142

Working Paper

WP142
WP
1976
(142)

IIM
WP-142

विद्याविनियोगाद्विकासः
IIM
AHMEDABAD

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT
AHMEDABAD

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF DECISION MAKING
STRATEGIES AND ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH IN
MAHARASHTRA PHULE KRISHI VIDYALAYA

EDUCATION SYSTEMS GROUP

W.P. No. 142
December 1976

Indian Institute of Management
Ahmedabad

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The present study is an exploratory research project to
analyze the decision-making strategies and organisational health
in a new multi-campus agriculture university. This is an extension
of our earlier research project which was carried out in Gujarat
Agriculture University, Anand (Matthai, Pareek and Rao, 1975). The
Mahatama Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth (MPKV) is situated at Rahuri, a
taluka headquarters in Ahmednagar district of Maharastra. Post-
Graduate subjects are taught at the central campus Rahuri. It has
three constituent colleges at Poona, Kolhapur and Dhule to impart
under-graduate education in agriculture. The central office at
Rahuri coordinates all the activities of colleges and research
stations. The central office has the Vice-Chancellor, Registrar,
Directors and Deans of various wings, and Comptroller. Each college
has a Principal (it is called Associate Dean also) who is responsible
for the activities of that zone for teaching, research and extension.
The university came into existance in 19⁶8 by the Maharastra Krishi
Vidyapeeth Act.

The MPKV has about 26 major and sub research stations,
2 Gramsevak Training Centres, and 8 Agriculture Schools in its
jurisdiction. These are under the control of college principal of

the respective zone (it has three zones) although some of the major
research stations are having research specialists. The research
specialists are only in charge of research activities and hence do
not take part in teaching activities of the university. A few of
them have masters' students attached to them. Formally before
the formation of MPKV, some of the research stations were under
the control of State Government Department of Agriculture. They
were transferred to the university.

The research centres can be classified as main stations,
regional centres and sub-station in relation to their research focus.
For example research stations at Sholapur, Rahuri, Padegaon and Niphad
are main research stations. The specialist is the head of the research
stations. While Wheat Rust Research Station, Mahabaleshwar, and
research stations at Igatpuri, Kolhapur, Manjri Mohol, etc, are
sub-research stations. The main function of the research specialist
is to direct research activity. Technically the research specialists
are governed by the HODs from Rahurin and administratively under
the Associate Dean of the zone. Thus the research stations in MPKV
have two heads - one for technical guidance and the other for
administrative guidance. Most of the research specialists are of
equal positions to their heads. Some research schemes are also
functioning in research stations. These schemes are financed by
Indian Council of Agriculture Research and other agencies. Each
research scheme has a seperate scientist and staff. Because of
undefined roles of scheme scientist and research scientist, some

research stations are facing role problems.

This study was conducted during Feb.-May 1976. The university was about eight years old. It is still in the process of formation. The results of this study have to be interpreted in the contex of an emerging university with its problems.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted with the following objectives:

i) To identify the major strategies of decision-making used in this university at various levels in performing the tasks;

ii) To analyse the major tasks performed by this university, using the open system model and to use it as a framework for the study of perceptual variables;

iii) To study the characteristics of organisational health in such a university system which has its jurisdiction all over the state;

iv) To study the organisational health of this university as derived from the perceptions of its members;

v) To analyse the variations in organisational health by a) various colleges, research stations and Gramsevak Training Centres; b) designations; and c) departments;

vi) To relate the strategies of decision-making to organisational health of the sub-system in order to derive the impact of decision making strategies on the organisational health at different levels;

vii) To study the decisional participation experienced
by the employees at various levels and in different
sub-systems;

viii) To study the sources of decisional participation and
deprivation;

ix) To find out the effects of such deprivation or over-
participation on organisational health, productivity,
etc.; and

x) To develop implications of the results for planning
strategies and processes for increasing the effectiveness
of the system.

METHODOLOGY

Task Structure

The major tasks performed by the university were analysed
by using an open system model, the available documents of the uni-
versity relating to the tasks functions, delegation of authority,
activities, etc. Such an analysis was aimed at finding out different
roles and functions performed by these formally and informally
roles. The analysis of the available documents was supplimented by
the interviews with the role incumbents to go in depth.

