

1

PROCEEDINGS OF ONE-DAY FACULTY SEMINAR ON
"INSTITUTION BUILDING EXPERIENCE OF IIMA FACULTY:
LESSONS FOR FUTURE"

1992

Ravi Matthai Centre for Educational Innovation
Indian Institute of Management
Ahmedabad

PROCEEDINGS OF ONE-DAY FACULTY SEMINAR ON

"INSTITUTION BUILDING EXPERIENCE OF IIMA FACULTY: LESSONS FOR FUTURE"

The objective of the seminar was to capture the insights and experiences of the faculty and draw lessons for more effective Institution Building (IB) interventions in future. The seminar was designed to be split into four sessions, each dealing with a specific theme. The four themes were:

1. Establishing new institutions: Lessons from turnkey projects initiated by outside agencies.
2. Establishing new institutions: Lessons from faculty initiated projects.
3. Specific component based IB interventions.
4. Role based (office bearers, membership/committees/ taskforces etc.) interventions.

Each theme had a panel of faculty who had the related experience and shared it with the group for further insights and lessons. The faculty who participated partially or fully are:

1. Prof. Deepti Bhatnagar
2. Prof. Anil Bhatt
3. Prof. Anand Gupta
4. Prof. Anil K. Gupta
5. Prof. G.S. Gupta
6. Prof. Ranjit Gupta
7. Rev. Fr. Heredero (Behavioural Science Centre)
8. Prof. A.K. Jain
9. Prof. Prof. P.N. Khandwalla (Director)
10. Prof. Prof. A.H. Kalro
11. Prof. Ashok Korwar
12. Prof. Arun Monappa
13. Prof. Dilip Mavlankar
14. Prof. I.M. Pandey
15. Prof. Indira Parikh
16. Prof. H.N. Pathak
17. Prof. D.M. Pestonjee
18. Prof. G. Raghuram
19. Prof. T.P. Rama Rao
20. Prof. S. Sreenivas Rao

21. Prof. V. Venkata Rao
22. Prof. T.V. Rao (Chairperson, RMCEI)
23. Prof. Trilochan Sastry
24. Prof. J.K. Satia
25. Prof. S.P. Seetharaman
26. Prof. Girja Sharan
27. Prof. Gurdev Singh
28. Prof. J.P. Singh
29. Prof. Siddhartha Sinha
30. Prof. U.K. Srivastava
31. Prof. Pramod Verma
32. Mr. Mukul Vasavda (FPM)
33. Ms. Nayana Shah (RA)

SESSION - I

LESSONS FROM TURNKEY PROJECTS

The first session was opened by Prof. T.V. Rao who introduced the objectives and methodology of the seminar. He also introduced the monograph, "Institution Building Experiences of IIMA Faculty: Lessons for Future" written by himself along with Ms. Nayana Shah. This document presents some experiences and insights of our faculty, captured through interviews. It also includes a conceptual paper and experiences of three other institution builders. But this was only the beginning of a task which has to go a long way. The objectives of this workshop were stated as:

1. To induce the faculty to elaborate and expand on the work initiated.
2. To share the meaning and understanding of IB - a sort of "networking" within the Institute. (He quoted Prof. Ravi Matthai, on the Board of a company, "You are thinking too small. Why don't you start thinking big?")
3. To build a body of knowledge.

He hoped more faculty would get enthused towards these objectives.

Prof. P.N. Khandwalla (Director) traced back the roots of awareness in Institution Building to Vikram Sarabhai, Kamla Choudhry, Pulin Garg, S.R. Ganesh, Udai Pareek, T.V. Rao, Indira Parikh etc., all from IIMA. Hence, IIMA has been the base from where a magnitude of efforts in this area have been originated.

He also reinforced that apart from building others, we are also building ourselves through our experiences, experiments, processes, insights etc. Our residential programmes facilitate the transfer and transplantation of our culture and philosophy to the society at large. Hence we have greatly been instrumental in building and propagating the IB philosophy.

According to Prof. Khandwalla, Institution Building involves internalisation of organisational values, vision and mission of excellence, norms, policies etc. Internalisation becomes a part of life and its integrity is unquestioned. The process is so deep-rooted that even in the absence of the leader, the institution continues to excel. In measuring institutionalality he referred to S.R. Ganesh's criteria of capability development, innovative thrust and domain penetration. The processes that build institutions were

identified as the mission of excellence, the vision of excellence, values etc. There is a convergence between the corporate and the non-corporate goals towards excellence when we focus on vision, mission, values etc. For this convergence to take place, the science of management becomes necessary. Empirical studies have shown that those institutions excel who have a sense of internal values as the central, galvanising factor.

The key elements of IB are:

- Initial choices
- Decision making
- Motivation
- Conflict resolution mechanisms
- Renewal processes
- Balance between autonomy and institutional perspective
- Networking
- Responsive to client systems
- Giving voice to internal and external community

Prof. Khandwalla categorically emphasised our weaknesses in the last three categories viz., Networking, being responsive to Client Systems and giving voice to the Community. He also mentioned that we were creating deliberate tensions by juxtaposing conflicting orientation of situations. He referred to our academic programmes which were not necessarily designed in tune with our mission of catering to the priority sector. There were also conflicts between the mission of the Institute and the mission of each individual area. These tensions need to be explored and dealt with. Unless we learn ourselves, we cannot teach others was the message given by the Director.

