of 9 leading Mgt. Inst. Of India</b>	
			<b>Published</b>	<b>Refereed Journals / Select Papers/ Articles</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>6</b>					
				<b>Books Chapters</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>23</b>					
			<b>Total Published</b>		<b>37</b>	<b>29</b>					
			<b>Unpublished papers/ cases and chapters*</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>30</b>					
			<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>57</b>	<b>59</b>					
			<b>Presented in Conferences</b>		<b>24 (8)</b>	<b>12(6)</b>					
			<b>Working Papers**</b>		<b>27</b>						
		<input type="checkbox"/> Many presented in National/International Confere. **Most presented in Conf. and many published.									
<b>Rewards for good wok done</b>	<b>Faculty Development Programmes</b>			<b>Conferences</b>			<b>Directorship of IIMK (Institute having Max Constraints)</b>				
	<b>Conducted</b>  <b>8</b> <b>About 220 participants</b>	<b>Got Conducted Through IIMK/ SMF 100+ Over 4000 participants</b>		<b>Organised</b>  <b>4 in 12 years</b>	<b>Got Organised</b>  <b>29 in 6 years</b>	<b>Paper Presented</b>  <b>40 in 20 years</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing PGP batch size from 60 to 260 meeting 85% of OBC quota in 1<sup>st</sup> yr.</li> <li>Making IIMK Leader in Faculty Development.</li> <li>Making IIMK Leader in online programme (IIMK became 1<sup>st</sup> Inst. To launch online Exe PGP in 2009)</li> <li>Started FPM alongside 11 batch of PGP)</li> <li>GIving impetus to Organising Conf. (15 Conferences in 5 yrs.)</li> <li>Fastest growing corpus fund, (crossing Rs. 85 cr. Mark in 4 years)</li> <li>Keeping fee lowest in all activities</li> <li>Keeping neck high in PGP placement (Rank 5 all India) in 2008</li> </ol>				

Exhibit 5 (B)

**FIRSTS**

1. Launched Common Website of IIMs ([www.iimsworld.in](http://www.iimsworld.in)) (2012) \$
2. First faculty of IIML to complete 25 years of service to the institute (2011)@.
3. Increasing in PGP intake at IIMK to achieve 85% of the target under OBC quota in the first year itself, enabling institute increase intake to achieve not only to achieve but surpass the target by 10% in the second year (2008) \$
4. Launching Four, New 6- months long executive programmes on Interactive Distance Learning Platform (2008) \$
5. Starting Fellow (Doctoral) Programme in Management launched at IIMK 2007 @
6. First Joint Conference with another IIM (2007) \$.
7. IIMK becomes only Major QIP Centre of AICTE in the field of Management 2005\$
8. First Batch of Management Teachers' Programme of Strategic Management Forum May 2005\$
9. First International Exchange Programme at IIMK, 2004@
10. First Director of an IIM from IIM, Lucknow, 2004
11. First Collaborative Teachers. Programme (with IIMA, IIMB, IIMK, IIMIdr, IIML, IIFT, MDI, XLRI) 2003-2004) \$
12. First Colloquium in Collaboration with Press on Competitiveness and the Role of Fourth Estate (Sept. 13, 2003) @
13. First Web-based Industry-Academic Network Initiative for Studies on Global Competitiveness (2003) \$
14. First Collaborative Research Work at IIML with Faculty of other IIMs (2002) (IIML as Nodal Agency) \$
15. First Collaborative (with IIFT) National Seminar at IIFT, New Delhi (2002) @
16. First Chairman, Corporate Collaboration (2001-03) @
17. First Collaborative (with other IIMs) National Seminar at IIM, Lucknow (2001) \$
18. First Dean (Academic Affairs), IIM, Lucknow, India (1998-2001) @
19. First person at IIM, Lucknow to float a national level professional body (1997) \$
20. First National Conference at the Institute. (1997) @
21. First Case Analysis and Instructors Guide for Case Book in Strategic Management (1997) \$
22. First Management Teachers' Programme (1996) at IIM, Lucknow @
23. First Case Book (on Strategic Management) at IIM, Lucknow (1996) \$
24. First MDP Series of 5 programmes for IFS Officers (1993-95) @
25. First IIML Case Series (1994) @
26. First International Collaborative Research Study conducted at IIM, Lucknow (1993-94) @
27. First person to conduct 6 PGP courses in a single year (1993-94) \$
28. First Case Study with International Collaboration. (1992) @
29. First person to get the Best Faculty award at IIM, Lucknow (1989) @
30. First Case Written at IIM, Lucknow @
31. First Chairman, Placement, IIM, Lucknow (1986-88) @
32. First Chairman, Business Policy (Strategic Management Area) (1986-88) @
33. First person sent by Bank of Baroda on deputation to a Management Institution (1985) @
34. First person to complete doctoral course (FPM) with specialization in Business Policy area at IIM, Ahmedabad/ in India (1979) \$
35. First Recipient of ICSSR Research Grant at IIM, Ahd for doctoral research (1978) @
36. First person to be sent on Study Leave by Bharat Heavy Electricals Ltd. (BHEL) (1975)@