Decision Making Strategies

Decisions in MPKV are made at various levels. At the one
level decisions are made by the Vice-Chancellor, Deans, Registrar

and Head of the Departments individually in some instances. At
the committee or group level, decisions are made by the bodies like
Court, Executive Council, Academic Council, Faculties, and Board of
Studies. All these are in the formal organisational structure. Yet,
at another level decisions are made at teacher associations, student
bodies etc., which may or may not influence the system. The present
study is attempted to explore both the structural and operational
aspects of decision-making in the university systems.

Structural

In a university decisions have to be made in several areas.
To mention some of the broad areas like budget and planning, selection
of faculty and administrative staff, promotions, salaries, leaves,
tenure, manpower planning, faculty office and space, teaching load,
course allotment, development of new courses, time-table, departmental
goals, secretorial help, scholarships, travel grants and deputations,
research projects, student admission, examinations and evaluation,
new departments, laboratory, library, fund allotment, housing, etc.

There are three main strategies which could be used in
decision-making in relation to these areas: (i) Need based democratic
strategy involves feeling of need to introduce change or implement
something new. Here decisions are usually taken through the direct
or indirect participation of the persons concerned in a committee.
(ii) In the centralised strategy the decisions are made at the apex
level by the higher authorities (Vice-Chancellor, Registrar, Dean or

Head of the department as the case may be) without consulting
anyone. (iii) In some cases these two strategies may be combined
and some intermediary strategies like decisions through consultations,
etc., may be taken. However, it is not on the part of decision-makers
in these strategies to involve or not the persons about whom the
decisions are made.

Here an attempt is made to analyse the different
decision-making strategies used and the levels involved in decision
making in relation to different areas. By levels is meant the level
of hierarchy, Vice-Chancellor, Dean, Principal, Head of the Department,
etc. This involves besides listing out from the Act and Statutes,
a few interviews with the decision-makers including members of
various committees to spell out the process of operation of these
strategies. Feeling of decisional participation likely to influence
the faculty effectiveness. Therefore, decisional participation for
the above mentioned areas is proposed to be studied here. To study
the decision making strategies, major decisional situations were
explored with the help of interviewing key persons in the university
and by examining the available documents.

This study is an extension of our earlier attempt
(Matthai et al., 1975) in Gujarat Agricultural University, Anand.
Therefore, the methodology of this study more or less remains the
same. By seeing the objectives of the study, the following

instruments are used:

    i) Organisational Health Inventory,

    ii) Decisional Participation Scale, and

    iii) Bio-data Sheet.

The development and standardisation of these tools have
been fully discussed somewhere else (Matthai et al., 1975). The
concept 'Organisational health' of an organisation is parallel to
the concept of health (physical and mental) for an individual. When
the individual is physically andmentally well equipped to function
to the maximum of his capacities, we describe him as healthy person.
Similarly, the main component of any organisation is its structure
and its member who are expected to perform certain functions. For
a university, the faculty is one of the main components and the
effectiveness of the university depends upon the effectiveness of
its faculty. Thus the effectiveness of faculty generally depends
upon their own health as well as their organisational health. It
is possible that physical and psychological health of the employees
cannot be controlled by the university, but the organisational
health can be controlled to a great extent through structured
and unstructured interventions. If certain rules and regulations
are perceived by the faculty as hindering their academic work,
the rules can be modified to facilitate rather than hinder academic
work. However, their perception that rules and regulations are
hindering the academic life is an indicator of some deficit in one
aspect of the organisational health of the university.

The Organisational Health Inventory (OHI) developed by
Matthai et al (1975) was used in the present study. The OHI is
designed to assess the organisational health at three levels -
(i) individual level, (ii) subsystem level, and (iii) total organisational level. It includes in all total 19 areas of the university
organisational health. These areas are given in Table 1.

Table 1

Areas of OHI as obtained through the categorisation of

opinions expressed by the respondents

(based on task structure existing in the university)

Area	Description of the area content
1. General administration - General efficiency	This dimension deals with the general climate of the total university system. Dimensions of organisational health deal with general esteem of the respondents for the central university administration, their orientation and the interpersonal and intellectual climate of the university.
2. General administration - Decision efficiency	It has 15 items dealing with delay in decisions, implementation, constitution of committees and decision making process.
3. General administration - Bureaucratic orientation	Items dealing with bureaucracy, rules and procedure orientation, hierarchy consciousness, concentration of decision making powers in a few etc. are discussed.

