

**POST GRADUATE DIPLOMA IN TEACHING  
AND RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT**

**Term-End Examination**

**December, 2015**

**PGDTRM-02 : INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT**

*Time : 3 hours*

*Maximum Marks : 100*

- Note :** (i) *There are two Sections A and B.*  
(ii) *Attempt any three questions from Section - A, each carry 20 marks.*  
(iii) *Section - B is compulsory and carries 40 marks.*

**SECTION - A**

1. Identify and briefly explain various theories of educational management.
2. (a) Briefly discuss the current trends in Management Education.  
(b) Explain the process of change management in Management Education.
3. (a) Design a conceptual model of building a management institute. Explain the major constituents involved in institutional building.  
(b) Suggest the different steps in branding an institution of higher learning.

4. (a) Define Total Quality Management. Briefly describe how accreditation of an educational institution enhances TQM.  
(b) Illustrate the institutional arrangement for accreditation.
5. Write short notes on **any four** of the following :
  - (a) X, Y and Z theories of management.
  - (b) Responsibility and contributions of various stakeholders in higher education.
  - (c) Essential personality traits of a teacher in his/her role as change agent.
  - (d) Expectation of students from management education.
  - (e) Process of team building.

## SECTION - B

6. Analyse the case and attempt the questions given at the end.

Raghavan Vaidhyar was a well known Ayurveda Doctor in Thrissur and a most respectful leader among Ezhavas. He was a disciple and follower of Sree Narayana Guru. He wanted the Ezhava Society to be uplifted in their culture and education. With that motive in mind he had formed an Educational Society named Noble Educational Society. The society got registered with competent authorities in 1966. The members of the society were mostly his supporters. NES established schools in various parts of the state in

1967 and there after several colleges were started by the society within and outside the state. Now the society has 120 schools, 56 Arts and Science Colleges, two Medical Colleges and four Engineering Colleges in the State. The fourth Engineering College is located in Ernakulam and was established in 2011 with the approval of AICTE, affiliated to MG University. The College had advertised several times for a qualified principal but NESCET failed to get a suitable person having Ph.D in Engineering. They somehow managed to appoint a person who is doing his Ph.D as the Principal-in-charge. Mr. Subramanian took charge as Principal on 12<sup>th</sup> August 2011. The admission for the first batch of students began in the first week of August and the classes were started on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2011 with 92 students. The college appointed sufficient teachers required for the first year classes. Since there was scarcity of M.Tech candidates, most of the teachers appointed were B.Tech. The classes were scheduled from 9am to 4pm with a lunch break of one hour. The Principal had entrusted the work of setting the time table to the senior most teacher in Mathematics. She had been designated as the HOD in-charge of first year classes. As advised by the Principal 92 students were divided randomly into three batches and two teachers were deputed to each class as their mentors and class teachers. Strict restrictions were imposed for students and teachers to meet the Principal. He had deputed an attender in front of his office to restrict people who come to meet the Principal. Being a new college there was lack of facilities and amenities in the College - Labs for the first year classes were not fully functional.

The college did not have any arrangement for transporting students from various places. The students were demanding for a canteen as there were no hotels or arrangement for food in the nearby locality. The Principal was not willing to listen to the demands of students. He did not bother to inform the management about the various demands of students. The students began agitation for a canteen and transportation. The Principal was adamant and did not react favourably to the demands. Somehow the management came to understand the issues and arranged a local person to make tea, snacks and lunch for students and teachers in a shed lying vacant inside the campus. The management also arranged a bus from Ernakulam and nearby places.

