



## **B-School Conclave: Moving To The Next Orbit**

Organized By:

National HRD Network  
and

FORE School of Management, New Delhi

PROCEEDINGS

Edited By:

Prof. Jitendra K Das and Prof. Freda Swaminathan

December 02, 2010



# **B-School Conclave: Moving To The Next Orbit**

*Organized By:*

NHRDN

and

FORE School of Management, New Delhi

PROCEEDINGS

*Edited By:*

**Prof. Jitendra K. Das**

and

**Prof. Freda Swaminathan**

December - 02, 2010

## Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Status Report: B-School Challenges in the Context of New Economic Order	5
3	Panel Discussion-1: Curriculum and Pedagogy Relevance	14
4	Panel Discussion-2: Research Output in Association with Industry: Issues and Challenges	23
5	Panel Discussion-3: B-School: Governance Issues	29
6	Key Learnings	41
7	Speakers Profile	45

## Introduction

Post-graduate business education in India has been growing to meet the demands of the industry. The post-recession challenges of a global world have, however, brought about many changes in the running of educational institutions offering post graduate management degrees or diplomas. A, B-School Conclave titled, 'Moving to the Next Orbit' was conducted on December 01, 2010 as a pre-conference event to the three day conference, the 14th National HRD conference during December 1-3, 2010 titled 'Towards the Next Orbit'. Thought leaders from leading Business Schools and industry shared their views on the issues faced and recommended an action plan for business schools in India.

The Convenor of the Conclave was Dr. Jitendra K. Das, and the anchor was Prof. Freda Joseph Swaminathan both from the FORE School of Management, New Delhi.

Panel discussions were held by renowned academicians and members of industry on "Curriculum & Pedagogy Relevance", "Research Output in Association with Industry" and "Governance Issues at B-Schools". The participants in each session included eminent personalities from reputed organizations and educational institutions.

These proceedings are being reported verbatim with editorial adjustments and views expressed are of the speakers. The session plan and speaker list is as follows.



Session	Speaker	Profile
Welcome Session: Status Report: B-School Challenges in the Context of New Economic Order	Mr. Suresh D. Tripathi	President, Delhi & NCR Chapter, NHRDN and President (HR), SRF Ltd.
	Mr. Aquil Busrai	Past President, NHRDN. CEO, Aquil Busrai Consulting (Former Executive Director-HR, IBM).
	Prof. Jitendra K. Das	Director, FORE School of Management, New Delhi.
Panel Discussion-1: Curriculum & Pedagogy Relevance	Prof. Asha Bhandarker	Professor, MDI, Gurgaon.
	Prof. M. J. Xavier	Director, Indian Institute of Management, Ranchi (In Chair).
	Prof. Upinder Dhar	Vice Chancellor, JK Lakshmipat University, Jaipur.
	Mr. Suresh D. Tripathi,	President, Delhi & NCR Chapter, NHRDN and President (HR), SRF Ltd.
Panel Discussion-2: Research output in Association with the Industry: Issues & Challenges	Mr. Aquil Busrai	CEO, Aquil Busrai Consulting (Former Executive Director-HR, IBM).
	Prof. H. Chaturvedi	Director, BIMTECH, Greater Noida (In Chair).
	Mr. Mohan Krishnan	Sr Vice President, IMRB, New Delhi.
	Prof. V. K. Bhalla	Professor, FMS, Delhi University.
Panel Discussion-3: B-School: Governance Issues	Prof. Pritam Singh	Professor of Eminence, MDI, Gurgaon (In Chair).
	Mr. Chandan Chattaraj	Chief Human Resources Officer, Aircel Ltd.
	Mr. A. Thothathri Raman	Chairman at Standards for Educational Advancement & Accreditation (SEAA) & Consulting Editor, Business India.
	Mr. Premchand Paley	Chief Executive, C fore.

## Status Report: B-School Challenges in the Context of New Economic Order

*The Welcome address was chaired by Dr. Jitendra K Das, Director, FORE School of Management, New Delhi and speakers included Mr Suresh D. Tripathi, President, Delhi & NCR Chapter, NHRDN and President (HR), SRF Ltd.; and Mr Aquil Busrai, Past President, NHRDN and CEO, Aquil Busrai Consulting (Former Executive Director-HR, IBM).*

### **Prof. Freda Swaminathan (Anchor):**

The theme, "Moving To The Next Orbit" is a very apt adaptation of the NHRDN's three-day conference titled 'Towards The Next Orbit' and is in recognition of the importance of B-Schools to industry. Three issues raised as an introduction to the inaugural session were:

1. B-Schools have been continuously faced with the challenges of keeping pace with the increasing dynamics and complex environment of business, especially in the light of the repercussions of the financial crisis, globalization and quest for innovation and sustainability.
2. The second concern was with the issue of moving the MBA student to the next orbit. It was pointed out that an MBA was not just a technical finishing school but an advanced degree that would empower the student with high end strategic thinking and eventually provide potential leaders to industry and society.
3. The third point raised was the incorporation of values to the curriculum.

### **Mr. Suresh Tripathi:**

The architecture of the Business Conclave, 'Moving to the Next Orbit' has had the valued inputs of Padmashree Dr Pritam Singh and Mr Siddiqui. The intention was also to add value to the three day National Conference, 'Towards the Next Orbit', organized by the National HRD network, an organization that is more than twenty years old and has members consisting of CEOs, HR professionals, students, consultants and also academicians. With close to about 10,000 members, the membership to this Body was



not limited to any region, any particular city or location. On the contrary it was noted that gradually there were people from across the globe, across different countries who have shown a keen interest to become a part of the National HRD network. Members were always welcome and encouraged to play an active role in the events spearheaded by the NHRD.

### **Mr. Aquil Busrai:**

Two issues that need to be raised are:

1. Industry was often frustrated with what business schools promise in terms of human resources, and what they deliver.
2. After recruitment, organizations have to incur extra costs to re-train and re-educate personnel. Sometimes these recruits were found to be inappropriate candidates and could not be employed by the industry.

This did not mean that there were only shortcomings in the academia. The industry was equally responsible for not actively interfacing with the academia. Organizations needed to participate in educational institutions by looking at the design, the content and the delivery of the curriculum rather than playing a negative role of visiting campuses and complaining that students did not meet the specific requirements of Industry. At the same time, business schools needed to come forward and expose faculty to at least a six month period of industry-experience, and work at the grass-root level and see how industry actually works and what it really needed. In fact efforts have been made in this direction by NHRD through their past Presidents, viz., Mr. Dwarkanath, Mr. Santrup Mishra and Dr. Agarwal to remove the existing lacuna. The organization of this Conclave by Dr. Jitendra K. Das and Dr. Pritam Singh is also a step in this direction.

There was a need to find a common platform that would bring core members of the NHRD network together and organize collaborative events. Suitable action plans needed to be drawn up through small task forces, using the network of the NHRD. Industry and Business school interface and fusion could be spearheaded through the help of the NHRD network and academicians like Dr. Pritam Singh and other luminaries. After all, the NHRD network has had a rich tradition of over twenty five years with twenty three chapters, and was therefore able to hold such a Conference which would see more than twelve hundred delegates come together under one roof, of whom approximately one hundred and sixty delegates would be from foreign countries. In fact, because of the active participation of members, and the variety of topics, the conference had to hold concurrent sessions. The

---

<sup>1</sup>One lakh equals 100,000

“joy” of the conference could be seen in two ways:

One, it brought onto the same platform, people who were conceptually and academically strong and those from the industry who have the wherewithal to execute policies. When these two met each one realized how much each can gain from the expertise of the other.

Second, this realization should lead to some sort of action, collaborative in nature, for both academia and industry and get converted into some sort of action plan for going forward. In this way by the end of the day it was the execution that mattered, not only what had been deliberated.

### **Dr. Jitendra K. Das:**

A brief report on what was happening in B-schools in India and outside the Country was reported. Since the speaker was associated with the IIMs in the past, and with the student governing system in the North American University in Toronto, he was exposed to the various administrative systems of higher education institutions like AICTE approved institutes, universities and those who were neither universities nor AICTE approved. It was remarked that such institutions ran a variety of degree programs ranging from two year degree programs, three year degree programs, four year degree programs and as well as five year degree programs. According to the AICTE publically available reports, out of 2400 B-school programs that were currently running in India, the AICTE approved ones were only 2000. These were 2000 programs and not institutions, e.g., FORE School of Management, New Delhi had three programs that had the approval of AICTE. The combined capacity of seats in all these 2400 B-schools was estimated at 1.9 lakh seats. However, the total MBA aspirant pool, counting the CAT, MAT and various other exams, along with some estimate of common aspiring students, the total number was estimated to be roughly 3.5 lakhs students! This meant that about 3.5 lakh students were interested in the MBA program. The following statistics may be studied:

Seat availability in Indian B-schools:	1.9 lakhs
11 IIM's including 4 new IIM's:	3000 seats
Top 50 B-schools:	15,000 seats (40% with work experience)

This put the top 50 B-schools in a commanding position in terms of admissions because 1.9 lakh aspirants became a fairly a large number. The business schools that were not rated in the top 50 had difficulties in getting students for admission. In the last two to

<sup>2</sup>Estimated for 2010 by telescoping available data. In 2008 there were 250 thousand students who took the CAT exam that included 60% with work experience.



three years the situation had become from bad to worse with the economic downturn of the last two years actually being the worst part in the admission process for the B-Schools. The current data indicates that in the year 2010 of all AICTE approved seats approximately 30% seats remained vacant. And if one projected this 30% vacancies to total number of AICTE approved seats which were available, which was 1.9 lakh, it would work out to approximately 60,000 seats that had not been filled in business schools. If one projected the 60,000 seats being unoccupied at an annual fee of say Rs. 2 lakh, it worked out to a sum of Rs.1200 crores per year in lost revenue to business schools across the country.

The speaker related his experience with the admission process of one of the new upcoming B-Schools. Role played by syndicates outside of B-Schools is well known. Typically a low ranked business school approaches these syndicates for help in the admission process. Such B-Schools have an admission team which is larger than their faculty pool. For example a B-School had a faculty pool of twenty and the number of admission officers they had were twenty five. One B-School had actually signed an agreement with one of these syndicates that was charging Rs 40,000 per admission. And this was linked to the fee payment plan for the student. For example, the syndicate received 10% at the time of admission confirmation, 60% when the first fee installment was paid by the student and the balance soon thereafter. Some of the 'other-than 50 B-Schools', had their own economics, e.g., they collected a sum of Rs 2 lakh a year from a student and paid Rs 40,000 to the syndicate and so still made Rs.1.6 lakh as revenue and was, therefore, considered to be a worthwhile proposition. For these 'other-than 50 B-Schools', the problems multiplied right from the curriculum offered to the students to the time of their placement. And if the potential student was not able to justify the expenditure in comparison to the expected job offer, the intent for admission was cancelled ultimately. This resulted in slowdown in admissions. The worst of this was seen in the drop in number of experienced students or candidates wanting to go to a B-School. Because of the work experience they had they were more judicious and selective in going to a B-School. A fresh graduate may jump into taking admission into a B-School because of peer knowledge, peer pressure or some inaccurate information. But a candidate with some work experience was expected to be more prudent in terms of deciding on a B-School – considering that such decisions were based on the amount of money spent on the program versus the anticipated earnings after graduating with an MBA degree. This was one of the reasons why some of the 'other-than 50 B-Schools' have had problems in terms of their admissions. It may be summarized that the problem of these 'non top 50 B-Schools' was a problem of their non-acceptance by potential candidates owing to 'poor' placement record.