@ in the organization    \$ in the country

DO NOT COPY

Exhibit 6  
Seniority List of Professors

	Faculty Code	Area	DOJ	DOJ (Asst. Prof.)	DOJ (Asso. Prof.)	DOJ (Prof.)	Retired/ Resigned
1	PP	MKT	01-09-1986			01-09-1986	31-05-2013
2*	Pathak	SM	02-01-1986		02-01-1986	31-08-1987	30-06-2011
3	KNS	OM	31-01-1997			31-01-1997	31-08-2014
4*	Bose	DS	24-12-1990		24-12-1990	01-09-1998	31-08-2020
5	RKS	OM	29-06-1990		29-06-1990	01-09-1998	31-10-2019
6	BB	IT	06-11-1996		06-11-1996	01-09-1998	31-07-2023
7*#	Devanandan	SM	17-09-1990	17-09-1990	09-11-1995	07-05-1999	31-05-2017
8*\$	Charlu	FA	01-08-1991	01-08-1991	30-09-1996	07-05-1999	31-12-2019
9	AKJ	SM	01-07-1999			01-07-1999	31-08-2020
10#\$	DRR	COMM	30-05-1985			28-07-2000	30-06-2020
11	BKM	DS	20-02-1995		20-02-1995	07-08-2001	31-01-2023
12	AB	DS	01-01-1997		01-01-1997	07-08-2001	31-07-2021
13*	Mukri	HRM	28-04-1997		28-04-1997	07-08-2001	30-06-2025
14	SS1	HRM	19-03-1998		19-03-1998	07-08-2001	30-04-2024
15	SN	BE	12-11-2001			12-11-2001	31-07-2012
16	NKG	DS	06-02-2002			06-02-2002	30-11-2012
17	DC	HRM	01-11-1996	01-11-1996	07-05-1999	23-05-2003	30-09-2029
18	DSS	LAW	30-11-1999		30-11-1999	23-05-2003	31-07-2020
19	JKD	MKT	01-09-1999			23-05-2003	15-05-2010
20	NK	MKT	24-11-1995		24-11-1995	27-05-2003	30-09-2016
21	PS1	HRM	15-07-2005			15-07-2005	30-11-2015
22	MA2	FA	06-09-2006			06-09-2006	30-04-2028
23	AKM	FA	19-11-1996	19-11-1996	07-08-2001	02-01-2007	31-07-2032
24	KGS	BE	15-09-1997	15-09-1997	07-08-2001	02-01-2007	31-05-2028
25	NN	OM	21-04-2008			21-04-2008	31-10-2013
26	SDM	BE	23-09-1997	23-09-1997	23-05-2003	18-11-2009	30-11-2030
27	PK	HRM	03-04-2001	03-04-2001	02-11-2004	18-11-2009	31-08-2032
28	SK1	ABM	20-04-2005		20-04-2005	18-11-2009	31-07-2030
29	SK2	OM	08-07-2005		08-07-2005	18-11-2009	31-03-2031
30	MK	FA				07-02-2012	
31	AM	MKT				21-08-2012	
32	SK3	ABM				20-12-2013	
33	RP	BE				20-12-2013	
34	KA	IT				20-12-2013	
35	RT	BE				20-12-2013	
36	SSK	BE				20-12-2013	

\* Members of the PRC Committee for Developing Scheme for Performance Evaluation  
(There was an External Expert Dr. Bisaria as Chairman of the Committee.)

Who all would have got on 21.8.2012? No. of professors= 28, Eligible= 11

So upto Prof. Mukri would get it as Profs. Pathak, JKD and SN had gone due to retirement/ Resignation

**Exhibit 7 (A)**  
**Overall Load with Changing Portfolio (Approx.) \$**

Considered as workload													Also Considered as significant & counted as workload earlier			Others						
Sl. No.	Acade Year	PGP	Ph.D Course	Exe Edu		Dissertation Guide	Ph.D. Guide	MDP*		Publication	Conf	WP Counted Material	Acad Admn	Online Progs.	FDP		Con fere Org.	BoG work	SMF	AICTE MHRD work	Consul tancy Rs. in Lakh	MHRD Research Res. Grant Rs. (Lakhs)
				WMP	IPMX			Paper	#		Day				#	Day						
				3	4			10	9		7				19	20						
25	2010-11	1		1						1		3		2	12		N	N	N	15		
24	2009-10	1		1	2					1		3		2	9		N	N	N	0.3		
23	2008-09								1			6	2					N	N	1		
22	2007-08								1			6	1					N	N	10		
21	2006-07								1			6						N	N	5		
20	2005-06								1			6		1				N	N	16		
19	2004-05								1			6						N	N	5		
18	2003-04	1	1				1		1	1		2		1	6			N	N			
17	2002-03	1	1				1		3	4	3							N	N		18	
16	2001-02	1	1			1			2	4	3			1	3	1		N	N			
15	2000-01	3							1	5	2	2				1	N	N	N			
				Started FPM															N	N		
14	1999-00	3		Started internationali sation								4	2					N	N	N	16	
13	1998-09	4								2		2						N	N	1		
12	1997-98	4					1	6	0.5	2	1							N	N			
11	1996-97	2					2	9	2						1				N			
10	1995-96	2					2	12	3					1	6		N	N	4			
9	1994-95	5					5	21	1	1								N	N			
8	1993-94	6					2	9											N			
7	1992-93	5					1	3		1									N			
6	1991-92	4	Only 9 months , was away to Europe under EICEP Exchange																N	N		



		prog. For 9 months																				
5	1990-91	5										2						N		N		
4	1989-90	3							0.5			2										
3**	1988-89	3							1.5													
2**	1987-88	3										1										
1**	1986-87	3										1										
Total		60	3	2	2	1	2	13	60	20	22	13	50									
Average of 25 Years																						

**N Not considered workload**

**\$ Memberships of various committees, admission related work not included**  
**\* Jointly conducted MDPs not included**  
**\*\*PGP Batch size only 30, increased to 180 in 1998.**

Exhibit 7(B)