4.	General administration – Administrator	Item on this area deal with the managerial efficiency of the administrators as indicated by their orientations. Openness of the administrato.s to suggestions, cooperation among them etc., are also included.
5.	General administration – Personnel function	Manpower planning, selection and development of university employees, reward system and promotion are discussed in this area.
6.	General administration – Excessive administration	Existing concerns for administrative and procedural hinderances formed this area.
7.	Committee orientation	Three items on this dimension deal with the effectiveness with which the committee are constituted and function in relation to various tasks.
8.	Academic council	Items on this area deal with concerns of the Academic Council members and the effectiveness of the Council.
9& 10.	Campus administration	Items dealing with the effectiveness of campus administration are taken here.
11.	College administration	There is only one item on this dimension deal: ng with the college administration.
12.	Departmental administration	This area deals with the administrative orientation of the departmental heads to their faculty.
13, 14 & 15	Teaching	Teaching is one of the three important functions of an agricultural university. This dimension includes items on the administration of teaching activities, emphasis on teaching etc.

16 & 17	Research	Research is another important function of university. Research activities involve several functions including administration of research to use of research results. Items dealing with dimensions including the administration of research projects, research personnel etc. are covered in this.
18.	Admission and allotment	Procedural problems in the student admission to courses are covered in this dimension.
19.	Examination system	Administrative aspects of examination systems are included in this.

The OHI as given in Appendix A, has 89 items dealing with the dimensions like delays in decision making, coordination between administrators at different levels, academic freedom, rules and regulations, research facilities, teaching, recruitment, functioning of different university bodies like the Court and Academic Council, funds, student admission, faculty orientation, etc. The respondents have to check each item on a five point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Items not applicable are not to be responsed and provision is made for it in the questionnaire. To keep the principle of psychological dominance in organisational health, respondents were asked to give their first reaction. All the items are negatively stated. A total score of organisational health can be obtained by totalling the responses checked by the respondents.

Thus it is safe to assume that if the respondents perceive the organisational health as poor than productivity is also likely to be low and thereby the efficiency of the organisation is hampered.

While the individual OH score contributes to his efficiency on lack of
it striving to achieve the organisationalgoals, the aggregate OH of
all or most of the members of an organisation contributes to the
efficiency of the organisation in achieving its goals. The MPkV
has several system components as consisting of different levels of
faculty like professor, associate professor, assistant professor,
etc. They can be differentiated by designation or status or as
composed of different institutions (colleges and research stations,
departments) and activities like teaching andresearch. It is also
possible the dimensions used in the organisation may be viewed as
different sub-systems. A member of the university may be viewed as
a member of many sub-systems. Such sub-systems in interaction with
his personality and other background influence his perceptions of
the system and thereby his organisational health. The effects and
the direction of such sub-systems have been studied here.

Decisional Participation Scale

The existing policies and practices of decision making
through records and documentation reveal the existing patterns of
decision making, but does not provide any insights into the expecta-
tions and feelings of the members who are not a part of the decision
making process but may get affected by the decisions being made.
In order to look into this important side of decision making, the
decisional participation processes as experienced by the members
of the university were also studied. An inventory developed for
Gujarat Agricultural University study was used. It consists of

various categories of decisions. It measures the decisional
participation, deprivation and satisfaction of the members of
the university.

The respondents were asked to indicate if they are parti-
cipating in the deicisionsat present and if they like to participate
in them. If an individual indicates his willingness to participate
in decisions relating to a particular activity, but he does not
participate at present, he is indicating <u>decisional deprivation</u>.
If an individual is participating in decisions relating to certain
activities buthe is not interested in participating in them, he is
indicating <u>over participation</u> of an individual is participating (or
not participating) and he likes to continue to be in the same state.
he is indicating <u>decisional satisfaction</u> (or saturation). These
four dimensions were studied using the scale given in Appendix B.

Depth Interviews

Besides studying the above variables through questionaires,
interviews were held with the faculty members at colleges and research
stations. The main purpose of these interviews was to understand
and assess the general problems the scientists facing in the university.
These observations formed a seperate chapter for the study.