In this regard, three questions were framed to find solutions as to how these 'non top 50 B-School' could enhance their image and performance:

1. The first question that the B-Schools needed to ask themselves was whether the admission process created was based on a 'have money, will give admission model'? There were some of these B-Schools who did not even look at prior academic credentials of a student, and they tend to give admissions based on the ability of the MBA aspirant to pay the high fees demanded.
2. The second question was, how do these schools measure up to the academic standards of some of the best B-Schools not only within India but also world over. These 'non top 50 schools' needed to compare and see if the curriculum offered by them measured up to the best curriculum offered by the other top business schools the world over.
3. The third question, which was a follow-up of all these, was the question of placements.

An MBA student has one primary objective and that was a good placement on completion of his/her MBA degree. So if the fee that she paid was considered as an investment then the placement becomes a very important criterion for students to take a decision. The fees for the top 50 B-Schools have been sky rocketing in the last four to five years. In 2001-2002 the fees in the IIMs was typically around Rs. 1.5 lakh and in 2010 it had touched close to Rs. 12 lakh. The compensation to Indian managers has shot up during the last ten years and subsequently their expectations to earn more have also increased. While the IIMs may have been able to maintain the academic vigor, intellectual thinking, teaching innovation, etc., to keep up the standards that they have become renowned for, but most of the other non top 50 B-Schools actually slip up on this. It may be pertinent to mention here that when one of the IIMs raised the fees, many remarked that the stated Institution was 'milking the MBA cash cow'. The MBA 'cash cow' seemed to be the main criteria for students opting to study for an MBA. This was the argument given by an IIM aspirant who was willing to pay a higher fee on the prospect of earning greater dividends within a short time-span, on completion of an MBA degree in two years. This reasoning in fact led to a national debate on whether it was good or bad to charge a high amount as fees by the IIMs from an MBA candidate which ultimately resulted in a quantum increase in the fee structure nation-wide. This resulted in the other IIM B-Schools also raising their fee without the proportionate increase in the placement CTC remuneration. B-Schools then started trying to figure out how to improve the orientation of students towards job requirements. This resulted in many B-Schools offering various new initiatives to attract students to the MBA program offered by their institution. While some institutes offered



soft-skills programs others offered leadership programs. Yet others added communication specializations to their curriculum. Some of the B-Schools other than the IIMs had regular departmental units to provide these soft skills training with the main focus being that all students must be presentable for placements and be confident to face interviews. Therefore, the MBA program offered by them had each institutes' specific requirement incorporated in their curriculum. This gave rise to another stream of professionals who came up with an MBA program that specialized in the soft skill training for the MBA students. And while this was happening in India, quite a few business schools in the US were facing the same student shortage problem. They were not able to find enough students seeking admission and these B-Schools use the term 'student recruitment' to depict the criticality of the admission process. They had a marketing department for student recruitment and they did not call it the admission department. To improve the 'student recruitment' they started segmenting and 'selling' specialized program to make the MBA 'offer' more attractive. An interesting example of this was the creation of an MBA for Buddhist monks. The objective for this was to create a body of specialized personnel who would be adequately trained to hold key positions for temple management. In order to achieve this they launched an MBA programme specifically for temple management. This made news in MBA education domain thus helping strengthen their brand positioning.

In the USA there were some Professors who had used specialized field to distinguish themselves or to present themselves at institutions that were offering something different to their MBA graduates. They had turned to specialized themes, such as, teachings of the Hindu gurus and the wisdom of Lord Krishna for guidance to find students for their courses. Currently the teachings of the Gita or the teachings of Lord Krishna had begun to appear in almost all management courses in India, particularly in HR or in Marketing. For example, a London professor in Operational Research attempted to differentiate his Operation Research course by including some of the learning of the Gita or the sayings of Hindu gurus. However, fulfilling student expectations on these specializations remained largely unmet. The placements, however, did not improve to that extent. The problems of mismatch of the expectation of the student and the placement they actually had continued to be a problem. The speaker gave his personal view that spiritual thinking was very different, and that an MBA was not spiritual thinking but was materialistic thinking and, therefore, this could be debated upon. In institutions like the IIM's and FORE School of Management, 40 courses each of 30 hours (vis á vis 25 in the USA), were taught, including 28 core courses and 12 electives. This could be compared to Harvard and Wharton B-Schools where the number of core courses was about 10 and in the Sloan School of Management, MIT the number

of core courses was only 5. One may consider the reasons why students in India have to cover much greater curriculum content. Based on some of the meetings at the IIMs, the speaker said that he observed that faculty tended to be possessive about their courses. If a core course gets dropped but the total courses remains the same, the student would have more elective choices, which would in turn result in internal competition among courses. This was something which faculty would want to minimize. In the US, there was more emphasis on the elective courses, so a student got to choose what they wanted to do. Core courses were kept to the minimum. In this way the student knew the basic fundamentals of the MBA through core courses and the rest all through the elective courses. Typically in a B School in India there were ten to twelve faculty Areas. Each Area had at least two courses as core course. So, there were twenty four stipulated core courses in a specific program. This was very difficult to resolve amongst the academic faculty. But in this process the entire MBA curriculum takes a hit with too many core courses. This was an issue that B-Schools needed to address.

The other aspect related to the curriculum in India particularly, was concerned with the teaching resources – the text books. For this the Indian institutes have been fully dependent on North American publications. Only lately, Indian versions of the B-School's text books are being introduced. The initiative for this was usually taken by the publisher abroad who saw India as a huge market. These international publishers, to come to India and sell "Indianized" books, enter into an agreement with the professors in India stating categorically that the content matter must essentially remain the same and only Indian examples are to be included. It was here that the Indian B-Schools could do more to make the curriculum more relevant to what was required to be taught in the B-Schools.

There were B-Schools in India that claimed that they used case studies. But there was a lot of ambiguity on what a case study meant. In fact, many faculty members had used case slides to say that they used cases in their curriculum. At Harvard B-School, for example, the case was very elaborate and very detailed and they looked at a case as a totality and, therefore, the case was used to trigger thinking in a student. And that was how the learning happened. This was unfortunately lost in most of the B-Schools, including some of the IIMs these days. So the question that needed to be addressed was therefore, how to fill the learning gaps among Indian MBA students. This in turn put another question in front of the B-Schools. And that was should the B-Schools teach more or teach less. Should B-Schools teach Indian situations or global situations? Or should they follow a proper mix of both of these. What should be the output? On this domain one may consider the issue of faculty output. Faculty output depends a lot on the governance system in the B-Schools.



A few B-Schools in India and IIMs were the pioneers in framing governance system that encouraged faculty to be more productive. They had put in many systems in place to not only reward and give recognition to faculty, but also give financial incentives to the faculty to write these technical papers and business cases for classroom teaching. Compared to the US the research output levels or the publications per faculty in India were still very low. But, nonetheless, this was not to be looked at whether the faculty was capable or not. It was not a question of their capability but a question of a system that was created for the faculty to operate in. For example, it was said that while Indians in India may not be so successful, but if they go to the US they are able to immensely contribute to the US society and businesses. That is, it was not that the Indians were incompetent. On the contrary they are quite competent, but the Indian system somehow did not encourage the sincere, the hard workers, or the people who had the capacity to contribute to the academia. The B-Schools in India, therefore, need to know how to handle this. In the US for example, a professor or an assistant professor was within the tenure system (kind of probation period in India) in which the faculty was typically given a five year time period to prove her competency. The university gave this person a grant which was then reviewed at the end of a stipulated time period. And the common saying in the US is that by the time you get your confirmation or become a tenured professor, one ends up handling his/her divorce. Which meant that in the US one was so much under pressure to perform and to write papers that one tends to forget even one's own family. It is a kind of standard saying in the US that a tenure track professor, two to three years down the line, would be asked by their friends about their family life quite seriously. Invariably, the answer was either 'somehow managing' or 'going through a rough weather'. That was the kind of pressure that has been built into the system. The upside is that the faculty has complete freedom in terms of taking the choice of research or the choice of hiring a Ph.D. scholar or a research associate within the university framework. The performance of a faculty member in a tenure track would be assessed in about five years. If the performance of the said professor was up to the mark, then he/she was given a tenure confirmation and made an Associate Professor. Thus, by the time this person became an Associate Professor this person would have on an average three to four highly rated publications. Indian B-Schools do not have this kind of a system. Therefore, there is a need to do something to inculcate, foster and create a system that ensures faculty productivity measured by an accepted international norm. The US or the Canadian system provided liberal funds to the professors to carry out their research activity with ample autonomy. A below par research output also meant drying up of any future research grant and this is considered a 'death knell'. India urgently needs a system that fosters faculty productivity in Indian B-Schools.

The last point raised was the issue of admissions to B-Schools. Because of the CAT exam and the ensuing competition among students to get into the best B-Schools, coaching institutes promising enhanced performance in CAT have mushroomed. So CAT, having multiple choice questions, has become more mechanized from student perspective as coaching institutions teach students not to understand the question but how to figure out the correct answer. So, a low CAT score need not always meant a less intelligent student. Indeed, CAT fostered a rat race that was not good at the national level.

To summarize, some of the issues addressed, directly or indirectly, were the curriculum design, delivery of quality, the support material and the Indian version of teaching the text that should be available to the students, and enhancing faculty research output. The admission system, the placement scenario, the role of AICTE, the system of governance from not only the faculty perspective but from the student perspective needed to be reworked. As the ranking issue was taken quite seriously by the students, these also needed to be assessed in terms of the weight to different components. In some rankings the weights given to components went up to three decimal places which smacks of working out the weights to suit a purpose. So, this was yet another aspect that needed to be looked at.

There had also been a lot of debate on the liberalization of the education sector and the entry of foreign universities in India. This issue needed to be addressed and solutions needed be put in place. From the B-Schools point of view the need was to look at the problem of expertise and the problem of too much teaching. There is the problem of not having good and relevant research output. Then the issue of teaching with a focus on making students 'job worthy' was yet another problem that was required to be addressed. Then the issues of industry interface for faculty to make research output and classroom teaching more relevant also needed careful looking into. There was yet another concern that needed careful attention of experts. For B-School curriculum to be job oriented it was imperative to make industry interface strong. B-Schools needed to be participative and transparent in their governance and in their dealings with the stake holders. Because the stake holders were non-participative and were not transparent in their dealings some of the above mentioned spheres remain unresolved and therefore went off on a completely different tangent. In the North American systems, things were quite transparent, and very much open to all. But in India, a trivial issue of attendance of faculty members was often a major discipline issue. All these issues must be taken up and addressed by either the B-School fraternity, by the other stake holders, industry or may be by the government agencies and suitable initiatives need be taken.