Prof. J.K. Satia, chairing the first theme for discussion requested the panelists to share their IB experiences with turnkey projects.

Prof. Ranjit Gupta briefly narrated his experience of working to set up the Indian Institute of Forest Management (IIFM). A detailed report of his experience is recorded in the monograph, "IB Experiences of IIMA Faculty". The major issue for consideration in any IB effort, according to him, was "the induction-initiation process".

Prof. T.V. Rao shared with the group the process of designing an Education and Training Institute which would have a combination of self employed people as well as people for higher education. This was in response to the requirements of the Government of Arunachal Pradesh in 1982. The Institute had to be designed considering the unique needs of the State.

A lot of creativity went into its design and there was difficulty in selling the idea. There was opposition from the Planning Commission and some other agencies. However, the design was given, and the IIMA faculty withdrew. It was later known from other sources that the institute was set up, but there was no formal feedback. The lessons learnt from this exercise are:

- a) It is possible to design innovative institutions inspite of certain problems. Nevertheless, it would be much easier if political considerations support the idea.
- b) Continued association is necessary in all IB efforts. If the post-design role is eliminated, other processes are not known and the purpose of IB is affected adversely.

Prof. U.K. Srivastava described two of his IB experiences, one of which was a failure and the other which has just been initiated. The first experience was with the Centre for Agricultural marketing. The process of this project is discussed in Prof. Seetharaman's interview in the monograph. The essence of the experience is that, though all the preparatory work was done and accepted in principle, implementation was an utter failure. In Prof. Seetharaman's words, "You can take a horse to the water, but you can't make it drink."

Prof. Srivastava believed that "paper projects do not get translated into action". Also power systems work strongly when people come from government departments.

His second effort in IB is with the Institute of Primary cooperative Management in Gujarat. It is a very recent venture and he is hopeful of a positive outcome as the person heading it seems to be having an institutional perspective.

Prof. V.V. Rao was not aware of the IB perspective when he and his group undertook the faculty development project of State Bank of India Information and Communication Management (SBIICM). According to him, Prof. T.P. Rama Rao's interview in the monograph gave a neutral to positive impression of the whole exercise. However, he wished to highlight some negative experiences in the process.

1. Neither the client nor the consultant were clear about the objectives of the Institute.
2. The client constantly saw the consultant in competition with him, and this was not very healthy.
3. The contract not being very clear, the cut off point was uncertain.

4. Vision of the person actually asking for help differed from that of the person in charge of the implementation. Perceptions differed, creating some problems.
5. Campus development was given more importance than people development.
6. An organisation being a sub-set of a larger organisation always has some unavoidable constraints which have to be dealt with during the process.

Response

Reflecting on all the experiences shared by the panel, Prof. T.V. Rao drew out one lesson. All IB interventions, especially the turnkey projects need a long term process and this may be ensured by us before taking up the assignment. He also suggested a periodical self-rejuvenating process, may be after a year or six months.

Prof. A.K. Jain lastly made a few suggestions. He opined that a child should not be exposed to review every six months or every year. During the initial phase the consultant has to be constantly around to infect the people with the IB processes. To ensure long term stability, processes cannot be designed on paper - one has to be right there. Also, while taking up a turnkey project good amount of flexibility (not control) is required to figure out what is really expected out of the assignment. He also posed a thought provoking query to the group. "When we get opportunities to participate in bits and pieces, we are not in total control of the project. Thus we may not necessarily make a long term impact. Then, should we take up such projects or leave them?"

Prof. Satia concluded the session by adding that there seemed to exist a conflict between what top management wants and the long term institutional sustainability. Hence a deeper understanding of the IB philosophy might facilitate better interventions. Redefining our objectives may also be fruitful because "if there are already so many institutions of excellence and if this is where we are, then should we go on building new ones with similar consequences?"

Faculty Interviewed in Theme 1: Turnkey Projects

1. Prof. Anil Bhatt was a member of a five member task force formed by the Government of India in 1990 to design a master plan to establish an institution for adult education at the national level.
2. Prof. Ranjit Gupta was nominated by the President of India to be on the first Board of Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU). IGNOU was constituted in 1988 out of a statute of the Parliament and is in the mission of distant education. He was thus involved in the basic design and implementation of the design since its inception.

SESSION - II

LESSONS FROM SELF-INITIATED INSTITUTIONS

Fr. Heredero of the Behavioural Science Centre (BSC) whose experience is brought out in the monograph in detail shared with us some typical issues related to voluntary organisations. The first issue was concerned with 'recruitment'. According to him, most of the people who join voluntary organisations are either dissatisfied with the family or with the society. In their urge to 'fight' they discard social and familial norms of taking up a professional career which would otherwise be very acceptable. A power struggle between the individual and the family exists and this is reflected in the organisational setting also, leading to many problems.

Secondly, IIMA has helped the BSC a great deal at the technical level. But the most important prerequisite in any such effort is the "knowledge of men". Only when one knows other human beings can they place them in the most productive area. It also facilitates in knowing the age of excellence of a person and in not being deceived.