SAMPLE

In a university, like the MPKV, there are so many systems.
It was decided to include most of the systems in the study. One of
the members of the study group visited the colleges and research

stations in the jurisdiction of MPKV. However, only major research stations could be included in the study. Thus, in total 363 members of the MPKV were taken for this study. They were taken from the four colleges - Rahuri, Poona, Dhule, and Kolhapur - and other research stations. Both the Gramsevak Training Centres at Manjari (Poona) and Kolhapur were included in the study. The break up of sample is given in Table 1.

Table 1

Break-up of Sample from Various Institutes

Institute	N
1. Post-graduate School, Rahuri	58
2. College of Agriculture, Poona	85
3. College of Agriculture, Dhuke	41
4. College of Agriculture, Kolhapure	76
5. Research Stations (seven)	68
6. Gramsevak Training Centres (Two) and Agricultural Schools(four)	35
Total	363

Table 1 shows that the sample includes more than 60% of the faculty. Table 2 shows the highest qualifications obtained by the respondents.

Table 2

Highest Degrees Obtained by the Respondents

Degree	N
1. Ph.D (Foreign)	09
2. Ph.D (Indian)	18
3. M.Sc	203
4. M.Tech	06
5. B.Tech	18
6. B.Sc (Agri.)	102
7. B.Sc	04
8. Matriculation and below	02
9. No response	01
Total	363

A great majority of the respondents have post-graduated degree in agriculture, followed by the undergraduate degree in agriculture.

Table 3 gives the years of experience in MPKV of the respondents.

Table 3

Years of Experience in MPKV of the Respondents

Years of Experience	N
1-5	118
6-10	82
11-15	91
16-20	33
21-25	16
26-30	15
31 and above	7
No response	1
Total	363

CHAPTER 2

TASK, STRUCTURE, AND DECISION MAKING IN MPKV

Introduction

The Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth (MPKV) was established
by Maharashtra Krishi Vidyapeeth (Agriculture University) Act of 1967 as
amended under the Punjabrao Krishi Vidyapeeth Act, 1968 of the Govern-
ment of Maharashtra. Actual functioning of the MPKV was started on
1st June, 1968. The Central Office of the University is situated in
Near Rahuri taluka in Ahmednagar district. It has five constituent
colleges throughout Maharashtra:

i) College of Agriculture, Dhule

ii) College of Agriculture, Poona

iii) College of Agriculture, Kolhapur

iv) College of Agriculture Engineering, Rahuri, and

v) Post Graduate School, Rahuri.

Objectives

The MPKV, Rahuri has been established with the following
objectives:

i) to provide education in agriculture and allied sciences,
and humanities;

ii) to further the advancement of learning and research in
agriculture and allied subjects;

iii) to integrate and coordinate teaching of subjects in
different faculties in the University;

iv) to undertake and guide extension programmes for the improvement and development of agriculture in the State; and

v) to co-ordinate agriculture education, research and extension education activities.

Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of the MPK extends over the nine districts of Western Maharashtra viz., Poona, Sholapur, Ahmednagar, Kolhapur, Sangali, Satara, Dhule, Jalgaon, and Nasik. It has the following constituent institutions and research stations throughout the Maharashtra:

i) Two Gram Sevak Training Centres at Manjari (Poona) and Kolhapur

ii) Eight Agriculture Schools at Manjari, Sholapur, Puntamba, Kolhapur, Digraj, Borgaon, Dhule and Jalgaon

iii) Five major Agricultural Research Stations at Rahuri, Sholapur, Padegaon, Jalgaon and Niphad

iv) Twenty one Agricultural Sub-Research Stations at Vadgaon, Lonawala, Manjri, Goneshkhind, Mahol, Jeur, Kopargaon, Chas, Shrirampur, Kolhapur, Gadhinglaj, Radhnagari, Digraj, Mahabaleshwaram, Karad, Dhule, Yawal, Igatpuri, Pimpalgaon, Baswant and Vadner Bhairao

iv) One cattle breeding farm at Igatpuri.

Besides, there are 52 recognized research centres for post-graduate studies affiliated to the University from all over India.