## Panel Discussion-1

### Curriculum and Pedagogy Relevance

*The panel was chaired by Dr. M. J. Xavier, Director of IIM Ranchi, and the members were Mr. Suresh D. Tripathi, President, Delhi & NCR Chapter, NHRDN and President (HR), SRF Ltd; Dr. Upinder Dhar, Vice Chancellor, JK Lakshmi University Jaipur; and Dr. Asha Bhandarker, Professor, MDI, Gurgaon.*

#### **Dr. Xavier:**

When academic papers are published very often it is said, on a lighter note, that there are only three people who have read the paper – the author, the editor, and the printer! There had been a lot of criticism about the kind of papers that were being published today. In the US after the 9/11 attack, enrollments in B-Schools went down and post recession, everybody tended to criticize management education. According to Smith, the conventional MBA programme trained the wrong people, in the wrong ways with the wrong consequences. B-Schools created MBAs with good analytical skills rather than managers with genuine leadership and execution abilities. According to Peter, management educators have lost their souls and that altruistic values have been supplanted by a mere 'show-me the money' attitude mindset amongst MBA students. Recently, when the Hon. Minister of State for Human Resource Development (Higher Education) Govt. of India attended the golden jubilee celebrations at IIM Calcutta, he criticized the management of leading business schools for only focusing on creating profits and not social development. But the current view gives more emphasis on the spirit of competition. Prof. Chakravorty has been talking of value based management education and that there was a great fixation among these B-School rankings. Whatever be the case, a student aspires to be in the top twenty or the top-50 B-Schools. Because of these rankings, these top fifty B-Schools keep on increasing their fees. The sole objective of the MBA student was to earn a Rupees one crore salary which could be made by many other different ways. Invariably there was a gap between theory and practice. Typically in sciences, theory was practiced; the developments in the laboratory were applied in the field. But in management one always looked at what was happening in the field and then make a theory out of that. So there was always a big

gap between theory and practice! How did one really bridge this and the loss of scholarly focus? There was a general comment that the MBAs coming out of the top B-Schools were selfish, arrogant, and egoistic. A kind of a feeling had been created where people point at the MBAs for all the problems of this world. This belief was fundamentally wrong. There were people who debated if management was a science or an art. And this debate is still going on. At least this Western management concept which had been brought here reinforced the belief that management was a science. Therefore, this view point was to be accepted and the view point of the other school of thought that referred to management as an art was to be rejected. So, suddenly there was the examining of this view point as well and a greater emphasis was beginning to be paid to values, the aesthetics and the ethics.

It is interesting to note that in the US at east sixty percent of class studied an Indian edition of management books. On being asked the reason for doing this, the students studying in the U.S said, that the American publication cost them about \$110 while the Indian edition costs them a meager amount ranging from ten to fifteen dollars. Besides the Indian publications were more accessible and easily available to them as they could be ordered on the internet. All these factors encouraged the students studying in American universities to buy the Indian publications. But if one was to address this reverse flow, the US publishers were getting the Indian authors to add a few odd case studies and they were selling these books at a low price in India while keeping the price of these textbooks very high in the US. Now under the prevalent circumstances not many Indian authors would be really willing to come forth and publish good text books as there was virtually no incentive for them to do so. However, it may be noted that excellent work has been done by writers like Dr. Asha Bhandarker, Dr. Pritam Singh and Dr. T. V. Rao, among others. Writing books did not offer any kind of much monetary benefit to anybody in the Indian context, as the royalty earned from a book was equivalent to a couple of days of consultancy. But nonetheless, the situation was not completely grim. There was constant change in the number of opportunities for the more adventurous and daring author in India. Authors had a repertoire of many mediums to choose from to enhance their publications. They had the facility of using 3D videos, as well as the use of audios, videos through "youtube", etc. to add a high quality value to their publications. Students could learn a great deal from them. There were so many different aspects of knowledge that could be disseminated by the author to the student of the twenty first century. In this the role and responsibility of the B-Schools in the spread of education was phenomenal. Were B-Schools to give just information, or to be the major change in the entire processes of imparting education? In order to do this there were several issues that needed to be



addressed. First and foremost was whether to follow the western model or to develop one's own model of curriculum. And to what extent were the B-Schools to come up with a blend of models? Management education in India was at cross roads with the entire west looking up to the east for ideas. With the Indian 'dabbawalas' going and making presentations at the Harvard University, with the former minister Mr. Lalu Prasad Yadav going and making presentation there, the sugarcane farmers from Maharashtra making presentations at the key American business schools, many Indians had begun looking up to India to provide the answers to the many woes they were faced with. So there is plenty of opportunity for themes for a panel discussion.

### **Mr. Suresh Tripathi:**

First, from the industry's perspective, for achieving business objectives there are several issues that need to be addressed. First and foremost is to have a group of people with the right kind of information, right knowledge, right skill, right attitude and competence needed to be instituted so that they could deliver what was expected. The top priority was the establishment of a body that was grounded in today's reality. Industry did not require everyone to be a leader but it requires good managers who could ensure that whatever knowledge was there is sustained.

Secondly it required a set of people who could bring in something which was needed for tomorrow. These are the people who are the leaders of tomorrow. Those who could think of the growth of the organization and this, in turn, would lead to the objective of planning what was to be achieved tomorrow and planning for that today and to ensure that all futuristic plans are realistic, well conceptualized and meticulously planned today. Its domain expertise comes through actually working on the job, or handling what is to be done. For example, somebody may have a good knowledge of the tax system and somebody may have very good knowledge of how the tax system was, but when one started working one saw how the knowledge was to be applied to ensure that one complied. That is, if a person is tax compliant, then she/he would make sure that the minimum tax was paid. So compliance with minimum tax was where the application came. And that was where domain expertise can make the difference. B-Schools must realize that organizations do not have time for people to come and learn on the job over a long period of time. The speaker gave his personal experience of when he was a management trainee for one and a half years. But those days are gone as in today's fast moving world one cannot wait for a year and a half only to train a person to take up a beginners assignment. So, looking at the external environment, the expectation of the industry tends to become that anybody who joins an

establishment joins it and hits the ground running in terms of being prepared for the job not only in terms of information and knowledge, but also in terms of its application. This would mean an understanding of the organization and the ability to integrate with the needs of the organization. Keeping this need in mind, and being unable to find suitable candidates from management institutes, many organizations tend to look at how to develop managers from within rather than looking at them from outside. Some of the organizations, such as, Bharat Forge, had set-up their own curriculum for the youth. The Company picked up people at the lower end (may be a diploma holder), and gave them the entire education over a period of five years which was very much entrenched in the actual, real job and at the end of the five year period they placed them up on a panel as engineers. Similarly they have also developed another program which was spread over a period of three years and they converted their employees as MBA graduates. These graduates were considered to be as good (or even better) as anybody coming from a good B-School. So, it was prudent to prepare one's own timber and to use it as well and in the process prepare somebody who is very specific to one's own requirements.

Very few generalists are needed over a period of time. This is where the academia has to look at and that if this trend continued one would need to know the added kind of value that would emerge from a B-School graduate at the completion of his/her management program. Another trend was in terms of how industry and academia could join hands and prepare people. Here technology could come in very handy because the good practices and learning of one organization no longer becomes considered as an internal matter. Wherever all parties join hands, the benefits are reaped by all. Besides a lot of learning tends to happen when one was consulting. If in one organization, a person has done something very well, handled a situation very well, other organizations could go to that organization and help them as consultants and probably offer their services free of charge. In this way the tested policies of one organization could be tested on another and in this way a huge amount of effort and manpower would be minimized. For others in the industry this would become a good practice because there would be somebody whose actual and practical expertise was applied to help others. This was a trend that was coming in and the academia needed to re-think accordingly.

### **Dr. Asha Bhandarker:**

There was gap in expectations between industry and the type of product which academia was bringing out. The focus from now on, therefore, should be specifically on the pedagogies. Conceptual understanding level in students indicated a grossly inadequate



method of teaching. Many leading business schools use the case method. The case method was definitely far superior to the chalk and talk method. And the reason for this was that in the case method the students got an opportunity to see the situation in totality and respond to that complete situation. But again, if one looked at the case method, one of the major advantages of the case method was that it gave one a rich and complete input of how did the case method worked. It worked through the analytical approach because one was sitting and running through a case and analyzing it. In both the cases the focus was on cognitive and conceptual understanding. No doubt, the case method has been proven to be better than the chalk and talk method, but still, it raised a basic question which was not addressed and that was regarding how to prepare complete managers and how to prepare complete future leaders. That raised the question of how did one educate not only the analytical side of the student but also to educate and shape the emotional, the spiritual side as well the practical side of the student. Because when Mr. Aquil Busurai talked about execution, he put forward the pertinent query of where did execution come from? Execution constituted a very clear set of practical skills. So, a complete manager and future leader needed those practical skills, the thinking, the cognitive capability, the emotional level as well as the spiritual level. And it was this understanding which made one not only a better human being but made one a better future leader. Though Mr. Suresh Tripathi earlier said that the need of the hour was to produce managers and that we were not so bothered about producing leaders. But a study that was carried out indicated that when a hundred different HR leaders from industry were interviewed, they responded that they had opted to go to business schools to recruit because business schools looked at management graduates as the future leaders. This was the expectation as on the one hand that they were the future leaders. And, secondly, as per what the great Einstein said that a mind once stretched does not go back to its original shape, meaning that at a later stage we needed to give the mind plenty of enriched exposure, experience, opportunity to diverge, by which all these three or four levels of the human being get addressed. The next was the third level of pedagogy. This level was superior in many ways, because it helped one to develop all the levels that have been talked about, i.e., the emotional, the spiritual, the cognitive and the execution based on the practical level. And that this was the level, a set of techniques and approaches which, if one went by the great Confucian statement "What I hear I forget, what I see I remember, and what I do I understand", exposed the individual to actually doing things and in the process of actually doing things the person discovered himself or herself the enhancing in learning at these three to four levels. And these set of techniques were an entire range of activities, running from something as mundane as watching a film and evaluating it by going beyond the film to participate in various types of simulations, various types of out of the box activities, various types of interactive theatre, all of which together help in bringing an individual face to face with his or her value systems, face to face with his or her capabilities, thereby ushering in the process of reflection. When an individual reflected on

the question of what one should be doing, the contemplation begins and this would lead to the actual process of complete self development. But very few schools went for these kinds of pedagogies. On a deeper analysis, two kinds of things emerged when MDI, started the PGP in Human Resource Management Programme. The first one of the fundamental things done was to bring a practical orientation into the program and to involve the national HRD network to actually developing a curriculum rather than simply imitating one as was the general practice. Imitating was an act of the cut and paste technology, checking out a few courses which were available online, setting up what one wanted by mixing and matching various aspects to create one's own curriculum. This was the worst possible way in which a curriculum should be developed. Because what was delivered in a curriculum was focused, it made sense and added value to the knowledge imparted if the school was clear about what it wanted to do. Was the school clear, or was it simply developing a set of hands with some functional skills or was the school clear that ten to fifteen years down the line these were going to be the leaders that the B-School were going to create? In terms of what was the action, what a school should do, it first and foremost needed to be clear as to what was the product that was being offered to the student. The second aspect to be addressed was involving the industry in developing the curriculum to be then followed by pedagogy because pedagogy was closely intertwined with the types of curriculum and closely intertwined with the types of products one created. A business school could be visualized as a transformation crucible - a transformation crucible where students were exposed to all kinds of situations of which the classroom was only one of them. There were many other avenues, ways and means through which an enriched exposure had helped to develop the mindsets of students. It was dismaying to find that many professors themselves do not believe that it was possible to create leaders. So, if one did not have the belief that it was possible to create future leaders, how could one create them? This was so because people came up with the belief that students came to the MBA programme when they were twenty two to twenty three years of age by which time their value systems were well established and were very clear. At that stage there was little or no possibility of developing them further as some people strongly believe that leaders were born and not made!

The speaker put forward the collective perspective that B-Schools needed to evolve and be the transformation crucibles, and in that transformation crucible the students should be given many more learning, unique pedagogical experiences by which a better and a more complete manager and leader gets produced.