Objectivity gets eroded and the chances of success become limited when the caste component becomes active in any organisational process. Help in this area was also sought by Fr. Heredero. Lastly he mentioned that it is not enough for IIMA to help set up an institution. Mechanisms have to be designed wherein the institution can refer back in times of crisis. **"Crisis is like a house on fire."** If not dealt with on time, the total institution can be destroyed.

Prof. Anil Bhatt briefly described his IB efforts in building two voluntary organisations viz. DISHA and SETU. The first one was started with the clear objective of trying to help the poor, the tribals and the oppressed of Gujarat. These groups are helped to build capabilities for themselves and to learn to fight the bureaucracy.

The second one (SETU) was initiated as a research project with the aim of generating a dialogue between the people doing research and the people being affected. A bridge between action and knowledge is built and here too the main target groups are the deprived and the oppressed.

Prof. Bhatt's experience with VOs expressed concern to the fact that in building others, the organisations do not build themselves. There is always dependency on outside help. In SETU, the organisation has remained small in terms of expertise and the number. It also does not have an appointed leader for a fixed

period of time. The coordinator is the leader who is there forever. Hence it can be called an "organisation process" and not an institution. Lastly, he voiced concern over the constant conflict between action and research.

He also mentioned the positive support he had received from IIMA to pursue his work. There had never been any problem in terms of time or any other facility.

Prof. Girja Sharan voiced very negative sentiments in his efforts to initiate social work. With a small group of volunteers, he had tried to reach out to the slum dwellers of Gulbai Tekra and attempted to help them in the education of their children. When he saw the disparity between the education system and real life situations of these people, he also tried to influence some higher authorities, but totally in vain. His efforts were ineffective.

He realised that if he could not discover a general solution to a problem, then he should not involve himself into that task. The problem was too large to be tackled in such a small unorganised way. He felt that he was trained to restrict himself to a narrow path and the people who build unconventional institutions are those with different motivations. He definitely did not fit into that category.

Praising the US education system, he said "it helps you acquire pride and self respect for your own work". This he found miserably lacking in

To provoke the group to think in another direction, he suggested, "we must not build any unconventional institutions as it takes away some very very good people away from the mainstream. Just improve the consciousness in your own work and around your work."

Prof. Indira Parikh who is a founder member of the Indian Society for Individual and Social Development (ISISD) has shared her experiences in the monograph. She again shared with the group the key learnings and the processes undergone.

"The progenitors of an institution and the models of institutions that they bring to the institution lay the foundation of what the institution is going to be. When the positives are laid, the simultaneous pathology of the maps that are carried, are also sown at the same time. Over a period of time when the institution is taking a pause or is in the consolidation stage, these tend to crop up with much larger impact than what has been envisaged before. In the initial years, the personalities of the progenitors come to become the totality of the institution, organisational roles requiring a secondary status. The dynamics of ownership of the institution are generated, when the individual becomes the institution. But, institution is always a collectivity and not an

individual."

In ISISD, there were stages where their focus shifted from being institutional to organisational to institutional. Self-awareness and review led them to design creative processes towards IB. However, the unintended consequence was that the institution became very large and in times of dilemma or choice making, emotional ransom was used. "Institution" got the priority at the cost of the "individual" and a whole lot of questioning arose. Issues of sacrifice, compromise, duty etc., emerged along with commitment and association being questioned. This led to a stress in the system which again called for a review and self-analysis.

The key learnings from the entire exercise are:

1. Belonging to an institution which is different from an organisation, raises the question - "Is there a personal and institutional discipline which gives you the choice or discretion to prioritise your personal and institutional roles?"
2. When membership is by choice and commitment, how does one differentiate between replenishing the institution because it is your choice and not because the institution compels you to do so?

A dynamicity has been created between people who have only the ISISD institutional membership and those with other memberships. This unique dynamicity deals with institutional and structural disciplines.

3. As the institution grows and membership increases, the chances are that the institution itself will influence the choices of people and the people will get influenced by the kind of choices they make.

Then Prof. Parikh described the transition in her role from being founder member to Dean to Executive Director to founder member. The Executive Director's role was the most difficult to be accepted by her and the others, as that role had already been held by one of the progenitors. Hence, translation of roles held immediately was a difficult task. "Collective Synergy" is required in an institution. Role holders' synergy is based on tasks, targets and achievements. Unless collective efforts and investments are not made, enlivening processes cannot be created and institutions regress back into organisational modalities. Power dynamics from the social system will start impinging on the institution.

Hence to generate institutional health processes, ever renewing, every regenerating, ever scanning mechanisms need to be established.

Prof. T.V. Rao founder member and the first Director of the Academy of Human Resource Development owed it to IIMA (RMCEI) for having rendered the support and encouragement as a part of their commitment to institution building and professionalisation of management. The RMCEI facilitated the Academy as it was an IB activity and would serve learning about processes and problems in establishing such bodies. Exploring the non-corporate sector was another area of IIMA's concern.