Considered as workload																		
Sl. No.	Acade Year	PGP	Ph.D Course	Exe Edu		Disser tation Guid ance	Ph.D. Guida nce	Open MDP*		Publ ication	Conf Prese		WP		Publ+ Conf. preesent+ WP	Acad. Admn @	General Credit	Total Credit
				WMP	IPMX			#	Day		Counted	Not Counted	Counted	Not Counted				
				1	2			3	4		5	6	7	8				
25	2010-11	1		1							0.5				0.5	3	0.5	6
24	2009-10	1		1	1.5						0.5				0.5	3	0.5	7.5
18	2003-04	1	1				1		1	0.3				1.3			0.5	4.75
17	2002-03	1	1				1		2.5	0.5	0.5			3			0.5	6.5
16	2001-02	1	1			0.5			2	0.8	0.5		0.8	2.8			0.5	5.75
15	2000-01	3							0.3	1.3		0.3	0.3	1.8	2		0.5	7.25
14	1999-00	3		Started internationalisation							0.3	0.3		1	0.3	2	0.5	5.75
13	1998-09	4								0.5				0.5	2		0.5	7
12	1997-98	4						0.5	6	0.5	0.8		0.3	1.3			0.5	6.25
11	1996-97	2						1	9	2	0.5			2.5			0.5	6
																	6.28	

2003-04 data is July '03- Feb'04 only. Thereafter Dr. Pathak went for assuming charge as Director

**Criteria A1:** Completed 22 yrs in Professors Scale    **Criteria A2:** Completed Average 6.4 in 6 yrs between 1998-99 and 2003-04

**Criteria B1:** Data not available but seldom if ever got below 3.0 in 55 course taught between 1987-2004

**Criteria B2:** 5 points between 1998 to 2004

**Criteria B3:** 5 points between 1998 to 2004

**Criteria B4:** 6 points between 1998 to 2004

**Criteria B4:** 6 Lakhs consulting between 1998-2004 & Rs. 18 Lakh Nodal Research Between 2002-06

## Exhibit 8

### ITEM No. 110.10 ANY OTHER MATTER WITH PERMISSION OF THE CHAIR.

#### 110.10.1 NORMS AND PROCEDURE FOR ELEVATION OF PROFESSORS TO HIGHER ACADEMIC GRADE (HAG) SCALE

The relevant agenda was placed before the Board. A copy of the same is placed as Annexure –C. The Board approved in principle, grant of Higher Academic Grade Scale of Rs. 67000-79000/- to a maximum of 40% of available posts of Professors who are fulfilling the laid down criteria and are thus eligible for HAG scale. The scale will be effective from 1.10.2012

It was also approved that the professors who are due to superannuate should be granted HAG scale couple of months prior to their dates of superannuation, if meeting the requirement of meeting minimum length of service as professor.

## Exhibit 9

### EXTRACT OF ANNEXURE- C

#### 110.10.1 NORMS AND PROCEDURE FOR ELEVATION OF PROFESSORS TO HIGHER ACADEMIC GRADE (HAG) SCALE

The issue with regard the to implementation of decision of GoI for grant of HAG scale to full professors was first discussed in the 102<sup>nd</sup> meeting of BoG held on Oct. 7, 2010. The recommendation submitted by the PAC committee under the Chairmanship of Dr. Bisaria were approved by the BoG for implementation in the aforesaid meeting. While the action for implementation was being taken, a representation outlining his views on the recommendations of PAC was submitted by Prof. AKJ., a senior professor of the institute. The representation was considered by the BoG in 109<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 16.6.2012. The BoG then decided that the matter should be referred to the same Committee, who had earlier submitted its recommendations. Accordingly, the representation was referred to Dr. Bisaria, Chairman of the Committee for his consideration and recommendations.

Dr. Bisaria has since submitted his recommendations, a copy of which is placed at Anuexure-14 (AP 87-89). On perusal of the recommendations submitted by Dr. Bisaria on the representation of Prof. AKJ, it has been observed that the guidelines proposed by the Committee and approved by the BoG are appropriate requiring no change. Dr. Bisaria has further stated the Board may ensure the implementation of the Scheme in an equitable and fair manner to protect the interests of all dedicated senior professors who have contributed to the advancement of the field of knowledge in Management, and in raising the stature of IMX to higher levels of excellence.

A Group of four-member Committee was constituted in November 2010 to review the relevant service data in respect of all eligible Professors in the area of consideration and recommend the names for grant of HAG. The Group consisted of:

- 1) Prof. Charlu

- ii) Prof. DRR,
- iii) Prof. MA2,
- iv) Shri SC, FA-cum-CAO.

The Group submitted its report in June, 2012. A copy of the report of the Group is placed at Annexure-I5 (Exhibit).

It is now proposed to implement the recommendations of the Review Group. The total no. of full Professors as on date is 28. In accordance with the recommendations of the Government of India, up to a maximum of 40% of the posts of Professor at any given point of time will-be eligible for HAG after having rendered 6 years of regular service. The 40% of 28 Professors worksout to 11 Professors who are eligible for grant of HAG. The eligibility of the Professors for grant of HAG by the Group was reviewed according to norms, based on available data. The exercise was done only for the following 14 senior most Professors.

1. Prof. PP	8. Prof. AKJ
2. Prof. KNS	9. Prof. DRR
3. Prof. RKS	10. Prof. BBK
4. Prof. Bose	11. Prof. AB
5. Prof. BB	12. Prof. AS
6. Prof. Devanandan	13. Prof. SS
7. Prof. Charlu	14. Prof. SN

Of the aforesaid 14 cases, Prof. PP does not fulfil the required criteria. Therefore, his case for grant of HAG has not been recommended by the Group. Of the remaining 13 eligible Professors, Prof. SN has since retired from the service of the Institute. Against the 40% of 28 Professors in, position as on date, it is proposed that the following 11 Professors in order of seniority may be considered for grant of HAG.