### **Dr. Upinder Dhar:**

India would become the world's most populous country by 2030. Its population forecast rose from 1.2 billion in 2010 to almost 1.5 billion in the next 20 years. India is also set to become the largest contributor to the global workforce. Its working age population is expected to swell from 749 million to 962 million over 2010 to 2030. If the



working age population of the country, so-called demographic dividend, was productively employed India's economic growth prospects would brighten. India at present has only 504 universities compared to the National Knowledge Commission's assessment that the country required 1500 universities. So far as management education is concerned, in 1989-90 there were about 125 B-Schools including university teaching departments in the country, but currently in India there are 2000+ B-Schools. Most of these are approved by AICTE though there are some which have not been approved by the AICTE, but they still exist. About 1.75 to 2 hundred thousand students pass out from these B-Schools every year with either an MBA or a Post Graduate Diploma in Management (PGDM). But the corporate world felt that most of these students were not employable. Many of the speakers have already endorsed the viewpoint that most of the students coming out of the business schools are not employable. This was so because the teaching and learning systems of most of the B-Schools were ineffective. The existing system did not inculcate a qualitative transformation of the students even after they spend two years in these institutions. In other words the output did not appear to be significantly different from the input. Why was this so, was the question that needed to be answered. The basic reason for this is that the process that intervened between the input-output was not sound enough to bring about the desired transformation. One of the major components of this process dealt with the following questions - Why to teach? What to teach? How to teach? The answer to the 'Why' question was that it was the responsibility of B-Schools to transform students from raw candidates to highly skilled management professionals. This has been mentioned even in the 'Theme Paper' of the school. The answer to the question on what to teach is immensely relevant today and in the times to come. Unfortunately the curriculum of B-Schools has not changed for a number of years. Prof. Dhar cited the example of how a few years back he had the opportunity of visiting a well known business school as a member of the Activation Committee. This business school was affiliated to a well known university but surprisingly, the curriculum or the syllabi of this B-School was revised after eighteen years. The faculty in this B-School continued to teach what may have been irrelevant in the present day scenario. Secondly, the faculty at the B-Schools may or may not be purely theoretical with no interface with the practical institutions. It was imperative to teach what was contemporary and practical. Thus, the curriculum of every B-School should be updated at least once in three years as had been recommended by the Knowledge Commission as well. From time to time experts from industry should be involved in structuring the same. This was something that was not happening in general. Some of the top business schools had successfully experimented with this and found their experiences to be good. For example at Nirma University, a private university established under the State Legislation, people from industry were invited to be on its various academic committees and boards. And the experiences were reported to be really good. But in general, we are aware of the fact that a large number of

B-Schools in the present day can broadly be divided into few categories, with each category having its own problems. For example, the first and foremost category was that of the IIMs and some other similar institutions. The second was the category of the University teaching departments. The third category was that of the private institutions affiliated to some universities. And the fourth category was of the autonomous institutions which were not affiliated to any university. All these four categories have their own problems and their own issues, e.g., in the case of the university system, the rigidity is more. The bodies which were responsible for bringing about any change, even change in the syllabus, were so heavy that it became really difficult to change anything that has been prescribed. Thus, it was extremely important that experts from industry should be involved in even restructuring the curriculum.

B-Schools must formally invite experienced corporate executives on the academic council and boards of studies to evolve a realistic blend between theory and practice. With the changing environment in which we operate, with a much larger number of corruption charges, it has become necessary to emphasize on business ethics and human values in the curriculum. One needed to only cite the example of the corruption rampant in the recently concluded Common Wealth Games of how the ethics and moral values had virtually disappeared from the practices followed by the officials at various levels of the Games. Now let us come to the third question of 'How to teach?' Though the lecture method was relevant even today, there were other methods also which must be used for facilitating the students in developing explicit skills for facing the challenges at their work place in particular and those applied in general. It was necessary to make use of the newer teaching tools and techniques also, such as role plays, cases, games, simulations, management exercises, group discussions, etc. which may be supplemented with lectures too with the lecture method still remaining an integral part of any teaching activity. It has not become redundant. It remained even today a relevant feature of any teaching and the learning activity. But at the same time B-Schools needed to incorporate a fine blend of a variety of methods to make their curriculum a challenging one because business education could not rely on teaching only theory or teaching concepts only. There has to be a blend of both theory and practice so that students besides gaining the knowledge develop certain explicit skills which they required in the long run.

The students must be sufficiently exposed to the industry to understand the world of work. Technology based teaching aids needed to be used. The pedagogy must be student centered, not teacher centered. Of course, it was the student who had to be encouraged to play an active role in the class. Continuous evaluation should be used to test or evaluate the level of learning of the students. Till recently we had been following the traditional system of assessments, that is, simply teaching and testing the memory of students. The student only crammed the material provided by the institution and in reality learnt very little. This was



something that was needed to be constantly assessed and monitored. As we have mentors for students from the academic world, the B-Schools must invite senior executives from corporate world too to mentor the students. Even CEOs, or senior executives of experience could be brought in to mentor the schools and shape the students. This process would certainly help in bridging the gaps. Both the academic mentors as well as the mentors from the industries would be there to take care of the students. This would certainly help in bridging the gaps. To sum up, it was innovation that held the key to stepping into the next orbit: Innovation in designing the curricula without losing the touch with reality, innovation in delivering the content to shape the students for a great future.

### **Dr. Xavier:**

The panel chair summarized the panel discussions by highlighting the following:

The need of the hour was to develop a holistic kind of personality rather than to just developing the analytical skills of the students. Academicians should also aim to look at the emotional, spiritual practical dimensions of a person with an emphasis on the need to prepare leaders, not necessarily managers. There was a big difference in terms of creating leaders. At present the question that still remained to be answered was that were the B-Schools really B-Schools or were they only management institutes? If one was a management institute one should have a much broader growth and not only train leaders for the business, but leaders for the society as well. The key focus should be on 'action learning'. And as information was available everywhere why did the B-Schools have repeated lectures only? All information was available on the net, on 'youtube; and other places, so the classroom could be used for learning activities, whether it was case study or role play.

An interesting perspective that was raised from the industry's point of view was that a large number of MBAs remained unemployable. Who was to be blamed for this? Whether it was the curriculum, the faculty or the outdated syllabus that was very theoretical? One needed to really revise that in order to go to the next orbit. Mentors from the industry needed to be involved, and B-Schools needed to upgrade values and ethics into the whole system. We needed to move into the next orbit, we needed to rethink teaching strategies. There were no simple solutions available. But fundamentally, one has to look at not just developing the analytical skills but what was really important was that academicians had to achieve the goal of developing the body, mind and the soul. For this it may be imperative to teach yoga to the students with a little bit on health care and how one was to remain fit. The B-School graduates also needed to be taught a little spirituality along with ethical values. They needed to be taught also to learn to look within. If one could somehow blend the western process and deficiencies with the eastern values and the wisdom, it would have a winning combination. Indian B-Schools would be in a commanding position to create a curriculum which would be the envy of the rest of the world and emerge as leaders rather than being led by the world.

## Panel Discussion-2

### Research Output in Association with the Industry: Issues and Challenges

*The panel was chaired by Dr. H. Chaturvedi, Director, BIMTECH, Greater Noida. Other members were Mr. Aquil Busrai, CEO, Aquil Busrai Consulting (Former Executive Director-HR, IBM), Mr. Mohan Krishnan, Sr. Vice President, IMRB, New Delhi and Dr. V. K. Bhalla, Professor, FMS, Delhi University.*

#### **Dr. H. Chaturvedi:**

Management Education in India has completed more than sixty years. Even the leading institutions like IIM Ahmedabad, Calcutta, have completed fifty years of existence. When these IIMs were set up the Indian economy was not very strong in the global context. India was taking a lot of aid from the developed nations under various arrangements as we were not self sufficient in a variety of spheres. But in today's scenario, there is a paradigm shift. Not only has the Indian economy travelled a long distance, but India is now recognized as one of the powerful economies in the world and our management education has also matured a great deal. In the '50s and '60s there were hardly 50 B-Schools in the country. But today there are more than 2400 B-Schools. Not only is the Indian economy strong, but even the Indians are well established in the global community of academicians. Management education all over the world has a marked presence of professors and academicians from India. And currently some of the Ivy League B-Schools are being headed by Indians, like Prof. Nitin at the Harvard B-School, Dr. Deepak Jain earlier at Kellog and now at INSEAD, Prof S. Kumar, Dr. Rakesh Khurana, Prof. Jagdish Seth, etc. and hundreds of these professors have carried out extensive research in the global business schools. Compared to their marked presence in the global research arena, it is worth having introspection on what is the current status of 'research' in India in the management domain, particularly research in collaboration with the industry. One could classify research into two categories, i.e., research of the academic kind, or the applied research. In management education the applied research is given more weightage. The most important question to be answered would be how this panel evaluates the correct state of affairs about the research in



B-Schools or management education in the country and were they satisfied with the current state of affairs. If they are not satisfied, then what are their suggestions to solve the existing stalemate? What is the placement of the B-Schools in the global arena in the context of research being done in association with industry?

**Prof. V. K. Bhalla:**

Industry could train B-School students according to their specific requirement. Good students invariably learnt themselves. The B-Schools simply provide students with the environment in which learning could take place. The good business schools provided the environment for scholars to carry out their research activities. However, for good research work, the most important, and often most difficult to get was the availability of good input from good faculty.

**Mr. Aquil Busarai:**

The prime question that needs looking at is where was the research activity in India being carried out? The research activity was happening in certain pockets in certain institutes, mainly based on some personalities associated with the institutes. In some of the educational bodies active research is being done which is used by the industry. Actually in the dearth of conceptual framework many of the practicing managers re-lived their experience of the past five to ten years and solved the problem in the current day situations based on their past experience, whereas what was required in the present scenario was the application of newer ideas. So, if one looked at the research work and the collaboration work, part of the question was what was one getting out of collaboration. On introspection it was universally accepted that there was so much more that one could achieve which one was not getting. But the question remained that whether the research work was actually providing value or was the research activity merely being carried out under the pretence of research work. Sometimes for enhancing the quality of the minds, research for the sake of research might be good for the academic body. This was however, believed to be not happening in most B-Schools because the type of research work being undertaken was not always a pragmatic one. At times the research carried out by the research scholar was not directly applicable to the existing scenario. But that was in the pocket of marketing research where a lot of work had already been done. It was directly a user product industry. But in human resources, no research or conceptual framework could address the issue of attrition.

**Dr. H. Chaturvedi:**

Mr. Krishnan could enlighten the panel on whether in North America or in Europe there was a good practice of Professors from B-Schools going to the industry for some time,

and executives from the industry coming to B-Schools to teach or for carrying on research work. Why then was the same practice not being followed in India? If this was made possible, what kind of quality improvement could happen in the research institutes.

### **Mr. Mohan Krishnan:**

The speaker's personal experience as a commercial researcher and a look to academia for new directions in conceptual thinking resulted in him having an experience of working on both sides. However, one could raise the question of where was the right opportunity for R & D? The problem was that both hands needed to come together in order to get something to happen. Typically market research expense in India is about 2% of profit today. Globally the cost for a market research was about 3½% to 4½% which meant that the need to carry out research work in India had to go up in some ways. So, if any industry was growing and selling well, what then was the need to invest in research programs? It is generally understood that this was required only when there was competition, some pressure, some worry for better business insights leading to a thinking that the money allocated for research needed to be substantially increased. Now if one looked from the other side and took a look at the top management institutes, that were under pressure to increase the number of seats they offered in their MBA courses in a cost efficient manner, as also many of the government supported academic institutions, would one focus on faculty resource, support for capacity building in new areas, deciding curriculum and teaching rather than in research. As Prof. Bhalla said, wherever the corporates or the government stretched their arm a reasonable amount of research output was achieved. People are struggling in the evolving economy and youngsters want to enter the market to enhance their career. Questions of how to appraise, how to award, how to retain and how to train are the key questions that must be answered both at the tactical level and at the vision level. Given the high expectation, what trajectory was to be taken? It was here that academia had to take the lead. Like what Prof. Xavier said, theory needed practice and practice needed theory. In the future, it would be theory that would lead practice and this needed the right academic involvement.