Prof. Rao has narrated his experience in detail in his interview, so he briefly highlighted the issues in such experiments:

1. One has to strike the right balance between the justice he gives to the institutional goals, philosophy etc., and the justice given to the task of setting up a new organisation.
2. There is no reason to believe that the persons who join the institution, necessarily have the same kind of vision, mission, philosophy or commitment. They may be there for reasons of their own.
3. Your own personality (the progenitors' personality) plays a very important role in the entire IB processes.

After highlighting these issues, Prof. Rao concluded that:

1. This category of IB, where there are faculty initiated projects or institutions, the chances of success are relatively high. it is more enjoyable, though there may be more frustrations.
2. The Institute (IIMA) more than facilitates your efforts in IB. Though there may be no formal assignment or project in terms of consultancy, IIMA has never discouraged any faculty from such activities.
3. In this category of IB, 'networking' is the most important issue. Most of the institutions are doing it and therefore, seem to be surviving.

Prof. Anil K. Gupta has very meaningfully defined IB as "the invocation of internal commands without external demands".

While narrating his experience in starting the "Honeybee", he mentioned that at some stage in one's career, one strives for a wider meaning and purpose from work, which for whatever reasons the tasks cannot provide. The tasks may be incapable to conceptualise the needs of the individual or the meaning derived out of his work.

After a wide review of literature and research, Prof. Gupta realised that the Indian agricultural system was getting more

attention and becoming more relevant in the current context of larger problems. He was convinced that people do not become poorer when they share knowledge. Secondly he identified the need to connect people to people. Hence the Honeybee metaphor (i) collect pollen from the flower without making the flower weaker and (2) connects flower to flower.

It was realised that the intellectual constructs and theories are shared only amongst the urban elites. The need to document these in local languages was strongly felt by him. It meant going back to them (people actually affected) and sharing with them their ideas and problems. This method implied a shift in the basic assumption that our entire basis of development is on the basis of what people do not have rather than on what they have. This was a tremendously inspiring and motivating influence on the people. It was an integration of the formal and the informal system.

Within two years they have been able to publish Honeybee in seven languages. They undertake the scientific as well as the ethical responsibility and believe that whatever is taken from the people must go back to them. No knowledge is used without the source approving it. The name and address of the person giving the innovative idea is published in the newsletter along with the name of the commentator. The system of accountability to the unorganised sector is well accepted. They have as much right to ideas, right to sanction and right of being cited as much as we have.

In the entire exercise, Prof. Gupta realised that organisational roles and boundaries should be defined and resolved very clearly. One should not seek similar kind of satisfaction in both roles. He was very clear about the difference between his organisational responsibility and his professional responsibility, which was very important for any person involved in such efforts.

He hoped to see the emergence of a professional peer group which can add value to the already initiated IB efforts.

Response

Prof. Anil Bhatt added to this that his experience in the voluntary sector was disheartening as far as the family was concerned. Children of the people working in this sector were fed up of their parents sacrifice and they definitely would opt for a 'better' career, profession, standard of living etc. They had enough of their parents and wanted to break away. In that sense the parents had lost their children.

In response to all the narratives, Prof. Pestonjee observed that this category of institution builders face many problems. But the response and support from the client system sustains the experiment.

Prof. Khandwalla in response to the issues raised by Fr. Heredero suggested that a loosely structured organisational design might facilitate better IB. A federation of small autonomous units getting together to network might reduce conflicts and the problems created due to strong power motivation.

He as Director of IIMA, raised the following issue for consideration:

"If Institution Building is such a significant activity - as gathered from all the experiences, should we think in terms of giving it explicit credit as part of our strategic diffusion policy? Should we legitimise it more and make it more of a statutory requirement rather than treat it as hobby?"

The session ended with this thought thrown open to the group.

**Faculty Interviewed in Theme 2 :
Faculty Initiated Projects**

1. Prof. Pulin Garg is the founder member of Indian Society for Individual and Social Development (ISISD).
2. Prof. Indira Parikh is another founder member of ISISD. The Society is engaged in developing culture specific theories, revitalising the Indian identity, social action and creating professionals interested in such work.
3. Prof. T.V. Rao was the first Director of the Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) set up in 1990. The Academy was set up to promote HRD and stimulate positive forces for humanising systems and organisations in national life.
4. Fr. Heredero of the St. Xaviers College Community, Ahmedabad is the founder of the Behaviour Science Centre engaged in rural upliftment, through economic activities.

SESSION - III

SPECIFIC COMPONENT BASED I.B. INTERVENTIONS

Prof. S.P. Seetharaman chairing the session, briefly recapitulated the different kinds of IB efforts discussed so far. According to him:

1. What Prof. Girja Sharan described was more of an attempt in social work than in IB.
2. IB is more of individual actualisation as described by Prof. Anil K. Gupta. The process is:
 - I discover a gap or a need
 - I start working towards it
 - Slowly, I become an institution
 - I build a following - a movement.
3. When an individual is playing a change agent's role in an organisation, his efforts can be termed as IB efforts.
4. The other types of interventions are turnkey consultancy, component based consultancy and role based intervention.

Prof. G. Raghuram described this particular category of IB as an effort of enriching an institution which is already there. IIMA as an institution can and should put in more efforts towards this and in view of the capabilities we possess and our mission of making an impact on the environment.