TEACHING

The instructional programme of the University is being carried out at the three constituent colleges of agriculture located at Poona, Kolhapur and Dhule which impart instructions at the undergraduate level. A Post-graduate school, located at the central campus, Rahuri imparts instructions in two year post-graduate degree programme leading to M.Sc. (Agri.) in the disciplines of - Agronomy, Animal Husbandry, and Dairying, Agriculture Botany, Agriculture Chemistry, Agriculture Economics, Agriculture Extension, Agriculture Entomology, Horticulture and Plant Pathology. The college of Agriculture Engineering located at Central Office, Rahuri, offers 5 years degree programme leading to B.Tech (Agri. Engineering).

The Gram Sevak Training Centres offer in service training to the village-level-workers (VLW). The Agriculture Schools located one each in its jurisdiction districts impart instructions to the sons of farmers in the vocational agriculture, in a two year course preparing them for modern scientific farming.

The MPKV has the system of internal evaluation under trimester-pattern, both at undergraduate and post graduate levels. System of common final examination for each trimester has been brought into operation in order to maintain uniformity and high standard of instructions at the all constituent colleges. During the period of 1974-75, the total strength of students was 1483 from 1st year B.Sc (Agri.) to M.Sc.

RESEARCH

Maharashtra is one of the deficit states in the country in respect to its foodgrain requirements. The per hactre yields of various crops are very low and there is a vast scope to boost them up through the planned research effort. In fact, one of the objectives of establishing the agricultural universities in the state was to find out the solutions to the various problems confronting the agriculturists in the State by undertaking research work in different disciplines. The MPKV has 26 Research Stations (both major and sub-stations) in Maharashtra located in its jurisdiction. The research programmes of the University are executed through the schemes financed by the State Government, Government of India and Indian Council of Agriculture Research. Besides, the research work on the regional problems is also undertaken by the staff working at the constituent colleges as well as the Central Campus at Rahuri.

EXTENSION

The extension education activites are carried out under the extension education scheme. Research on extension problems of importance to the State and the regions (it has four regions viz., Rahuri, Poona, Kolhapur, and Dhule) is carried out by the staff of the constituent colleges. Besides, one agriculture development extension education scheme, agriculture development activities are carried out in the developmental blocks attached to the extension wings of the constituent colleges.

The extension services of the MPKV include the following activities:

i) <u>Training classes</u> for the farmers, extension workers engaged in the agricultural developmental activities in Zila Parishad and the State Department of Agriculture, and the students and staff from agriculture school and colleges located in the jurisdiction of MPKV.

ii) <u>Demonstrations</u> to show the results of improved technology and farm practices are conducted in respect to important crops. Minikit and national demonstration are also being conducted.

iii) <u>Campaigns</u> are being held at the various institutes of University

iv) <u>Meetings</u> are conducted where village development plans are chalked out, felt needs are ascertained and knowledge of improved agricultural technology is given.

v) <u>Seed-distribution</u> of hybrids and high yielding varieties of crops like jawar, paddy and wheat etc., are supplied to farmers.

vi) <u>Horticulture</u> seedings and grafts of improved varieties of fruit plants are supplied to the farmers.

vii) <u>Film shows</u> are arranged by audio-visual units on agricultural topics at various places on different occasions for the benefit of farmers.

viii) <u>Field days</u> where farmers are taken to the institutes or research stations to show the activities on agriculture

ix) <u>Tours</u> are held for farmers within as well as out of state to the places of agricultural interest.

x) <u>Publication</u> of news articles and putting out leaflets and pamphlets are done at constitutent institutions of the University.

The MPKV has done immense work on agriculture extension activities. One of us participated in training class, campaign, demonstration,

meetings and field days activities at various places of MPKV
jurisdiction and found quite useful to farmers. There is a general
concern that the extension services of most of universities are poor.

APEX LEVEL ADMINISTRATION

The personnel of the University can be classified under the
following categories:

a)   Executive and other officers - who have the administrative
authority and who are design.ted as such under the Act or the Statutes.
They include - the Chancellor, the Pro-Chancellor, and the Vice-Chancellor
(all executives); and other executives are - Directors of Instriction,
Research Extension Education, Student Welfare, Deans of Faculties,
Associate Deans, Registrar and Comptroller,

b)   Academic Staff Members - who have duties of an academic nature
such as teaching research and extension education and who hold profe-
ssional ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor,
Lecturer or Demonstrator,

c)   And the Ministerial Staff Members - who are not included in
(a) and (b) above.