### **Dr. H. Chaturvedi:**

The faculty members of B-Schools are the most important stake holders in producing good quality trained personnel. The next question was put to Prof. V.K. Bhalla that faculty in B-Schools were very hard pressed for research activity. Many a times, they were not in a commanding situation to do good research as they had too much of teaching load. So how could they produce good quality of research work? Is there any other new approach which could be adopted to carry on research work?



**Dr. V.K. Bhalla:**

Churchill once said success lay in failure. When one spoke about technology helping in the learning process and learning being a continuous process, so, one needs to look at the persons who had contributed in setting up of the new models. They were the young, fresh MBA graduates some of them chartered accountants having a general background but they had done some fabulous work. Faculty in the Indian B-Schools tended to be occupied with teaching, consultancy, or being on the board of a company. One cannot expect research from all of the 2400 B-Schools since they were merely teaching shops. This was unlike the tenure system for the faculty in the universities of the West where a job confirmation heavily depended upon research output.

**The Chair invited three questions from the audience.**

The first question came from Prof. N Mitra, Director, Business School, University of Jammu. It was commented that what Mr. Busrai had said about some kind of disconnect when one spoke in terms of research in HR needs to be looked at differently. Prof Mitra commented that when a faculty guided PhD researchers in business schools or when the faculty was trying to carry out research, a project was always looked at with a perspective of what the industry needed, and what was relevant to the industry. The question raised by Prof. Mitra was why could not the industry come out with some burning issues from time to time in the form of, or on a periodic basis depending from industry to industry, company to company, which would then act as a feeder to the academia. This in turn would help connect the academia and industry better. Prof Mitra put forward a query as to why could the industry not come out collectively and state those issues which have been bothering the industry as a problem issue. It is then that the faculty would look at them very closely in terms of the research focus and to enrich in terms of text books and curriculum development.

**Mr. Busrai:**

It was rather candid to say that academia was not aware of what were the basic issues facing the industry. But the fact remained that it was the academia that needed to get grounded to these realities. They must be in touch with what was happening in the industry and then partner with the industry. He stated that the industry was always lethargic to state in categorical terms the problems faced by the industry in general and offer the solutions, as 'failure' was a dirty word in the industry. Therefore, it was imperative that one differentiates between research and problem-solving.

**Dr. Chaturvedi:**

They should formulate some research periodicals on which B-Schools could initiate something.

**Question from audience:**

Industry usually did not give enough time to students and faculty. How then was this problem to be resolved and when one associates with industry the executives in Indian Companies did not easily come out and share their experiences and knowledge.

**Mr. Mohan Krishnan:**

While management had all good intentions, the middle management level managers usually found that they had too many tasks to do. So, what the management did was to publish a book in which the views of the management gurus were published. The management trainees were advised to read these. This was very often the practice followed in most if not all the B-Schools all over the country. As a result of which the student were inadequately guided. For this one could blame the fast growing Indian economy. In the fast pace of life people really did not have the time and those who were involved in commercial work realized this. It was suggested that what the faculty could do to teach the students was to raise pertinent questions which could be answered by the faculty in a short time rather than have extended discussions with the manager.

**Mr. Busrai:**

It was unfortunate that an industry practitioner did not give one the required time. But, from the other point of view those who were the 'pulls' of industry, they would prefer to stay that way rather than be the 'pushes' of industry. It would only yield positive results when there was a need, a hunger, a desire, that one would find enough of receptivity rather than push oneself from one organization or another. In this sphere it was the academia that needed to take the controls of leadership in their hands. The summer training was what one came out from the B-Schools for the mandatory training of some leadership skills. While some of us took this very seriously while others did not. Those students who were focused in their approach train themselves seriously. Yet sometimes one finds that they were left alone by the faculty on their own home ground in the academia and that they do not like listening to persons who was coming out of the first year of the or MBA programme.

**Dr. Chaturvedi:**

The audience was invited to give three concrete suggestions to improve the research output of the B-Schools when associated with Industry.



The first suggestion made by the audience was that if the MBA aspirant could use technology to interact with industry and apply management concepts.

The second suggestion was that summer internships should be a good opportunity for academia to collaborate with industry on research.

The third suggestion was that (like what was followed in the IIM Ahmedabad) research studies be undertaken in collaboration with industry and this be integrated with various faculty activities. Secondly, research output, like that produced with the help of the Indira Gandhi Institute of Economic Growth, should be adopted in the curriculum by the management schools in India.

## Panel Discussion-3

### B-School: Governance Issues

*The panel was chaired by Dr. Pritam Singh, Professor of Eminence, MDI, Gurgaon. Members were Mr. Chandan Chattaraj, Chief Human Resources officer, Aircel Ltd., Mr. A. Thothathri Raman, Chairman at Standards for Educational Advancement & Accreditation (SEAA) & Consulting Editor Business India and Mr. Premchand Palety, Chief Executive, Cfore.*

#### **Dr. Pritam Singh:**

**I**t must be recognized that we have two persons on the panel today who have spent their life in terms of assuring the quality of management schools - Mr. Raman and Mr. Premchand. The kind of work which they have done and the kind of service which they have rendered are a very valuable contribution to the country. The other panelist Mr. Chattaraj has been a well known person who has contributed immensely to the HR fraternity for the last thirty years. So, this panel has people from the academic world, from the industry and someone who had spent their life in terms of assuring quality.

As far as the problem of governance crisis is concerned, it must be understood that this crisis is a global phenomenon. While talking about governments in the global context, one got to hear of crisis after crisis. The management world was not free from that. Why was there a crisis? Many management schools were not aware of what kind of institution they were going to make. There is a tremendous crisis of dreaming, of vision, tremendous crisis of mission. However, many times institutions had a laudable vision, of dreams and mission. So the first issue with which one was going to be concerned with was the kind of school one was going to build. Many persons were very satisfied by merely creating teaching shops overnight by building many schools. What kind of schools needed to be orchestrated or built and what should be the architecture of the school were sensitive issues that needed to be addressed. The second thing important and powerful question to be given careful attention was one regarding the question of who were going to be the stakeholders in this venture. One of the prime stakeholders is the students and very often they get treated as customers



by B-Schools. Very often this concept of students as customers means commercializing management education. Another question that needed considerable attention was what strategy was needed to be evolved to have a powerful interface with the corporate world, with the students, the alumni and the rest of faculty. Keeping in mind the powerful statement made by the president of Harvard University that schools were not known by the great faculty nor by the great campuses but were known by the great alumni. Therefore, the next question that needed to be addressed was the kind of work that was needed to be done to ensure that a great alumni network was built. Last but not the least was the issue of curriculum and pedagogy as raised by Dr Jitendra Das.

The first question to the panel that was raised was what kind of crisis does one see in the management schools about governance.

**Mr. Premchand:**

After visiting about 50 B-Schools in the country in the last ten years, one important thing that I have observed was that the composition of governing boards was grossly inadequate. They did not represent all the stakeholders. There were hardly two or three B-Schools in India where the faculty members were represented in the Governing Boards. There were Directors, but the Director was not part of faculty but was a part of the management. Besides, corporate representation in the Governing Boards was very poor. They had people with a lot of experience in the corporate sector, but then they had retired from job and were in the seventies or of higher age group. In more often than not they did not know what was happening in the current scenario. Persons who were involved in day to day activities of their profession in the industry should be represented in the Board and at least 30% of Board members should be from the corporate sector. That was very important, but in most current situations this was something that was not happening. Not only in the Boards, but in the Academic Advisory Committees one should have persons who have been actively involved in day to day activities of the industry. Only when this happened would the revising of curriculum and pedagogy that matches with the industry expectation will take place. Currently this representation was very inadequate.

**Mr. Raman:**

Improvement in B-School performance is basically a governance issue. One needed to survey at least 10% of the B-Schools to study this issue. Judging from the visits to 300-400 B-Schools by Mr Raman in the course of the last ten years or so, he expressed that one generally found that nobody could be accused of not having adequate enthusiasm. People were in the business for this business and were very passionate about wanting to

do something, but were not too sure about how to go about the business of setting up and running a business school. First and the foremost important question to be tackled was one of finding out where to get all the relevant know-how for setting up the business needed to be addressed. The big issue was of who was going to lead them. They wanted to produce leaders but who was going to lead them? The industry definitely was not. There was no leadership from FICCI, AIMA, AIMS, etc. As also, there was no dearth of leadership, though, from the industry as a community. Now if it came to the naturally accepted leaders which were the IIMs and some other reputed B-Schools, even they themselves were not there in the picture when it came to international standing. The leaders in industry or the community were not helpful for the growth of B-Schools. This was one big issue that needed to be addressed. Besides there were not many role models who were available for the people to emulate. Thus, there were several issues which arose out of the governance compliance norms. The biggest issue in this country was that the big schools, especially the new ones which were coming up, had the potential of being excellent schools but were lacking in compliance - compliance to the local laws of the land. So, when one spoke about institutional accreditation, the first and foremost question asked was if the school had complied with the local law or not. In fact quite a large number of good schools, which were considered as models in this country, had not fully complied with the law of the land. This gave very wrong signals to the entire industry. The admission process was not very clear across the system and the curriculum revision process was also not very clear either. The faculty recruitment process was not very transparent. And in fact neither were the various support systems. Capital investment across 200 schools can be estimate at about Rs 1.5 crores per school on an average. Typically half of the total expenditure of the schools went towards faculty in terms of salaries. But when it came to support systems for the research programs then there were no budget allocation, for example. If one looked at the total revenue, it is estimated that the average revenue of a B-School in the top 200 was not even Rs 5 crores per year and 99% of business schools were fully dependent on the fee revenue. So, there was something terribly wrong with the fee structure, something to do with size of the industry probably, or something to do with the support system that we have in our country in the business schools. Something was terribly wrong somewhere in the broader governance point of view in them.

### **Mr. Chattaraj:**

Governance was an international issue, which needed to be dealt with. Businesses in this century were run for not only profit, but also run keeping in mind the maximization of the stakeholder's value. The governance in terms of family, institutions and country,



typically built the style and character that drove B-Schools. Governance as a topic required a discussion with a larger context.