Prof. Raghuram has facilitated IB in the Railway Staff College and Central Institute of Road Transport. He wished to reflect on what happened rather than what they did in the entire process. He was hopeful that in the long run the efforts may prove successful, but in the immediate context they were an utter failure. This he attributed to the basic design of the whole exercise. The two main issues responsible for the failure are discussed below:

1. The decision maker deciding about the need for the IB intervention and the user are two different sets of people. The Railway Board felt the need for change, whereas the actual user was the Railway Staff College. Similarly the Ministry of Surface Transport expresses interest for an intervention, but the user - the Central Institute of Road Transport is not so interested. Hence the chances of a positive outcome become bleak.
2. Secondly, there seems to be a discrepancy between the wave

length at which we at IIMA operate and their wave length (client's). Power dynamics play an important role and it is hard to be convinced for their inefficiencies. Since the operational styles are different, some problems are created.

The process is still on with the hope of success.

Prof. G.S. Gupta had quite positive experiences with the IB work that he had facilitated. He has conducted training programmes for management teachers, been on industry and university boards and committees, been Ph.D. guide and been on Ph.D. committee and has referred and conducted IAS training programmes. His efforts are role based as well as component based.

He rated the value of our IAS training programme to be very high and rewarding as compared to those conducted by other institutes. There is an integrated approach towards all disciplines and innovative teaching methods are introduced. This is in contrast to the university system where they copy the contents of our programmes.

Prof. Gupta also narrated an episode where he played a vital role in evaluating a Ph.D. thesis. He was pressurised from various sources to credit a Ph.d. student with the degree, to which he did not succumb. "We are the people who can stop such frauds inspite of temptations and pressures. With little efforts, a lot can be achieved. We are the gatekeepers for such activities."

Prof. J.P. Singh has provided us with a case narrating his IB efforts with the Christian Medical College Hospital, Vellore. He shared this experience once more for the benefit of the group. His first concern was to seek consensus and refinement on the distinction between Organisational Development (OD) and Institution Building (IB). His understanding states that OD stops at helping an organisation to be more effective in terms of achieving results. The activities are aimed at the goals defined for the organisation. IB goes a step further. It talks of the mission of the organisation, which makes a larger impact on the environment.

As narrated in the case the IB effort was initiated in CMCH by its Director, Dr. Pulimood, who had been to IIMA for a management development programme. Prof. Singh was invited to Vellore and asked to examine a minor concern of the organisation. The ward boys of the Hospital were charging tips from the patients which went against the values of the top management. Prof. Singh suggested to go back to the community and examine the larger concern of the organisation. After a brief survey, it was realised that the clientele rated positively 95% of the hospital facilities. This was a remarkable feedback. Then they reviewed the 5% areas where the facilities were not rated high. They were entry

problems, exit problems and the problem of reaching each patient at the right time.

Then IIMA was formally asked to intervene and help them analyse the choices related to the capacity expansion decision at CMCH. Prof. Korgaonkar and Prof. Singh submitted a report based on quantitative and qualitative analysis. The analysis considered issues on cost and benefits of capacity expansions, impact on mission and objectives, effect on the functional relationships between departments/units, impact of facility congestion on patient care and convenience and adequacy of support staff in general and nursing staff in particular.

Prof. Singh contributed towards an analysis of the considerations in making choices and prioritising actions. The considerations in choice making were based on the following factors:

1. Mission of the organisation
2. Vision of the future
3. Image of the organisation
4. Social responsibility
5. Child, adult and old age care
6. Contribution to improving quality of life
7. National health priorities
8. Potential for world leadership
9. Strengths of the organisation
10. Professional challenge

A year later this analysis was used as a planned input for the decennial international consultation which undertook a major review of the organisation's activities in all areas of its commitment. The consultation included various stakeholders in the organisation including donors, sponsors, associated missionary bodies, core professionals, support staff and other well wishers ("friends of Vellore") of the organisation.

The outcome of the consultation were innovative steps in different areas in accordance to their accepted commitment. The areas covered were : theology of healing, education, caring technology, research, community outreach, and organisation's role in the healing ministry of the Church. All of these were dealt with a holistic approach rather than a segmented approach.

Prof. Singh concluded by describing his efforts as an enriching experience and appreciated the culture of the organisation and the dedication of the management towards its institutional goals.

Prof. T.V. Rao described his experience of working with the Sanavar Public School, Doon School, Management Training Institute of SAIL,

St. Joseph School, Mount Carmel Group of schools etc. All of these were elite institutions and had the desire to improve. He quoted one of the headmasters, "I've no problems and I'm worried." At Sanawar, they realised that the dependence of the faculty on the headmaster was quite a lot. They administered some questionnaires to examine the problem in detail. A gap between the faculty and administrators was discovered resulting in the renewal of some sub-systems. The faculty was told, "Imagine the school does not exist. You have a budget and you have to design a new school." The new design was compared with the existing system with the necessary review and renewal exercises. These were even shared with the Indian Public School Systems and a considerable impact was made.

However, this experiment was tried out on the Jawaja School but failed miserably as it was based on economic activities. Also, since a strong leadership was missing there was total failure.