1. Prof. KNS	7. Prof. AKJ
2. Prof. RKS	8. Prof. DRR
3. Prof. Bose	9. Prof. BBK
4. Prof. BB	10. Prof. AB
5. Prof. Devanandan	11. Prof. AS
6. Prof. Charlu	

In line with the directives of Govt. of India as contained in letter No. 23- 112008-TS.11, dated 26th August, 2010, the recommendations are to be implemented w.e.f. 18.8.2009 i.e. the date of issue of order. However, in case the recommendations are implemented retrospectively w.e.f. 18.8.2009, the same are likely to create serious anomalies whereby some juniors in seniority are likely to supersede seniors. Such a situation will not be healthy and thus should be avoided. It is, therefore, recommended that the grant of HAG to the aforesaid 11 full professors should be given w.e.f. the date of approval of the Board.

Submitted for consideration and approval of the Board.

### **Review of Service Data of Professors for HAG**

On November 23, 2010, a group of four members was constituted by the Director to review the relevant service data in respect of all eligible professors for consideration of their name for grant of Higher Academic Grade (HAG). Before the group could complete its task, one of its members retired and another member proceeded on extraordinary leave. Subsequently, the group was reconstituted with two new members on April 25, 2012. The reconstituted group met five times during April and May 2012 for about 20 hours and has completed its task. The approach adopted for this exercise is described in the following text. The summary results of the review exercise are given at Annexure 1. Based on the data up to Academic Year 2011-12, all the professors from serial number 2 to 14 in the Annexure meet the required eligibility criteria for the award of HAG.

To complete the exercise of the review of service data of professors for grant of HAG, the first question that required an answer was the date from which the HAG would be applicable to the eligible professors at IIML. Since the exercise depends on this answer, on which the decisions of the Board and the Ministry of HRD are silent, the group applied its own mind. The exercise was done assuming that the placement of Professors in HAG would be done in the near future (not with retrospective effect). Accordingly, the review of the service data has been done on the current date, based on the data available till the academic- year 2011-12.

The total number of full professors (excluding the: Director) is currently 29. Therefore, a maximum of 12 professors can be placed into HAG. Accordingly, as the first step, a list of professors fulfilling the requirements of six years of service in AGP 10,500 or equivalent grade was made in descending order of seniority, as per the norms approved by the Board (Please refer Annexure . 2). The eligibility of these professors for HAG was reviewed according to norms, based on the available data. The exercise was done only for the 14 senior-most professors. For the remaining professors, the exercise was not done as it would have been inconsequential. The data for the exercise was provided by the offices of Dean

-----  
Anomalies are generally expected in implementing a decision with retrospective effect. These are more likely to arise in this situation, because the total number of HAG posts are limited to 40% of professors. One anomaly that is likely to occur is illustrated hereafter. Suppose we implement the decision retrospectively say, with effect from July 2010, and there are 29 full professors, allowing 12 HAG positions. Further, suppose on July 2010, a professor (say Prof X), with more than six years of service, does not fulfill criterion B of the norms and therefore, is not eligible for HAG. Consequently, another professor (Prof Y) who is junior to Prof X is placed in HAG. When this analysis is done for the year 2012 (today), Prof X fulfills criterion B, with additional credits from the years 2011 and 12, but there is no position available, as the 12 positions were filled in 2010. Since the entire HAG positions for 2010, and 12 are being filled today, the fact that Prof X would fulfil all the conditions in 2012 is known today. Knowing this fact today, and filling the position of HAG with a junior professor with effect from 2010 or 11 appears anomalous. At the same time, Prof X cannot be denied the position in 2010 according to rules. This anomaly would be difficult to resolve in retrospective application of rules. On the other hand, if such a situation arises in prospective application of the rules, it can be defended. Firstly, this would be in line with the spirit of the approved norms, and secondly, one does not know whether the professor who is not fulfilling the criteria today, would be able to fulfil these in future.

The data on the teaching feedback for the third term of academic year 2011-12 was likely to take more time in compilation. Therefore, for criterion 130, the data till second term of 2011-12 was considered. However, since an average over six years is used for this criterion, its fulfillment does not change from year to year. In any case, all the professors under consideration fulfilled this criterion. The inclusion of teaching feedback for the third term of academic year 2011-12 would delay the decision, and is not likely to change in any way.

(AA) and Dean (P&D), which is attached at Annexure 3 and 4. As a precaution, the professor (Prof PP) not fulfilling the required eligibility criteria {according to the data available at the offices of Dean (AA) and Dean (P & D)}, was requested to inform the group about any omission in his relevant credits, so that the same could be incorporated for the review. The communication sent to Prof PP this regard is attached. Since no response was received limn hint within the stipulated time of 15 days, it was taken as conformation of the correctness of the available data related to his work credits.

**For Prof PP, who is in professor's scale** since 1986, the performance on criterion A(2), could not be averaged for die complete period "1986-2012 due to non-availability of data for the period 1986-97. Instead, it was averaged for the period 1997-2012 (for which the data is available). Therefore, in his case the benefit given is 'higher of last six years' average and last 15 years average' instead of 'higher of last six years average and last 26 years' average'. Even after this, he does not Ada the required eligibility criteria,

-Sd-

(Charlu)

(DRR)

(MA2)

(SC)

## Exhibit 11

(Comments and Observations by Dr. Bisaria in response to reference by the IMX Board of Governors.)

This note is with reference to the representation of Prof. AKJ, submitted to the Board of Governors regarding the Guidelines on the above-mentioned subject recommended by the Committee constituted for this purpose and approved by the Board. The Board in its meeting held on 16 June referred it to the Chairman of the Committee for his consideration and recommendations.