### **Dr. Pritam Singh:**

In many cases, it had been noticed that the composition of the board and even the chairman of the board at the IIMs and other B-Schools were not committed to the school, per se. An institution was lucky to have a person who was willing to spend a lot of time as a Chairman of the Board. One may consider the following issues:

1. What qualities should the Chairman of the Board have? Should she/he be appointed by the government or by the board? What about the issues of governance in these institutions? But everywhere one talks about the autonomy of the Board and whether the Chairman should be appointed by the Board or by the government and that was one issue that needed to be resolved.
2. Secondly the issue which required to be highlighted was that not many B-Schools had brought faculty members on the Board. In fact there should be at least three faculty members on the Board, with nominal academic work load. And also only those personnel who were managing business enterprises should be on the Board.
3. Thirdly, who are the biggest stakeholders? It must be understood that the alumni are the biggest stakeholders in this venture. Faculty members were not the stakeholders as they could join the Board today and leave tomorrow. But those who have been the students of the institute, they were familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of their alma mater, and therefore, why should the student body not be on the board? The alumni could question the working of the administration at all levels. The question of why should there be no business executives of the industry at various functional levels, including teaching, also needed to be addressed. Marketing teaching area, for example, could also have some person from the industry. In this way every area could have a mini academic committee or some sub-committee to smoothen the governance of institutions. It may be suggested that, one or two members of the community could also ask a question or two regarding the kind of contribution one was doing within ones community. It was the composition of the Board that was in fact the real issue that was required to be addressed with deep thought and planning. The expenditure was again a mismatched feature when private B-Schools wanted to save money on research. Business schools wanted to save money on community development, without realizing that it was, perhaps the only productive investment.

**Mr. Premchand:**

There should be competition between stake holders which was not happening in the current situation. Sometimes there were many Boards who met in five-star hotels. This was something that should not be encouraged. The meetings should take place on the campuses of the business schools with some members of the student community being a part of Board deliberations. The student fraternity had the right to know what was happening in the board. After every board meeting the main points of the meeting should also be known to the faculty. If this were to happen, Boards in India would become transparent governing bodies. At the Board meetings the representatives of the student's body should be encouraged to raise questions about the governance of the institution and the quality of teaching.

**Dr. Pritam Singh:**

It is suggested that institutions could host lunches or dinners for all faculty and have faculty centric group activities. There should be informal discussions between the faculty and the board members. Some of the students could also be invited to these meetings. This would go a long way in building transparency in the working system.

**Mr. Premchand:**

The main problem in the Indian business schools was that most of the B-Schools were like private enterprises run by business families. The boards of these privately owned enterprises comprised mostly of family members. These private enterprises wanted Directors who were, more or less, puppets in the powerful hands of the board members, to be used merely as a rubber stamp as and when desired. In this manner the business family can run the B-School with few chances of friction between the Board and their powerless Director. This is a major problem in the smooth and transparent governance of these institutions.

**Mr. Raman:**

In majority of the business schools run in the country one finds that the key administrative posts are manned by family members irrespective of their educational qualification.

**Dr. Pritam Singh:**

The issue of importance was one of empowerment and decentralization.



**Mr. Raman:**

CAT (Common Admission Tests conducted by the IIMs) has been seeing a large number of examinees for the MBA admissions every year. With more and more candidates taking these exams a larger volume of students were seeking admissions into these management schools. But there appears to be a problem here as the CAT is not actually introducing counter-measures to reduce the number of applicants. It is meaningless leading to a ridiculous situation where there were three lakh applicants for three thousand seats! This meant that straight away the management institutes were acquiring a larger number of aspirants whose hopes and ambitions have been dashed to the ground. In order to safeguard against these, the filters have to be made stronger and stronger. In order to have these in place, first a lesser number of people competing in the admission process need to be ensured. The second front that needed to be handled was to put in place a good teaching faculty. This did not necessarily mean that the Ph.D. system in this country has not been made very effective. The AICTE insists that the B-schools should have faculty with PhDs to impart instruction to students. Some where a serious discussion has to take place in order to allow faculty with industry exposure, who may not hold a doctorate in management but were very qualified otherwise, to come in to the B-Schools.

**Dr. Pritam Singh:**

When one studied psychology, one saw more of statistics and less of psychology. Even in competitions there seems to be more of mathematics and less of communication. The question that has been raised in America was what kind of research work was being undertaken? Was it all esoteric or was it relevant. It was pointed out that any research work not having the application was an exercise in futility and was a meaningless endeavour. This could become a situation of the blind leading the blind.

**Mr. Premchand:**

The systems and processes in most of the B-Schools were so inadequate that there was hardly any practical education imparted to the students. With the faculty having so much of a teaching load on a day to day basis that they did not have time for any research work. The possible solution to this problem was to promote relevant research. It was important to promote an entrepreneurial culture in the business schools. It may be suggested that B-Schools could come up with an annual business case contest. This body should be given adequate funds from the corpus to start it up. If one thought on those lines the end result would be that the whole institute would be geared towards relevant research. They would

see what kind of businesses could be tried in an emerging economy.

**Mr. Raman:**

Another aspect that needed to be looked at was should the management with the administration of the business schools be left to the managers and not necessarily to the faculty. Most of the time what happened was that faculty time was taken by the placement committees and various administrative activities. However, various administrative activities can be handled by an administrator who is a management expert thereby saving a lot of faculty time. At this juncture it was suggested that B-Schools must have education administrators as an integral part of their system of governance.

**Mr. Premchand:**

One could actually think of having a training program for newly appointed Directors. Many a time it has been seen that a very good faculty was promoted on the basis of her/his research publications to the position of a Director. In the bargain one can lose a good teacher and get a bad Director. So, perhaps one could think of setting up a program for the new converts. It was extremely important for them to learn how to manage a business school as there were many things one needed to learn because management as a subject was very easy to teach but very difficult to give priority.

**Dr. Pritam Singh:**

Workshops for the Vice Chancellors, Directors and Deans are an extremely important concept. It was an easily accepted fact that there was a crisis of good leaders in the country, but there was an even greater crisis of good academic leaders with the business schools because, in the industry, for example, at least the industry forum could train them, this however remained virtually impossible in management schools.

**Mr. Premchand:**

Even when there was strong industry interface often there was no faculty to match and guide the industry. On the contrary, one found that it was the faculty that was often led by the industry. As a result of this there was a tremendous challenge to lead industry. In order to do this successfully one needed to cultivate faculty. One needed to invest in them. But in order to do that the mindset of the big business houses that ran these B-Schools must change.

**Mr. Chattaraj:**

There was also the need to train the Board of Directors as well. Pertinent questions



regarding the existence of a Board, its purpose and its context needed to be worked out well in order to make an impact in the governance of the business schools. Questions regarding the presence of the directors whether they were there because they wanted to be there philosophically, or were they there for a purpose was required to be skimmed off carefully before they became a reality.

**Mr. Premchand:**

There was a wide gap between the vision of Directors and what the industry actually wanted. In the current scenario there was a disconnection between them. So first and foremost priority for all Directors should be to have a vision regarding the direction they collectively wanted the B-School to provide to the industry. Having done so they should then communicate or make the faculty internalize that vision – something that was not happening as many a time the Directors adopted the divide and rule strategy rather than promoting team work amongst the faculty.

**Dr. Pritam Singh:**

One needs to deliberate on how to integrate management schools with the corporate world because if one wanted to run a good medical college, one needed a very good hospital. If one wanted to run a good engineering college, one must have a very robust engineering workshop. Similarly, if one wanted to run a great management school, one must have something like workshop of entrepreneurs or others where people can learn the tricks of the trade, so to speak. So, the big question that remained to be answered was how one built a powerful interface with the industry, an issue that has been deliberated upon for many a decade but still a satisfactory solution is not in place.

**Mr. Premchand:**

The faculty should deliver and interact with industry, with the sole objective of leading the industry. This was something that was not happening. If one did not give enough space to the faculty and resources to the industry, there would hardly be any strong interaction between the two. This was clearly cited by the statistics that out of the top 200 B-Schools in the country, only about 30 B-Schools could be said to be fully integrated with the industry.

**Dr. Pritam Singh:**

If the management trainees did not interact with industry, ultimately the B-Schools would pay the price for this and if the B-Schools did not get students of high quality they

would be the losers. But, in reality if anyone was going to be the loser, it would be the industry and not the academic world because whatever B-Schools groom, they groom. So, if the industry wanted to have students of high caliber they would have to talk about the question of employability. Industry must support student interaction failing which it should be prepared to emerge as losers.

**Mr. Premchand:**

Historically speaking, industry has played a parasitic role. It wanted to take the best advantage without giving back to the management schools.

**Dr. Pritam Singh:**

The crux of the problem was that for whatever period students were trained by B-Schools, if industry had a short-term mind-set to bring the manpower costs from, say, 6 months to 2 months, it would be the losers. That was the reason where organizations like FICCI, CII, National HRD Network, needed to play a role.

**Mr. Chattaraj:**

Technology management was also a key differentiator, unlike industry as it existed ten fifteen years ago.

**Mr. Raman:**

It was quite unfortunate to realize that there were hardly any B-Schools in this country which had introduced technology management as a subject because in contemporary times it was not the issue of education or knowledge, but an issue of how to manage the knowledge one saw technologically that was of very serious concern.

**Dr. Pritam Singh:**

If an organization could think about patronizing about 10 B-Schools with the objective of investing in these 10 B-Schools, undertaking placement from them and providing support for 3 years before moving on to other schools, it would be beneficial to all concerned.

Chair invited audience to ask question.

**Question & Answers**

**Audience #1:**

Introduced himself as Sudesh Pradhan, a student of IIM, Calcutta and HR Management and a software professional as well. He gave the suggestion of using the case studies from Harvard and other institutions with the objective of being related to the



prevalent environment. The cited case studies could be followed up with similar situations on line or through newspapers or any other agency. This would help to connect the students to the reality of the corporate world and also enhance the case study knowledge.

### **Mr. Premchand:**

Live projects were also very important. What needs to be improved was the system of governance. The prevalent system of governance did not give space to industry, faculty or the student. In the current scenario there were hardly any resources given to the faculty members to interact with industry to show, or to generate cases. When a faculty was expected to teach 8 to 9 courses in a year how could one expect the faculty to do these cases. The existing impossible situation needed to be corrected.

### **Dr. Pritam Singh:**

When a faculty member wrote a case study and went to the class, the process of teaching became a natural process. If another case is used to teach students, while this is okay in cognitive understanding of the situation, but not the emotional understanding, the student's learning from this case may not be as effective. Cases are as important as writing papers. Papers were an important tool to spread education no doubt, because to go for global education, the kind of research work one has to carry out required a thorough study of all aspects of the case study. However, in order to make the teaching exciting and very meaningful the case study should be used.

### **Audience #2:**

Mr Varesh from Sitargarh College, Andhra Pradesh. He pointed out that in the current scenario even higher education was subsidized by the central or the state governments. The issue raised by him came from the perspective of business schools run by affiliated colleges. As the state governments were subsidizing higher education, especially MCA, MBA and B.Tech. courses, they were not interested in increasing the fee to these courses. He pointed out that MBA fee structure in Andhra Pradesh was only Rs. 27000 of which the students had to pay only Rs.7000. The rest of the amount of Rs. 20000 was to be borne by the governments, but not at the time of admission but almost at the time of completion of the academic year. The result of this was that the faculty was getting a very meager amount of less than Rs.10000 per month as salary. Keeping this in mind it was pertinent to figure out the quality of faculty one was expecting. According to Mr. Varesh some of the big schools were not complying with the AICTE as Mr. Raman had already pointed out. At the same time, AICTE was charging an affiliation fee from all the smaller B-Schools but they were not giving any return in terms of inputs. So, the question he wanted to put forward was how

does one make the government and organizations change their mindset and enhance the fee structure or at least make it a worthwhile proposition for both the B-School managements and the other stakeholders?

**Dr. Pritam Singh:**

The roles played by AICTE and by the governments needed to be clearly defined. Where should the university system be reformed, and where was it satisfactory needed to be carefully reworked. At some stage the governments at both the centre and the state levels would have to rethink whether one should have a French model of segregating the school of technology and school of management from the university system. A lobby could be created to fight with the government on behalf of the student fraternity. Previously management schools were allowed to take only sixty students but under the prevalent scheme this number has grown to double the number. It was suggested by him that this strength could grow up to three hundred students. Such schools with low intake at present were not viable.