Working with the Jesuits was a good experience as they were wonderful as individuals. But when it came to working together, they had serious problems. Due to their vow of obedience, there were subtle problems and power dynamics became strong.

He concluded, "If we keep our eyes, ears and minds open, these specific component entry provides a tremendous opportunity for getting into IB or OD type of interventions. I don't think we can touch a sub-system without touching the other type of sub-system. If we treat the task only as touching one sub-system, we cannot make much of an impact."

Where there is a strong leadership like in elite institutions, the desire to keep eyes and ears open exists. The means to tackle those institutions with relatively weak leadership may be an issue for consideration.

Prof. Seetharaman narrated his IB efforts along with other colleagues in National Council of Cooperative Training. Through their efforts, there was a turn-around of the entire organisation and the results were rewarding. Prof. S. Sreenivas Rao being a member of the same assignment was interviewed to capture his experiences which are recorded in the monograph.

The initial assignment began with a case development workshop which led to the re-examination of the whole syllabus. The need for a total change was identified and the IIMA team put forth three conditions before taking up the assignment:

1. All principals who were the decision makers will have to attend the workshops.
2. Cultural and processual changes would have to be made.

3. Total upgradation of the existing staff.

All the conditions were agreed to and then three level meetings were held to review the syllabus of IIMA, IRMA and NCCT.

The first reaction to IIMA's intervention was that they wanted to thrust their syllabus on that of NCCT's. They were formed into groups and made to discuss their syllabus. Also each one was asked to take up an area of his own expertise and suggest the necessary changes. He was also granted some funds to go and visit an institute of his choice and review its syllabus and functioning. After these exercises, each principal came back and shared what he had seen, what in his view they had, and what changes were necessary for his organisation.

Another workshop was held to review the practices of faculty evaluation, principal's evaluation and student evaluation. Here, the inter-relatedness of all areas was identified. Our team is still working with them, with the knowledge that their recommendations are being implemented and processes generated towards their goals.

Prof. H.N. Pathak has some IB experiences in this category with two voluntary organisations founded on the Gandhian philosophy. Education is the main activity of these organisations, though they have spread in few other areas.

Lok Bharati, a growing institute was established by Nanabhai, a follower of Gandhi. Though it was growing, the dynamics of an institution were missing. They believed in the Gandhian philosophy, but the concrete discrimination between right and wrong was missing. Prof. Pathak reviewed their curriculum and suggested changes as per their requirements rather than theoretical concepts. He designed for them very small specific problem oriented research cases. Areas with irrigation facilities and those without them were examined in context to creating employment opportunities.

Another effort was with the Sarvodaya Ashram, Gundi, which though based on the Gandhian model was more open minded. In spite of being well managed, they wanted further improvement and wanted to spread the management philosophy in his organisation.

Prof. Pathak was of the opinion that although these institutions portray a not so dynamic picture, they are quite open and are always willing to change for the better. He wondered whether the CRMS (Centre for Regional Management Studies) of IIMA can further the cause of these organisations towards IB.

He also mentioned his IB effort in developing entrepreneurship in the diamond industry through Hindustan Diamonds. The industry is powerfully owned by the Palanpur Jains. Prof. Pathak with others

designed a combination of job work oriented and entrepreneurship oriented unit.

Response

Prof. D. Mavlankar made a brief suggestion that when we were sharing so much on IB, we should also consider the aspects that go into the deterioration or decaying of institutions over a period of time. What factors would be required to rejuvenate these institutions may be considered for review.

Prof. Anil K Gupta was amazed at the rich experiences our faculty had in IB, but expressed concern over our inability to share these experiences. He was of the opinion that when the organisational reward systems become irrelevant in pursuing your effort, the IB process can be said to be generated. He also mentioned the nature of problems created through sponsor driven assignments. "I will be disinclined to take up assignments where somebody else needs the change, but the people immediately concerned are different. Taking up of IB assignments need a careful scrutiny as they involve a great deal of personal and emotional investment. Working through "networks" and encouraging the establishment of more networks was strongly advocated by him as networks are fairer to the idea of IB, they being voluntary in nature and not sponsor driven.

Prof. A.K. Jain agreed with Prof. Anil Gupta's views on close scrutiny of the assignment before accepting it. Seeing eye to eye with client was very important for its successful implementation. Many a times it had happened that the problem identified by the client was totally different from the problem identified by the consultant; hence the area of intervention would have to be totally changed.

He observed that what was brought out from most of the presentation was that unless there is a coherent overall approach of how certain things can be influenced, we cannot make a good impact. Recognition of the inter-relatedness and interlinkages was very important in all component based interventions. He also stressed on the importance of the need of the intervention to be accepted by the concerned group. A funder - receiver relationship does not work positively unless the need for change is actually identified.

Prof. P.N. Khandwalla's response generated issues to be considered by the faculty of IIMA in furthering the goals of IB internally and externally:

1. He raised the issue of the choice of interventions to be

considered for providing IB help.