Here in the following pages an attempt is made to analyze the
power-structure at executive level and then to analyze the apex-level
decision-making bodies of the University.

The Chancellor

The Governor of Maharashtra State, for the time being, will
be the Chancellor of MPKV. The Chancellor by virtue of its office

is the head of the University and presides over all the meetings and
convocations where he presents. He is authorized to call any information
relating to the administration of the University and such requisition
is supplied by the University. He conforms every proposal to confer
any degree. He is also empowered by order in writing any proceeding of
any officer or authority of the university which is not in conformity
with statutes and regulations. The Chancellor is really an executive
head of the university. He is given enough powers but never uses without
consultation with others.

The Pro-Chancellor

The Minister for Agriculture, Maharashtra is the Pro-Chancellor
of the MPKV. He is also ex-officio Chairman of the Court. Actually the
Pro-Chancellor is a link between University and Governor (the Chancellor).
Like the Chancellor, he may also call for any information or paper
relating to the administrative affairs of the university. All the
annual university programmes are referred to the Pro-Chancellor for
his information and any suggestion made by him will be considered by
the Executive Council before submitting the said programmes to the
Court. Practically, he exercises all the powers and duties of the
Chancellor. Most of the powers are delegated to Pro-Chancellor by the
Chancellor. Since the Pro-Chancellor is the Agriculture Minister of
the State and by virtue of his position he is ex-officio Chairman of
the most powerful body - the Court - his powers and duties in an
academic institution should be clearly understood. The Court is
dominated by the State Government representatives. No doubt the
Minister is the first person who knows much better on agricultural

problems than any body else. There is a general consensus among the
academics that 'active politicians' should not be given apex positions
in an autonomous academic institute. We will discuss this point further
in detail with the Court.

Vice-Chancellor

The Vice-Chancellor is a salaried officer appointed by the
Chancellor for a period of five years. He is principal executive of
the university and an ex-officio member of the Court and Chairman
of the Executive Council and Academic Council. He exercises general
control over the affairs of the MPKV and is responsible for the due
maintenance of discipline in it. He can convene meetings of Executive
and Academic Council. He is like a trustee given powers to keep safe and
ensure that the provisions of the Act and Statutes are faithfully
worked out. He is also responsible for the administration of the
University and proper coordination between teaching, research and
extension activities. He is really the executive head of the University.
He presents budget to the Executive Council and Court, manages all
the activities of the University, calls necessary information from
the affiliated and constituent institutions, administers the funds
placed at the disposal of University, and takes immediate action in
emergency only subject to the control of Pro-Chancellor.

Registrar

The Registrar is also a salaried person appointed by the
Vice-Chancellor with the approval of the Executive Council. By his
office, he is ex-officio Secretary to all the three apex level

bodies for decision-making - Court, Executive Council and Academic
Council. He in his role is an administrative head and deemed to be
responsible for the due custody of records and other such work.
Although the Act and the Statutes have not given any specific powers
to Registrar, but he is assumed to hold and execute most of the powers
in the University.

Comptroller

The Comptroller is financial head of the University. He is
appointed by the Vice-Chancellor by the recommendations of the Executive
Council. He works directly under Vice-Chancellor. He prepares, keeps,
and submits the annual receipts and expenditure of the University.
He prepares the annual financial estimates of receipts and expenditures
and sends these to the concerning State authorities (i.e, Director of
Agriculture, Director of Animal Husbandry or other officers of State
Government). He gets audited the accounts and submits to the Chancellor,
Pro-Chancellor and the Executive Council. He also works out the
developmental plans of the University in consultation with other
authorities. He is a financial adviser to the Vice-Chancellor.

So far we have discussed the administrative heads of the
MPKV. The Statutes laid down some academic administrative heads in
the University. They are called "other officers" in the Statutes. For
convenience we have put the Registrar and Comptroller also in
executives' list.

The academic-administrator officers include - Directors of
instruction, Research, Extension Education Student Welfare, Deans of

constituent colleges. These officers are selected by the Selection
Committees constituted by the University.