**Audience #3:**

One is not concerned with the top 50 business schools of the country, but with the ones below the top 50. Most of the business schools were hiring the faculty at a petty salary of Rs.10000 per month in fact some B-Schools paid their faculty a meager sum of only Rs 7000 or Rs 8000 per month. This was less than the salary a peon in a government office! A clear message must go from the faculty that if the industry had expectations, then the industry must be prepared to invest in education.

**Dr. Pritam Singh:**

This was happening because of the mushrooming of B-Schools. The country does not need 2700 B-Schools. If there were a maximum number of 1000-1500 B-Schools in India the situation would be well under control.

**Audience #4:**

The basic challenge faced by the B-Schools in the country was to find talented faculty. Most of the top 50 B-Schools would rather leave a position vacant instead of appointing a wrong person. Now this puts a pressure on the existing faculty. They have to teach a subject with which they cannot connect well though they might be competent in teaching and this also reduced their ability to inspire the students. Because the teachers were mentally so preoccupied, they could not train students to make leaders out of them. When the teacher came to the classes he realized that he had to somehow rush through the text as the focus



was more on completion of the syllabus so the business of education became a vicious circle.

### **Dr. Pritam Singh:**

Approximately 40% posts remained vacant in IIMs as they were not getting suitable faculty. The speaker himself had suggested to the Pay Committee of offering a stipend of Rs 40,000 per month as scholarship for the Ph.D. candidates. For the Central Government this sum was peanuts, but the question that needed to be answered was could the government decide to give around 10000 scholarships paying each student a sum of Rs. 40000 per month. This was a question that needed to be debated upon.

### **Mr. Premchand:**

For a loan of Rs.10 lakhs, a student had to pay back around Rs 30000 per month after a period of 6 months of getting a job. This meant that one was paying back Rs 35000 per month while one got a stipend of Rs 25000 or 40000 per month! This left little or no incentive for the bright minds to come to the profession of teaching. Once the faculty had been appointed, the environment in B-Schools was such that it did not leave them with much scope to grow and thus this profession was not considered attractive enough. This needs to be addressed appropriately.

### **Dr. Pritam Singh:**

One can take the example of a mother crow training a baby crow that since human beings were cruel that if the baby crow found any human being picking up a stone, the baby crow should fly away because the human being would be hurling the stone at the baby crow. The stone would kill the baby crow. The baby crow asked its mother a question that if the human being already had a stone in his/her hand what was the young crow to do then. At this point of time the mother crow expressed her happiness by saying that her baby crow needed no further training because the young one had already begun to ask questions – the right questions!

The speaker said that as he saw more questions coming from the audience, he realized that the panel members had done their job. Their job was to ignite their student's mind and make them raise questions. He thanked the audience for being a patient, attentive and a participative audience.

## Key Learnings

*Prof F. Swaminathan invited Dr. Jitendra K. Das, Director FORE School of Management, New Delhi and convener of the B-School conclave to detail the key learnings and make the concluding note.*

### **Dr. Jitendra Das:**

The main purpose of this Conclave was to discuss the three items on the agenda and to come up with actionable points. The first panel that discussed curriculum and pedagogy concluded that there existed a gap between what was being produced by academic institutions and what was required by the industries. This gap was required to be understood and academic institutions needed to take initiatives to take the process of educating the aspirant MBA student forward and figure out what was required to be done to fill the gap. In order to achieve this, what required to be done was a high level of preparedness that was expected from the academia to take up the business challenges that the competing business organizations face. The Conclave had considered these and come up with suggestions that would initiate the reform of the curriculum. While the curriculum needed to develop the analytical ability, a holistic development and leadership ability was also needed to be in-built within the curriculum focusing on not only the classroom lecture mode teaching, but on the emotional, spiritual and other practical aspects including what was called the experiential learning. These must be factored into the pedagogy that one wanted to deploy. Input on curriculum content need must be taken from the industry through industry represented Academic Council or through other industry interface programs. If B-Schools had to play the role of being the transformation crucible, they need to focus on action learning. The lecture method was to be supplemented with case studies, role plays and as they say, experiential learning. Therefore, the business simulation software as a technology based tool for learning could be very effectively deployed for effective learning. Last but not the least the emphasis should be laid on business ethics and human values, which at times took the back seat because we focus too much on business drivers of the potential employers of students. There could be a fine blend of western practices and eastern values. That was the last observation made which was a very powerful one. Together the shareholders and the faculty should try to



figure out a way in which the efficient western practices with their processes and procedures must be adapted to our situation and infused with the eastern values.

Panel-2 was on the topic of research output of academia in consultation with the industry. The panel came up with the key point that there was a need for a fair recognition of the Indian academic community in terms of the research work. It was accepted that somehow, somewhere, the recognition given to research work was lacking within the B-Schools. There was something that was not considered conducive to an academic work culture due to a gap between what was called the 'management' and the faculty. For the imparting of a truly value based education this gap must be reduced. This was also endorsed by members in the Panel-3 discussions. Academic research needed to focus on issues which were a problem within the industry and not abstract ones. It was discussed that academia should take the initiative in this direction together with the industry. There was the issue of appointing quality faculty members who were required to carry out research work and that the recognition of the need that the faculty be given more autonomy on adopting various methods of teaching. It was accepted that the faculty should have the right mix of research, teaching and academic administrative activities such that they have sufficient time for research. It was emphasized that it is important to understand, as the research output is not immediately discernible. It was a common problem faced by the faculty in India and that is that a faculty was expected to extensively carry out academic administration along with their teaching work load leaving them with little or no quality time for research activity. The management of B-Schools needed to figure out how to handle this. It was said that the industry interface can be leveraged through professional networks like the NHRDN, the CII (Confederation of India Industries) or the PHD Chamber of Commerce. They could liaison with the industry and then identify common areas which the industries were interested in and find out where research could be undertaken. At the same time it was pointed out that the industry did have a responsibility to society and therefore to B-Schools and that this should be reflected in some expression of need by the industry. It was suggested that this could be done through the professional associations and not by an individual industry per se.

The third panel had animated discussions regarding the governance issues in B-Schools. The major points that came up were that governance was a global issue and B-Schools particularly, had to be very sensitive in ensuring that all aspects of governance and management were incorporated in the curriculum being offered to the students. It was recognized that identification of stakeholders was a key factor and that the interests of all stakeholders must be taken care of through adequate representation, leading to appropriate

systems and delivery mechanisms to meet the objectives of the business schools. This meant that inadequate representation of the stakeholders continued to be one of the major bottlenecks and that must be looked at with considerable detail. For example, the Chairman or the President of the Governing Board of any IIT or IIM may have very little stake in the well being of the institute because they may have a major commitment somewhere else and that this was only a part time engagement for them while the Chairman is expected to provide a very valuable direction and specific input in the proceedings of the Governing Board meetings and ensure their implementation. For example, at one of the Governing Board meetings at one of the IIM, a faculty, who was also a member of the Governing Board, in a discussion finally had to point out that he had much more stake in the well-being of the institute than the other Board member because the other Board member in all likelihood had a job elsewhere while his (and other faculty member's) reputation, career and means of earning a livelihood depended on this very institute in which he was employed. The other Board member was taken aback but then he took it sportingly and things worked out well. So, the stakeholders needed to be represented in the Board meetings of the B-Schools along with the student bodies, the alumni, the faculty, etc. Yet another major point that came up for discussion was the question of expenditure Vs investment by B-Schools. What percentage of the revenue of the B-Schools was to be spent on faculty development and how much of it was to be allocated for research was the question. The issue of research activity being given greater autonomy was put forward. This would enhance the chances of appointing the appropriate, well-qualified faculty who would be in a commanding position to deliver what was expected of them. The proceedings of the Governing Board meetings should be transparent in the sense that the faculty, students and other stakeholders must be aware of the deliberations at the Governing Board meetings that they must have an opportunity to contribute their views in these deliberations. In this way the participative and transparent nature of all aspects of governance would be strengthened in the Governing Board meetings. There should be an evolution of processes for empowerment and decentralization at B-Schools, taking the transparency and participative nature of the Governing Board to greater heights. It was also said that entrepreneurial culture in B-Schools for relevant research should be inculcated in the students. The panel also felt that educational administrators should be developed in B-Schools so as to lessen the workload of the faculty in administrative activities. This would enable the faculty to devote more time to research and other academic activities. It was also mentioned that the Directors of the B-Schools should have some formal training before they take over the responsibility of being Directors. It was also stated that the faculty must lead the industry, not the other way round. The initiative for this had to



come from B-Schools and it was agreed upon that the faculty was to give directions as to what were the new things that were happening in industry and that the industry should look at these concepts emerging from B-Schools and then take new initiatives. This was a common happening in the industrially developed economies where professors give insights as to what was to be done because they have the knowledge and the wisdom of being able to provide an impetus to industry – something that does not happen in India! In fact the faculty's role needs to shift from being a very nominal, miniscule contributor to being the leading light to the industry. Therefore with these changes, the faculty should retain its position and they would be able to lead the industry. Thus, research by faculty must be a top agenda in B-Schools. This panel also pointed out the industry would be a loser if they did not involve themselves in deciding what they wanted from the B-Schools because ultimately the benefit to industry goes to the national economy. The panelists were hoping that this entire deliberation of the Conclave is transcribed and released as a compendium of views that has been expressed, closing with recommendations. It may be circulated to all stakeholders or put on a website, from where anyone can take it forward.

Prof. Freda Swaminathan thanked Dr. Das for his well thought out agenda and organizing of the Conclave with distinguished speakers. Dr. Das in turn thanked Prof. Swaminathan for her very organized involvement and effort.

The Conclave concluded with a vote of thanks by Prof. Swaminathan to all those who contributed to the success of the Conclave, with a special mention to Dr. Pritam Singh, the Director of the NHRD conference, Dr. Jitendra K. Das, the convenor of the B-School conclave, the organizers from the NHRD, PowerGrid, all panel members, speakers, volunteers from FORE School of Management, New Delhi and last but not the least, the audience.

## Speakers Profile

### **Prof. V. K. Bhalla**

Prof. V. K. Bhalla is a Professor at Faculty of Management Studies, Delhi University (FMS). He has conducted a large number of studies with the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, Institute of Developing Economics (Tokyo), EFMD (EU), USAID, Planning Commission, RBI and the UGC.

Prof. Bhalla has received invitations from the IMF to be an observer on seminars relating to adjustment and economic growth. He is a visiting fellow at Bielefeld University, Germany and IDE, Tokyo. He has written 22 books and more than 120 research papers. Prof. Bhalla has been a member of the Government of India task force on Public Enterprises and convenor of the UGC management panel. He serves on the board of directors of several companies.

His specialization is Security Analysis & Portfolio Management, Financial Derivatives, International Finance & Corporate Decision Making

### **Dr. Asha Bhandarker**

Dr. Asha Bhandarker is currently the Raman Munjal Chair Professor for Leadership Studies at MDI, Gurgaon. She is a psychologist by training with a Ph.D in Business Management. She has spent time working fulltime in consulting as also in teaching and research. She has extensive cross national experience having lived and worked in different parts of the world - USA, UK, Egypt, Mauritius, and Sri Lanka.

She has three books to her credit as well as 15 research papers on Leadership and related issues. Her Research publications include articles and papers on topics like Leadership, Culture Building, Executive Stress, Profiles of Indian Executives on Innovation and Ambiguity Tolerance and Value Profile of Indian Executives.