Prof. AKJ has raised objections on the following aspects of the matter under consideration in Part A of his representation:

- I Not sharing information about the guidelines with the larger body of Faculty, and inordinate delay in implementation of the scheme by the Administration.
2. The constitution of the Committees i.e. the members of the Committee (except the Chairman).
3. Date of Implementation of the Scheme.

Since- Point # I pertains to Administration, I consider it beyond the scope of Committee's role, and therefore I would not like to make any observations. Only the Administration will be in a position to give facts and reasons for whatever process was followed in this connection.

Regarding Point # 2, it may be stated that the Committee's constitution was approved by the Board, who in their wisdom decided to only include the Deans/Ex-Deans as members. The contention that 'the members could choose, decide, and include or omit criteria on personal fitness and inconveniences' would be equally applicable in case of 'many other senior faculty members' whose inclusion according to Prof. Jain 'would have provided broader vision and different perspective.' Dr. Jain's questioning the motives and integrity of all Deans as members of the Committee does not appear to be objective and logical.

Regarding the date of implementation of the scheme, the Committee had recommended that: "the same as the date of revision of pay of the faculty members by the Sixth Pay Commission (1 January 2006). However, the final decision about the date of implementation may be taken by the Board of Governors". The Board has chosen the date which in its wisdom is most appropriate, and I have no comments to make on it, as I have no information on its implications. Only if a large majority of professors is not satisfied with the date chosen by the Board, there might be a case for review of the decision. However, I would like to point out that any date chosen for this purpose is going to benefit some and not benefit others. In my opinion, it is not proper to attribute motives in this matter as done by Prof. AKJ.

In Part B of his representation, Prof. Jain has raised many points about the guidelines. The Committee had clearly stated that 'the placement in the higher AGP (Rs. 12,000) will be primarily based on seniority, subject to fulfillment of certain conditions by the incumbents.' This was keeping in view the spirit of Ministry of IIRD's decision which stated that the eligibility for HAG will be "after six years of regular service in AGP Rs. 10,5001- per month subject to performance evaluation based on research, Ph.D. supervision, teaching and consultancy services. Since this is a *case* of promotion to higher level, the criteria for eligibility have been laid down

that will ensure continued active engagement of professors in quality teaching, research, research supervision, publications, consultancy, and also in sharing responsibility for academic administration and institution building that are critical in professional courses like management, and to develop and maintain high standards of excellence in the Institute keeping in view the highly competitive educational environment

I am surprised to note the comment of Prof. AKJ, who is a bright and knowledgeable scholar, about, 'Bad Inclusion' referring to case registration and stating that 'registration of cases with the Harvard Business Publishing and Ivey School or ECCH have no special merit'. Since there is no peer review process for cases, how else can ordinary cases be distinguished from cases that are in public domain through such media? If Dr Jain had developed good cases, why did he not put them on these most widely used platforms? Why did he have to wait for the reward through institutional credit system to make them available to students and teachers through such reputed channels?

What I am most surprised by is the statement which Prof. Jain has described as 'VERY BAD OMISSION' of Text Books that in his view should be treated at par with published research work. As a teacher and scholar who has worked in leading institutions in India and abroad, he should know that Text Books are NOT taken into account as research publications for the purpose of promotion to higher academic positions by leading universities and institutions. The obvious reason is that the research publications advance the frontiers of knowledge, whereas the text books mainly collate the existing knowledge. Whatever be the number of editions, and whatsoever wide may be the use of a text book, it cannot be treated at par with research publication or path-breaking thought leadership academic contribution that advances knowledge. This is academically well established norm of institutions of higher learning across the globe. Most of the points that Dr Jain has stated regarding academic criteria reflect his deep sense of grievance for lack of recognition of his work and merit, rather than objective views to help in making the process of placement of senior professors in HAG on a sound basis. Some points that he has made about the criteria may be laudable, but would create considerable problems of subjective interpretation and controversy, like introducing innovative courses, consultancy at higher levels, etc. Such initiatives need this purpose is going to benefit some and not benefit others. In my opinion, it is not proper to attribute motives in this matter as done by Prof. Jain. In Part B of his representation, Prof. Jain has raised many points about the guidelines. The Committee had clearly stated that 'the placement in the higher AGP (Rs. 12,000) will be primarily based on seniority, subject to fulfillment of certain conditions by the incumbents.' This was keeping in view the spirit of Ministry of IIRD's decision which stated that the eligibility for HAG will be "after six years of regular service in AGP Rs. 10,500/- per month subject to performance evaluation based on research, Ph.D. supervision, teaching and consultancy services. Since this is a *case* of promotion to higher level, the criteria for eligibility have been laid down that will ensure continued active engagement of professors in quality teaching, research, research supervision, publications, consultancy, and also in sharing responsibility for academic administration and institution building that are critical in professional courses like management, and to develop and maintain high standards of excellence in the Institute keeping in view the highly competitive educational environment.

I am surprised to note the comment of Prof. Jain, who is a bright and knowledgeable scholar, about, 'Bad Inclusion' referring to case registration and stating that 'registration of cases with the Harvard Business Publishing and Ivey School or ECCH have no special merit'. Since there is no peer review process for cases, how else can ordinary cases be distinguished from cases that are



in public domain through such media? If Dr Jain had developed good cases, why did he not put them on these most widely used platforms? Why did he have to wait for the reward through institutional credit system to make them available to students and teachers through such reputed channels?