2. He said that although the difference of IB and OD was not very clear, organisational behaviour and action research had fascinating and useful techniques which could be deployed and resolved in IB. Could we provide some sort of space or an internal framework within the Institute to share and learn these techniques from each other? Can RMCEI take up this responsibility?
3. If IB is such an important managerial philosophy not only for academic institutions and NGOs, but also for the corporate sector, is it anywhere reflected in our programmes or courses for the PGPs, FPMs, FDPs, MEPS, etc? Are we adopting a holistic approach towards IB?
4. Can we design a programme for the head of institutions wherein we can learn and teach from each other the experiences of IB? What should we do to strive for excellence?

Prof. S.P. Seetharaman chairing the session, summed up the issues raised by various people.

1. The issue of limiting the decaying process in organisations may be examined by us.
2. We started with an incidental approach but have developed a major field of action. Should we not get an award or reward for having contributed vastly to the economy through management discipline? Should we not strive for this and work towards it?
3. What should be the role of RMCEI towards this goal of spreading the IB philosophy?
4. He observed that the sectoral approach seemed to be more rewarding than the total organisational approach.

**Faculty Interviewed in Theme 3 :
Component Based Interventions**

1. Prof. Anil Gupta was assigned to review the working and direction of movement of Social Centre, Ahmednagar. This organisation is a voluntary organisation engaged in direct assault on rural poverty in a drought region.
2. Prof. T.P. Rama Rao was a member of the IIMA team assisting the State Bank of India's Institute of Information and Communication Management (SBIICM) to develop their training strategy, designing courses and faculty development.
3. Prof. S. Sreenivas Rao was a member of the IIMA team entrusted with the task of redesigning the curriculum of one-year higher diploma course of National Council for Cooperative Training (NCCT).
4. Prof. S.P. Seetharaman has made component based interventions in NCCT, Behavioural Science Centre, SEWA and Centre for Agricultural Marketing.
5. Prof. J.P. Singh along with Prof. M.G. Korgaonkar undertook the task of conducting a feasibility study for the expansion plan of Missionary Medical College and Hospital, Vellore.
6. Prof. Nitin Patel has coordinated workshops on OR in developing countries sponsored by International Federation of Operation Research Societies (IFORS).

SESSION - IV

ROLE BASED INTERVENTIONS

Prof. Pestonjee raised a conceptual issue by suggesting the use of the term "institutional development" in place of "organisational development".

He then briefly narrated his IB efforts in existing organisations, in the form of being a committee member or a board member. These type of efforts have little scope for autonomy and all sorts of constraints exist. However, they require help at some point of time. The first experience was him being the Chairman of the Reorganisation Committee of Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR). Prof. Pestonjee took charge after the demise of Prof. Nitish De and started afresh with a new orientation. He tried to focus on HRD systems and developing the career paths of the people of the organisation.

Secondly, he was a member of a commission set up by the Government of India to advise them on the amendment of the Banaras Hindu University (BHU) Act. The task was enormous and experts from all fields were members of this commission. Prof. Pestonjee's task was to suggest structural changes through which he recommended more autonomy for the specialised centres of the University. Various stakeholders like faculty, students, karmacharis, political parties, etc., had to be dealt with. Getting consensus from a diverse and large segment was a difficult task and required specific skills. There were people who had been in the organisation for many years and were sensitive to new suggestions and changes. Duration of the person implementing the changes also had to be ensured.

The third experience of Prof. Pestonjee was about him being the Chairperson of the Faculty Development Programme (FDP) of IIMA. He identified the problems of the programme due to its being attached to the PGP (Post Graduate Programme) and established its individual identity. He also influenced the UGC (University Grants Commission) to formally recognise the programme. These were major achievements. However, he also had some bitter experiences when he tried to implement the Murthy Committee recommendations. He was charged of misguiding his colleagues for which he apologised. But he asserted, "I shall not preside over the demise of the programme".

Prof. Pestonjee stressed on the importance of the environment and the constraints you operate with, in this type of IB category. The notion exists that there is not much to be done in these type of interventions but one can be of major influence to the organisation concerned.

Prof. T.V. Rao differentiated between the routine type of memberships our faculty have and those through which a change process is initiated in the institution. He considered the latter one as an IB effort and not the former one.

He then listed some of our faculty's efforts towards IB through membership on committees, boards etc. These were the ones who perceived themselves as change agents or influencers.

1. Prof. Ravi Matthai on the Board of NID
2. Profs. Ravi Matthai and Udai Pareek on the Board of North East Hill University.
3. Prof. Anil Bhatt on the Committee to design National Institute of Adult Education (NIAE).
4. Computer Group of IIMA in IFORS, ORSI, CSI, etc.
5. Prof. T.V. Rao in National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA).

A choice has to be made depending on the role one likes to play, as such opportunities keep coming. Review committees play a positive role towards IB due to the indepth analysis they make. Our faculty can play a major role in spreading a culture or a philosophy through them.

Prof. J.P. Singh gave the example of Prof. Nitish De who made an everlasting impact and contributed to an entire movement in the country through his membership on the boards of BHEL, LIC, P&T etc. He used the roles to fuse the concepts into the organisations. The weight of this position was used to create an activity but the impact made was enormous. If the organisation is not ready for such type of changes or there is no market for them, one has to deal with the situation to generate the change process.