Her current research is completing a book on the impact of B-school education on the profiles of graduates from India's top B-schools.



She consulted extensively with various Public, Private, Cooperative sector and MNCs since 1989 in India, Egypt and Mauritius.

She was awarded Senior Fulbright Fellowship to study the Best Practices of US Business Schools in 2004-2005.

She was awarded Best Book Award by the DMA and the ISTD for the book 'Winning the Corporate Olympiad: Renaissance Paradigm'.

### **Mr. Aquil Busrai**

Mr. Aquil Busrai is a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) at Aquil Busrai Consulting.

He has 38 years' HR experience covering all aspects of HR including IR, Recruitment, Training, Remuneration, Policy, Operations, Divestment, cross-cultural workforce and HR Shared Services. He has a Degree in Commerce, an MBA in HR, a Post Graduate Degree in Law and a Post Graduate Diploma in Training and Development.

Mr. Busrai has held senior positions in both operational and strategic HR including start-ups, acquisition, mergers and re-structuring. He has worked with Unilever PLC in India and Kenya, and with Motorola as Executive Director HR looking after Asia Pacific HR for Software business and HR for India Sub continent. He has also worked with Shell Malaysia as HR Director and MD for Shell People Services Asia Sdn Bhd. He was National President at National HRD Network for the year 2007 – 2008. His last assignment was with IBM India where he worked as Executive Director HR for Global Delivery business. He was part of growing the business from 14 thousand employees to 47 thousand employees in four and half years.

His passion is HR so he started his own consulting firm 'Aquil Busrai Consulting' offering Executive Coaching, HR Strategy, and Leadership Development and Training services.

Having lived in Kenya, Malaysia and India, and worked in 15 Asia Pacific countries he is familiar with cultural, legal and operational issues of most Asian and African countries.

### **Mr. Chandan Chattaraj**

Mr. Chandan Chattaraj is the Chief Human Resources Officer at Aircel one of the leading Telecom Organizations in India. His stint prior to Aircel was with the Oberoi Group as Executive Vice President-Human Resources where he led the HR Function and was also responsible for Oberoi Centre for Learning and Development (a pioneering hospitality

institution). He has also worked with Xerox India, Jubilant Organosys, Delphi Corporation, Asea Brown Boveri (ABB) and the Tata Steel in his professional journey thus far.

Mr. Chattaraj was recently conferred the distinguished Award of "The Most Powerful HR Professionals of India" at the Asia's Best Employer Brand Awards by 'Employer Branding Institute and Stars of the Industry Group' at Singapore.

He is an alumnus of Xavier Institute of Social Science, Ranchi (XIIS). In May 2007 he attended intensive leadership training at the Centre of Creative Leadership (CCL) in Colorado (USA). Currently, he is on the Board of Governors of the International School of Business & Media (ISBM – PUNE) and also in the Core team of the World HRD Congress.

### **Dr. H. Chaturvedi**

Dr. H. Chaturvedi is Director of Birla Institute of Management Technology, Greater Noida (BIMTECH). Before joining BIMTECH, he was Director, All India Council for Technical Education (1998-1999), Deputy Director, All India Council for Technical Education (1995-1998), Readers - Sr. Lecturer, RBS College, Agra University (1977-1995), and Lecturer, Sahu Jain College, Bijnore (1977).

He has published more than 20 research papers in national journals and magazines, and authored 4 books on issues in management.

He has a Ph.D. in Business Management and M. Com from Agra University.

### **Dr. Jitendra K. Das**

Dr. Jitendra K Das is Director, FORE School of Management, New Delhi. He was earlier founder Dean (Noida Campus) and a Professor of Marketing at the IIM Lucknow. He has a B.Tech. and a M.Tech both from the IIT, Delhi, and a doctorate degree from the University of Toronto. He has to his credit many national and international publications. He has a wide-ranging experience of the industry in the development of customer interface and sales systems at various organizations including at WIPRO. He has been a consultant to the World Bank, IDRC (Canada), GWB (for GTZ Germany), etc., and member of some policy committees of the Government of India. He has organized National Conferences and Management Development Programs, and has addressed distinguished gatherings at national and international forums. He has taught Marketing Management, Advanced Marketing Research, Strategic Internet Marketing and Customer Relationship Management courses at IIM Lucknow, IIM Ahmedabad and IIM Kozhikode. Through research initiatives he actively contributes to the body of knowledge in these fields.



## **Dr. Upinder Dhar**

Dr. Upinder Dhar is currently Vice Chancellor of J. K. Lakshmipat University at Jaipur. His specialties are Organisational Behaviour, Human Resource Management & Development, Organisational Development, Consumer Behaviour, Entrepreneurship, Mental Health, General Management, Institution Building, etc. He has held positions of: Director - Institute of Management, Dean - Faculty of Management, and Dean - Faculty of Doctoral Studies and Research at Nirma University of Science & Technology (Ahmedabad); and Professor of Management at NITIE (Mumbai).

He has been a Guest Faculty for the Management Development Programmes of the Indian Institute of Management Calcutta and Indian Institute of Management Indore. Besides undertaking consultancy assignments, he has authored/co-authored more than 450 publications. Twenty-six scholars have been awarded Ph.D. degree under his supervision by various universities.

Dr. Dhar was awarded National Fellowship by Indian Society for Training and Development in 2002-03. He has been on the Panel of Reviewers of number of prestigious journals, national and international. He has also been on the Panel of Experts maintained by the National Board of Accreditation, AICTE, Indian Council of Social Science Research, New Delhi, and South Asian Quality System.

## **Mr. Mohan Krishnan**

Mr. Mohan is Senior Vice President, IMRB International. He has over eighteen years of experience in the research and consulting industry. His experience spans diverse sectors in the area of technology and marketing issues. He has advised both private and public sector companies in sectors such as Consumer goods, ICT, Energy, Environment, Logistics, Steel, Automotive and financial services markets. He has authored several research papers that were presented to various Indian and international forums, has won awards at MRSI (Market Research Society of India) and is also a visiting faculty at IIFT Delhi & Kolkata and IIT Bombay.

He started his career as an engineer in sustainable development sector at Development Alternatives, moved to consumer research area at IMRB International where he later specialized in technology research before moving to head a sister company, Henley Centre, a marketing consulting firm. He returned to IMRB to head BIRD, a B2B and Technology research unit at Mumbai before moving to Delhi to head Consumer Quantitative in 2009.

He is an MBA in Marketing Management (1992) from Faculty of Management Studies, Delhi University and B.Tech. (1989) from Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi.

### **Mr. R. P. Ojha**

Mr. R. P. Ojha, Executive Director – HR & Corporate Communications at Powergrid Corporation of India Ltd (PGCIL), has more than 30 years experience in HR Strategies, Organization Restructuring, Systems and Policy, Mergers and Acquisitions, Training and Human Resource Development and all other aspects of HR in POWERGRID and at the sectoral level.

A Post Graduate from XLRI, Jamshedpur, he is a qualified MBTI practitioner and visiting faculty at leading B-schools including MDI and FORE School of Management, New Delhi.

### **Mr. Premchand Palety**

Mr. Premchand Palety is the Chief Executive of Centre for Forecasting & Research (C fore). He has over 15 years experience in market research, opinion research, election surveys and performance appraisal studies at national level. For about a decade he has been writing on management education.

His articles have been published in The Wall Street Journal, Mint, Hindustan Times, Economic Times and Outlook. He has also authored a book on Indian Business Schools published by Penguin. He has been a columnist for Mint since its launch for over 2 years.

At present he is a columnist for the The Wall Street Journal where he is also the contributing editor.

### **Mr. A. Thothathri Raman**

Mr. A. Thothathri Raman is Chairman at Standards for Educational Advancement & Accreditation (SEAA) & Consulting Editor Business India. He is a unique combination of a Senior Business Editor, Professor of Management, Award Winning Author, Knowledge consultant, HR Quality champion, B-Schools ratings expert and a well-known campaigner for bringing in global benchmarks of quality through International Accreditation. He has pioneered the rating and ranking process for business schools in India, and has been running India's largest B-school rating at Business India, with which he is associated as a Consulting Editor.



He is also credited with revamping the Indian Management Journal, the largest circulated management journal of All India Management Association (AIMA), as its editor for four years. Mr. Raman has written and published seven books on management and edited 14 others for AIMA, DMA and other leading business schools. His next book "The Other Brother", extolling a unique concept of philanthropy in education, is due for release in a few weeks. Currently, he is working on a book on corporate leadership.

His biggest contribution to date is to bring all the top rated international accreditation agencies to India to showcase their quality benchmarks as a series of conferences through an exclusive platform that he has created called the Standards for Educational Advancement and Accreditation (SEAA). The series of conferences across the country brought AACSB International, AMBA, EQUIS, ACBSP and IACBE, the Top Five global accreditation agencies in that order, to India.

### **Dr. Pritam Singh**

Dr. Pritam Singh, a Professor of Eminence at MDI, Gurgaon, is a management Guru who has devoted his life to the development of management education in India and abroad.

An M.Com (BHU), MBA (USA), Ph.D. (BHU), Dr. Singh is the author of seven academically reputed books and published over 50 research papers.

As Director, he developed for IIM Lucknow and MDI, collaborations across the world and signed as many as thirty six MoUs with American, European, Canadian, Australian and Asian Management Schools, and he effected a dramatic turnaround of MDI & IIM-L.

As Director, IIM Lucknow and Director, MDI Gurgaon, Dr. Singh strived to let the benefits spill over to the society at large. He has initiated a number of social projects focusing on healthcare, education, water management and road building for the surrounding community to improve the quality of life.

As Board Member of nearly a hundred institutions of the country, he has actively initiated and enabled the transformation process in the corporate world.

He has also been conferred with many prestigious management awards, notable among them are ESCORT Award (1979 and 2002), FORE Award (1984), Best Motivating Professor IIM Bangalore Award (1993), Best Director Award of Indian Management Schools (1998), Outstanding CEO (Chief Executive Officer) National HRD Award (2001) and UP RATNA Award (2001).

His distinguished services have been acknowledged by the Country for which the President of India has conferred the prestigious 'Padam Shri' on him in year 2003.

### **Mr. Suresh D. Tripathi**

He is President, Group HR of SRF Ltd. and also the President of the Delhi & NCR Chapter of NHRD. He has a vast experience of twenty eight years and he has worked for many years in SAIL, a public sector. He then moved to HCL system, Maxwell Global Limited. He is M.Sc. (Physics), Delhi University and has a Post Graduate Diploma from Calcutta University. He has also taken responsibility as a CEO, Sri Educia Ltd., a company in the School Education sector.

### **Dr. M. J. Xavier**

Dr. M. J. Xavier, is the newly-appointed Director of the Indian Institute of Management, Ranchi.

With more than 20 years of professional experience in teaching, academic administration and industry, Prof. Xavier specializes in marketing research and strategic marketing. His book, Strategic Marketing, won the DMA-Escorts Award for the best Management Book of the Year 1999.

A former senior manager in-charge of HRD at the SPIC, where he had formulated strategies for Henkel, SPIC Electronics and pharmaceutical, he has authored many management books. Prof. Xavier says collaboration is a better strategy than competition.



## For Enquiry

National HRD Network - Delhi & NCR Chapter  
Phone: +91-9810526884 / +91-124-4041560

and

FORE School of Management, New Delhi  
Phone: +91-11-41242424 to 33