With the lenient involvement of management the college could function calmly without much hindrance, attendance and progress of students were reviewed frequently by the Principal. The Principal was totally busy in his office and would get hardly any time to visit the classrooms or departments. Principal maintained strict security inside and outside his office. He always ensured that his room and table are locked whenever he came out of his office. He had no trust in his subordinate staff working with him. Even during the weekly management meetings organized in the nearby Director's room, he would ensure to lock his office. He was so vigilant and careful in dealing with various matters. He was even reluctant to sign various official letters to the University and AICTE. He

avoids such responsibilities and takes authorised signature from management representative or the Director in charge of the college. He collected daily report from the HODs regarding the classes, attendance, tests and other academic matters. When the management representatives and director enquired about the performance of the students he had promised and assured results above seventy percent pass in the coming University examination. In the meantime, he got conferred his Ph.D. He took lot of leave for the work of his Ph.D. He even denied the duty of forwarding and signing the renewal application for approval from AICTE and University. In May 2013 he had applied for one month leave and didn't join the college thereafter.

The college again functioned without a Principal as there were no senior teachers eligible to occupy the position. The management entrusted the administrative manager to look after the college. This decision of the management had created lot of hardship among the teachers. As the third semester was to begin in June, the management had given advertisement for various positions. Sufficient teachers were recruited with M.Tech as minimum qualification. In June 2012, the management could locate a person who had just retired from PWD and doing Ph.D in CUSAT to be the Vice Principal for the college. Mr. George Kurien joined the college as the principal-in-charge with a condition to promote him as Principal when he completes his Ph.D within three months. He joined the college on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2012. The teachers gave a very warm

welcome. On the same day he conducted the first meeting with all teachers and designated the senior most teachers in the departments as HODs. He declared in the meeting that he would like to continue the policy that was followed in his previous profession. He gave total freedom for teachers and staff to do their work. Teachers are expected to come and take their classes as per the stipulated time table. They were not insisted to come at 9AM if they had no class in the first hour. And they were allowed to leave the college as and when their duties were over. He gave importance to the duties and responsibilities of every teacher and not the time. He said that he had been following similar methods in PWD and was successful in getting works done through his subordinates. He believed that when employee's satisfaction is ensured by giving them total freedom the organization would be able to get good work from them. He took everybody into his confidence. The students were given freedom to come late on reasonable grounds. He had identified two HODs as his constant advisers and trusted them by all means. These two persons were with him for discussion most of the time and the principal would be well informed through them. Usually the Principal was arriving late at the College as he had to meet his guide in the University to discuss his thesis work. At times he would come to the college around 11AM and leave the college early. He also had taken the liberty to get some of the thesis work done through few teachers.

Third semester classes started on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2012. The admission for the new batch had begun

in August 2012 and the first year classes started on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2012. The Principal instructed all staff to be vigilant and asked to give special care to first year students to avoid any type of ragging in the campus. After three days, the senior students started mild ragging. Some of the juniors resisted the seniors from ragging them. One evening there was a big fight between the seniors and juniors outside the campus. Some of the students belonging to both the groups got injured during the attack. The matter was reported to the Principal. He ordered for an immediate enquiry by a committee consisting of two of his trusted persons and another HOD. Six first year students and four senior students were found guilty and responsible for the agitation. They were suspended from the college with immediate effect on several occasions the seniors and juniors fought inside and outside the campus. In the meantime, the first year result was announced and only five students out of 92 passed in full. The management was very much worried about the result. As per the recent Government order and University Stipulation for renewing affiliation, a college must obtain a minimum of 25% full pass in all semesters. They rushed to the college and asked explanation for such a drastic failure. The Principal escaped from the responsibility telling that the poor result was due to the failure of the previous Principal. He was confident in improving the result thereafter. He also suggested the management lot of improvement in academic matters and ensured total discipline in the college. For the time being the management had no other option but to believe the words of the principal.

**Questions :**

- (a) State and explain the difference in personality traits observed in the behaviour of the two Principals. Discuss the merits and demerits of the same.
  - (b) The head, manager and leader in an educational institution is the Principal responsible for fulfilling its objectives. What types of leadership style were exhibited by the two Principals in this case ? Explain the various leadership styles.
  - (c) Do you believe that the promise given by the Principal will be fulfilled in the present condition ? As a management expert, what changes do you suggest to bring in discipline among teachers and students as well as improve the result as stipulated by the University.
-