Hence, if one can take the approach of bringing together the essential role of a teacher, a learner, a consultant and a researcher with membership of such organisations, the mileage that can be achieved is tremendous.

Response

Prof. G.S. Gupta stressed on the importance of the role played by the faculty on course review, course design, faculty selection etc. There was ample scope to contribute as IIMA faculty is usually considered to be a very important resource person. One plays the role of a "gate keeper" while dealing with biases, pressures etc. These are normally service oriented roles with no monetary returns but a lot of personal satisfaction. One also earns a great deal of respect and acceptance from the community at large.

Prof. Deepti Bhatnagar chairing the session, summarised the experiences of the faculty who contributed in this category of IB. She said that if the goals are given to us, then the energy and commitment towards the profession makes all the difference to make a lasting impact. She explained the situation by differentiating "role taking" and "role making" normally used in the OB language. Role taking meant functioning within the constraints given to you without making an effort to generate change. Role making meant investing into the role and moving beyond the boundaries of the role given to you. It means releasing oneself from structural constraints.

Faculty Interviewed in Theme 4 : Role Based Interventions
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prof. D.M. Pestonjee has been on the Board of ICSSR, Advisory Board of WHO, Committee to review BHU Act, Committee formed by Board of Governors of IIT, Delhi to review their personnel policies, FDP Chairperson of IIMA and similar such positions. 2. Prof. Ashoke Chatterjee was the first full-time Director of National Institute of Design (NID). His goal was to rebuild the institution through redefining goals and objectives and being able to get maximum participation from various components of the NID family and the external support systems.

Summary and Conclusions from the Seminar

Prof. Anil K Gupta was asked to make the concluding remarks and draw out points for further course of action.

He requested Ms. Nayana Shah to share her experiences while interviewing the faculty and documenting them. She briefly explained the way she prepared the document with support from Prof. T.V. Rao. The first observation she made was that there appeared and still appears to be a lot of confusion regarding the IB concepts amongst our faculty. She suggested sharing and understanding of concepts to ensure movement in the right direction. If the IB philosophy has to spread and be institutionalised within IIMA, this was essential. She also mentioned the need to arrive at a consensus on the important issues in IB, e.g., term of the person asking for help, withdrawal at the right moment, induction-initiation processes, commitment without formalisation etc. A positive course of action was what she suggested the group to work out.

Prof. Anil K Gupta brought forth some issues to provoke thought and further course of action for the IIMA faculty:

1. The need to meet again, share, pool in thoughts, ideas and experiences was strongly stressed by him. He expressed the need to formalise the forum to pool insights of methodological, conceptual or practical nature. When society has invested so much in us, and the esteem we command makes us responsible towards the community at large. How do we discharge that responsibility? We need to articulate the criteria used in our decision making processes. Hence communication becomes a major area of action.
2. While institutionalising a small change in an organisation, the ideas of a target network of institutions have to be imbibed. Hence, a personal firm or organisation can make a marginal impact on the society. We must aim to move towards the super organisation or the inter-organisational perspective to invest our efforts in. This would make a larger impact.
3. For an intervention to become an intervention, the dilemma of organisational responsibility vs. professional responsibility is created. The internalisation process of IB has to be generated within our faculty.
4. IB literature was initiated in 1960s, the AID agencies wanting to fund developing countries. They wanted to create an aid absorbing capacity in the recipient countries. But the focus

has shifted in recent times. Our concern has become the community and considerations for prioritisation in the existing context. We have a collectivity in mind and our efforts are aimed towards it.

5. Our internal sharing processes are not as open as they should be. We cannot make people do something we do not do ourselves. We are accountable and answerable to them. Our internal processes need to be re-examined and if need be re-designed.
6. The kind of moral transition the society is passing through, implies that resource oriented reorganisation will not take place in organisations. Most firms will have to count upon management processes rather than resource generation to solve their problems. Here, we have an opportunity to communicate and work with the corporate sector. "We have a license to change. How to bring about change is our major concern." Hence the role of IB is tremendous towards upliftment of society at large. What can we do about it?

In response to Prof. Singh's suggestion of referring to the Director, he being the principal decision maker, Prof. A.K. Jain asserted that we were working as a collegiate group and not in a hierarchy. We cannot load him with the responsibility of initiating the task. he stressed on the vitality of role based interventions through which we could promote the cause of IB.

The one-day seminar ended with a positive climate created for thought and action. The faculty was charged with enthusiasm to institute the IB philosophy in our Institute.

Emerging Issues

Apart from those issues captured from the interviews, the following ones emerge from the narrations and discussions of the faculty:

1. IIMA's role in spreading the IB culture internally and externally. Does it need reexamination, redefinition and redesign?
2. What are our considerations in prioritisation of activities or assignments that we take?
3. How much do we communicate and how to generate more communication?
4. How can we formalise the IB forum?
5. Should we restrict IB to academic institutions and VOs or should we spread it to the corporate sector?
6. If the importance of "networks" is accepted, what should we do towards networking?
7. How do we generate internalisation processes to resolve the dilemma of organisational responsibility vs. professional responsibility?
8. How do we limit the decaying process in institutions?
9. What is our accountability to the unorganised sector?