What I am most surprised by is the statement which Prof. Jain has described as 'VERY BAD OMISSION' of Text Books that in his view should be treated at par with published research work. As a teacher and scholar who has worked in leading institutions in India and abroad, he should know that Text Books are NOT taken into account as research. publications for the purpose of promotion tailigher academic positions by leading universities and institutions. The obvious reason is that the research publications advance the frontiers of knowledge, whereas the text books mainly collate the existing knowledge. Whatever be the number of editions, and whatsoever wide may be the use of a text book, it cannot be treated at par with research publication or path-breaking thought leadership academic contribution that advances knowledge. This is academically well established norm of institutions of higher learning across the globe. Most of the points that Dr Jain has stated regarding academic criteria reflect his deep sense of grievance for lack of recognition of his work and merit, rather than objective views to help in making the process of placement of senior professors in HAG on a sound basis. Some points that he has made about the criteria may be laudable, but would create considerable problems of subjective interpretation and controversy, like introducing innovative courses, consultancy at higher levels, etc. Such initiatives need to be recognized in other ways. As far as definition of assignments of 'national importance' is concerned, it is well understood and cannot be re-defined as proposed by Prof. AKJ, who is confusing it with distinguished personal assignments.

Professor AKJ has rightly stated that 'A broader discussion amongst the community can bring forth other points as well'. Certainly, it would do that. The problem is that such issues can be discussed ad infinitum, and no solution will satisfy everyone. In case the Board wants to take note of the objections and suggestions of Prof. AKJ, it may like to know whether the proposed guidelines are, or are not widely acceptable to Professors. Only that ascertainment can help the Board in deciding to re-open the issue of revising the guidelines.

After raising all criticisms of the guidelines, Prof. AKJ concludes "At present, the best course to me seems that the faculty for HAG awards may be decided purely on the basis of seniority based on date of joining as full professor". Thus contradicting all his arguments for assessment of performance and merit for the implementation of the scheme, and suggesting policy contrary to the conditions laid down by the MHRD for this purpose.

Keeping in view the spirit of the MHRD's decision, ensuring active teaching and research engagement and continued academic and institution-building contribution by senior professors, I feel that the guidelines proposed by the Committee as approved by the Board are appropriate. The Board may ensure that the implementation of the scheme is equitable and fair, and protects the interest of all dedicated senior professors who have contributed to the advancement of the field of knowledge in Management, and in raising the stature of the IIM Lucknow to higher levels of excellence.

Submit-tell-to the Chairman, Board of Governors, IMX  
by Dr. Bisaria, Chairman, Committee for the Norms for Higher AGP for Professors, IMX  
September 25, 2012

**ELEVATION OF PROFESSORS TO HIGHER ACADEMIC GRADE (HAG).**

The Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education had conveyed the following decision of the Government of India:

**“Up to a maximum of 40% of the posts of Professors at any given point of time will be eligible for AGP of Rs.12000/- p.m. after 6 years’ of regular service in AGP of Rs.10500/- p.m. subject to performance evaluation based on research publications, Ph.D supervision, teaching and consultancy services.”**

Subsequently, it was clarified by the Ministry of Human Resource Development that higher level of Academic Grade Pay shall be effective from 18<sup>th</sup> August, 2009 and the services rendered by Professors in the pre-revised Scale of Rs.18,400-22,400/- will be counted for higher Academic Grade Pay.

For implementation of the aforesaid orders of the Ministry of Human Resource Development in IMX, a Committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Bisaria, Member, BoG, IMX and consisting of the following other members was constituted in May, 2010:

- |    |                         |   |          |
|----|-------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. | Dr. Bisaria             | - | Chairman |
| 2. | Prof, Pathak, Dean (AA) | - | Member   |
| 3. | Prof. Bose, Dean (P&D)  | - | Member   |
| 4. | Prof. Devanandan        | - | Member   |
| 5. | Prof. Mukri             | - | Member   |
| 6. | Prof. Charlu            | - | Member   |

The Committee came-up with its recommendations, keeping in consideration the criteria of performance evaluation specified in the letter of Ministry of Human Resource Development and the information on Faculty performance available at the Institute. The recommendations of the Committee, outlining the norms and procedures for elevation of Professors from Academic Grade Pay of Rs.10,500/- to Academic Grade Pay of Rs.12,000/- are given at **Annexure ‘A’**.

The recommendations of the Committee were approved by the Board.

Subsequent to the submission of the recommendations by the Committee, it was further clarified by the Ministry of HRD to extend the Higher Academic Grade (HAG) scale of pay of Rs.67000-79000/- without any Grade Pay will be applicable instead of AGP of Rs.12000/- per month, as the Academic Grade pay of Rs.12000/- per month does not exist.

A Group of faculty under the Chairmanship of Prof. Charlu has been requested to review the relevant service data regarding fulfilment of HAG eligibility criteria for professors. Prof. DRR, Dean (P&D), Prof. MA2, Dean (AA) and Mr. SC, FA-cum-CAO are the other members of Committee.

This is for information of all Faculty members with the request to extend cooperation to the Committee Members.

Exhibit 13  
Overall Workload as Per Official Records as on 1.6.2011

Seniority	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Faculty	PP	KK @	KNS	YKA	RKS	BB	MA	V	AKJ	RR	BKM	AB	AS	SS
<b>2010-11</b>	2.83	6.00	7.83	7.70	7.33	8.70	11.70	6.53	6.75	7.72	7.75	7.85	14.38	10.41
<b>2009-10</b>	3.00	7.50	6.60	7.60	7.70	6.00	8.61	6.99	O/L	6.07	6.95	6.20	9.61	8.70
<b>2008-09</b>	3.00	Deputed as 1st Director of a Central Institute from IMX	8.26	7.73	6.65	7.09	7.51	8.25	O/L	3.17	7.45	6.23	6.75	9.48
<b>2007-08</b>	5.06		7.63	7.40	8.25	9.07	10.43	6.75	5.52	1.00	7.40	6.16	9.13	7.98
<b>2006-07</b>	4.50		6.65	8.05	12.13	11.16	7.50	9.88	10.50	O/L	6.50	6.25	9.25	7.54
<b>2005-06</b>	5.36		6.79	7.25	11.42	9.00	NA	10.30	9.25	5.50	7.75	6.79	8.13	8.00
<b>2004-05</b>	5.66		9.37	7.75	9.81	9.25	11.97	5.82	6.25	12.54	7.75	6.50	10.82	12.20
<b>2003-04</b>	4.60	6.75	7.37	5.50	9.98	13.83	9.00	3.00	5.75	9.28	6.00	3.75	8.75	7.33
<b>2002-03</b>	3.38	6.50	NA	O/L	8.13	6.00	8.25	7.00	NA	7	4.5	5.25	8.75	5.75
<b>2001-02</b>	NA	5.75	3.75	O/L	6.00	5.00	O/L	8.40	NA	4.9	NA	4.75	6.5	NA
<b>2000-01</b>	NA	6.75	NA	NA	5.00	NA	2.50	6.00	NA	4				
<b>1999-00</b>	6.85	5.75	4.50	3.25	6.00	7.00	4.75	5.50	NA					
<b>1998-99</b>	4.00	7.00	4.25	O/L	8.50	5.50	O/L							
<b>1997-98</b>	7.75	6.25	4.25											
Professor since	1986	1987	1997	1998	1998	1998	1999	1999	1999	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001

@ Excluding many activities (see exhibit 6) which were considered important by the then Directors and Board but not included in the performance evaluation scheme

Exhibit 14  
Letter to Chairman

To,  
The Chairman,  
Board of Governors, IMX

From: Dr.PK Pathak  
200, Kaiser Ganj  
Bailaspur  
Dt. Oct. 24, 2014

**Through the Director**

Dear Sir

Sub: Correcting Mistakes in HAG Scale Implementation

I wish to bring to your notice a horrible fact that came to my knowledge by chance. This is regarding **fundamental** mistakes made by the Committee (which assessed performance of faculty members for awarding the implementation of Higher Academic Grade (HAG) in IIM, Lucknow), caused due to some untenable and unsound starting assumptions.

In its report (see para 1 and 2 of the Annexure I) the Committee has made two basic, starting assumptions. First, the committee had to decide the effective date of implementation of HAG grade “since the decisions of the Board and MHRD were silent on the issue”. ***This is not true.*** The MHRD had issued an emphatic notification regarding date of implementation (18.8.2009) on the subject as early as 15.9.2010 (see annexure II), which was approved by the Board in October 7, 2010. It was known to the members. ***It was also brought to the notice of the Chairman of the Committee (Prof. Vipul)*** by the current Director (Prof. Rajiv Srivastava) ***through an email dt.21.9.2010, along with the notification by MHRD*** (see Annexure III). Besides, the fact that the Board had approved implementation its meeting in October 7, 2010 after due concurrence of the MHRD which indicated date of implementation, should have been known to FA and CAO, as member of F & A Committee of the Board..

The second assumption made was even more unsound, unwarranted and even laughable; that “the placement of professors in HAG grade would be done in near future (and not with retrospective effect)”. The members of the committee simply forgot that they had received arrears of pay revision w.e.f. 1.1.2006 (including grade pay of Rs. 10500, which was to be Rs. 12000/- for 40% of the professor as on 1.1.2006) on account of 6<sup>th</sup> pay commission recommendations, although revision was announced by MHRD only on 18.8.2009 and approved by the Board on October 8, 2009 (after over 3 years) and HAG grade of Rs.12000/- was a part of pay revision. The new HAG ***scale*** announced by MHRD was to be effective from **18.8.2009** as notified by MHRD on 18.8.2010 and approved by Finance and Administration Committee on 7.10.2010, would be known to the Chairman of the Review Committee and FA- CAO who were special invitees. In any case the Committee should have verified with the Director if it still had any doubts rather than making an unwarranted assumption.

The wider ramifications of the recommendations of the committee on account of the above mistakes are:

1. Ten faculty members lost arrears for over three years for no fault of them due to postponement of the date of implementation with even seeking **reoccurrence of MHRD**..
2. The case of senior- most faculty (no. 2 in the seniority list of professors), the first faculty who served the institute for over 25 years as professor, was not even put up for Board’s perusal, as provided in the policy approved by the Board after due concurrence from MHRD. Instead a professor far junior than him was awarded HAG scale (**while the Board was given just opposite impression**, i.e., if the date of implementation was not shifted to the year 2012, a junior will supersede a senior professor)
3. The whole exercise also reflects the administrative inefficiency and insensitivity of the institute which goes unnoticed. An exercise, which could be completed in two months (April- May 2012) by the committee, was dragged on for over 8 months in 2010-11 (before the professor retired) and took over 2 years from the time the BoG approved criteria for performance assessment for award of the scale, resulting in over 3 years delay in implementation, making faculty members lose for no fault of them. .

The irony that the whole exercise of HAG scale introduction brings out is that:

- a) The people who do not have even the basic understanding of the administrative issues, lack comprehension and necessary sensitivity required for handling matters that may have demoralizing effect on faculty/ staff, are assigned the responsibility of Deans and such tasks as working out modalities of implementation of an important policy.
- b) The members of BoG, including representatives of MHRD, did not notice that the BoG had already approved the date of implementation in October 2010, in line with the MHRD notification. One can understand it, as this significant and material issue was brought for approval as “any other item” rather than as a “regular item for their perusal and consideration” and the impression given that if the date of implementation was not postponed it will create an anomaly; that a junior will supersede a senior professor (which was not true). Those members, who did not attend the BoG meeting, had no opportunity to have a careful perusal of the agenda item and give their considered opinion.
- c) The very fact that all the faculty members, who were finally given HAG scale (except the one who retired) would have got it if the scale was awarded on the basis of seniority alone without any delay, in Oct. 2009 itself, creates a doubt on the robustness and efficacy of the scheme of performance assessment for award of HAG scale itself.
- d) The Director who was in knowledge of the date of implementation ought to have given clear instruction about the date of implementation notified by MHRD in a formal and explicit manner. Further he had every opportunity to explain/ clarify to the committee and bring this significant material fact and wider ramifications to the knowledge of the Board members in an emphatic manner. He should have brought the item as a regular item, as full 3 months’ time was available from the date of submission of the report for being put up to the BoG.

I therefore request that the Board:

1. Should reconsider the decision and ask the institute to implement the HAG scale w.e.f. 18.8.2009 (it is better to correct the mistake than perpetuate injustice) and thus:
  - a) Let all the eligible faculty members get arrears that was due to them but got denied), with interest (those who were members of the Committee may be allowed to forego it, as they had more or less volunteered to do so by recommending the postponement of the date)
  - b) Any other mistake (like denial of the HAG scale to senior most faculty member, who retired on 30.6.2011 due to postponement of the date of implementation) may be examined as per the provisions in the performance assessment policy, approved by the BoG and concurred by MHRD. His consent may be taken for the purpose.
2. Ensure that in future all the significant and material items are sent to Board members as regular agenda items for careful perusal and consideration by them.
3. Do something for the development and appointment of Deans (who knows how many such mistakes they have been committing that has demoralising effect on faculty and their performance). For this it is necessary that the Board members take active interest in identifying and appointing Deans rather than leaving the responsibility to Director only, as was done when the Deans were appointed for the first time. But the system got derailed later.

Finally I may also mention that the two mistakes mentioned above were not the only ones. To me there were at least half a dozen more mistakes in implementation of HAG scale, which lead to not only denial of justice to faculty members but flouted the very introduction of HAG scale in letter and spirit. If outside world comes to know of it, it will be great embarrassment to the Institute and all concerned.

Looking forward to an early action,

With regards,

Yours sincerely,

Sd.

(P.K. Pathak)

## TEACHING NOTE

### Promoting Excellence (A) & (A1)

#### ABSTRACT

The case describes the introduction of Higher Academic Grade (HAG) scale in IMX institute of Management, (established by Government of India through Ministry of HRD (MHRD), as an autonomous body), as a part of pay revision under sixth pay commission. MHRD had introduced the scale to promote excellence by prescribing performance as mandatory condition, and notified that the scale be introduced w.e.f. 18.8.2009. The Institute appointed a Performance Review Committee (PRC), which developed elaborate performance evaluation criteria and evaluation system, but introduced the scale w.e.f. 1.10.2012 (more than 3 years later from the date notified by the MHRD)

The case gradually unfolds to indicate over half a dozen mistakes in the introduction of HAG scale. It later turns out these were not mistakes, but a part of major manipulation by the Institute, hoodwinking the Board of Governors (BoG) and in blatant violation of three major notifications MHRD in letter and spirit, raising questions on the use of autonomy by the autonomous institutions.

A little more prodding can lead the discussion to conclude that the very scheme of performance evaluation is not for promoting excellence but a fancy, elaborate tool to perpetuate mediocrity, defeating the very concern of GoI for introducing the scale.

The case highlights how a nice policy can be manipulated by vested interests while implementing the same, to derail the policy. The analysis also leads to serious questions on the competence and ethical behavior of some faculty members, director and some board members.

The class discussion has to be lead slowly and gradually to illustrate how the government policies are manipulated in a subtle manner to show “all is well and wonderful”, while the policy is being thwarted, leading to opposite results than envisaged.

#### Objectives of the Case

The case can be used to illustrate the following:

1. How a well- intended policy gets derailed during implementation.
2. How vested interests manipulate the process to do so for petty personal interests.
3. How they do it in a subtle manner, hoodwinking the controlling authorities as high MHRD.
4. How some faculty members/ boards/ directors of autonomous bodies, who demand more and more autonomy, work incompetently and indulge in unethical behavior with impunity.

#### Leading Questions

Case (A)

- Q1. Why MHRD had introduced the scale?
- Q2. What is consequence of changing the date of implementation?
- Q3. Is Institute right in changing the date of implementation? Why?
- Q4. Have there been any other mistakes in implementation of HAG scale?

- Q5. Do you think the contention that “if the date of implementation was not changed then a junior will supersede a senior professor” is true? Is the reality opposite?
- Q6. Who all would have got HAG scale by Oct. 1, 2012 if the same was awarded w.e.f. 18.8.2009 in view of exhibit 6?
- Q7. Comment on performance evaluation scheme given in exhibit 2.
- Q8. As member of the Board what course of action Mr. Bishnoi should follow?
- Q9. What action Prof. Pragyana/ Prof. Pathak should take, if Mr. Bishnoi does not respond?

Case (A1)

- Q10. Could the decision of the Committee have been different if Prof. DRR was not member of the performance review committee?
- Q11. Was the issue resolved by changing the date of implementation to Oct.1, 2012?
- Q12. What had led to the “zero sum game” situation? What could be alternate course of action?
- Q13. What changes in the performance evaluation scheme may be necessary to help the institute moving towards excellence?
- Q14. Comment on the review by expert Board member, Chairman of the PAC (see exhibit 11)
- Q15. Comment on exhibit 14.
- Q16. Has Prof. Pathak been discriminated? What are its ramifications?
- Q17. Comment on the reply of the Chairman to Dr. Pathak’s letter.
- Q18. What could be long term implications of the same in light of discussions in Case (B).

DO NOT COPY