Director of Instruction

Director of Instruction is mainly responsible to frame,
develop, evaluate and improve courses and curricula, and develop
teaching procedure designed to inculcate in the students, professional
competence, character and quality leadership. He ensures smooth
examinations at all constituent institutionsand maintains uniform
standard of teaching and examinations. He works like a coordination
among teaching research and extension activities. He formulates
budget estimates for educational programmes with consultation of
Deans, Associate Deans, and Heads of the department (HODs). He
exercises broad administrative control over the funds. His position
is whole-time salaried and works in close touch with the Vice-Chancellor.

Director of Research

Director of Research is an important post in the University.
He works directly under the Vice-Chancellor. He is responsible for
the performance of all research stations in the jurisdiction of MPKV
and coordinates all researches in close operation with the Deans of
Faculties and other officers. He controls and allots all the funds
related to various research activities. Like the Director of Instru-
ction, he also prepares the budget estimates and exercises control
over it. He formulates research policies and ensures timely publi-
cations in consultations with other university authorities.

Director of Extension Education

Director of Extension Education initiates, organizes, plans
and executes all extension education programme and activities with
the consultation and help of other authorities in the university. He
also formulates budget estimates for extension education programmes
and exercises broad administrative control - (a) extension staff,
(b) funds allocated to extension education, and (c) all physical
property related to it. His role is very important in successful
implementation of extension education programmes. He is in direct touch
with the State authorities to organize, implement and impart agricultural
practices and technology to farmers. As far as extension education in
the University is concerned, the Director of Extension Education is
the administrative head for it.

Director of Student Welfare

The Director of Student Welfare occupies a key position in
University. He deals all the affairs connected to students such as -
accommodation, mess, counselling, scholarship and freeship opportunities,
medical facilities, extra-curricular activities, liason between students
and teachers, job opportunities, placement of graduates and their
problems, arranging part-time employment, travel facilities and study
tours, communicates students performance etc to their parents, organizes
consumers' cooperative society, canteen and book-bank for students.

Constituent Colleges

There are three constituent college of agriculture with the
University namely - College of Agriculture, Dhule, Poona, and Kolhapur.

Each college is headed by one Associate Dean (He is also called
"Principal"), who is fully responsible for conducting teaching, research
and extension education programmes at all levels within the prescribed
limit of the region (The MPKV has four regions). He is official medium
of communication between University and college. He prepares the
budget for the college with the help of his colleagues. As far as the
Research Stations in his jurisdiction are concerned, he will be a
communication media between the Director of Research and the Research
Scientists or Head of the Research Station. All the technical (research)
matters are under the direct control of Director of Research and all the
administrative matters are controlled by the Associate Dean. All the
college and research stations' staff work under him. Thus, in respect
to initiation and carrying out research programmes, he will be responsible
to Director of Research. By virtue of their positions, the Associate Deans
(Principals of Agricultural Colleges) are ex-officio members of the Court
and Executive Council. He prepares the college budget in consultation
with his colleagues. He works under Director of Instruction for maintaining
law and order in the college. As far as research activities are concerned,
he coordinates with Director of Research in respect of initiation and
carrying out the research programme in different disciplines of the
college.

Heads of the Department (HODS)

Head of the Department is nominated by the Vice-Chancellor
among one of the professors in each department whom he deems fit as HOD
is responsible for resident, teaching, research, and extension. He
supervises the performance of academic staff members of his department.

APEX BODIES FOR DECISION-MAKING

At present the MPKV has five apex level bodies for decision-making as per the provisions of Act. They are:

    i) The Court

   ii) The Executive Council

  iii) The Academic Council

   iv) The Faculties

    v) The Board of Studies

The Court

The Court is most powerful apex level decision-making body in MPKV. There are total 105 members of the Court divided into various categories. The Court members from the University include - Vice-Chancellor, Directors of Instruction, Research, Extension Education, Student Welfare, Deans Faculty of Agriculture and Lower Education, Associate Deans of Poona, Dhule and Kolhapur agriculture colleges, Associate Deans of Education, Research, Post Graduate School Rahuri, College of Agriculture Engineering Rahuri, Principals of affiliated colleges and institutions and comptroller. The Registrar of MPKV is Member-Secretary for it. During 1975 there were 27 members of the Court from MPKV out of 105. Other members include - 12 from State Government, 9 Vice-Chancellors of Maharashtra Universities, 9 members deputed by the State Legislature, 26 members nominated by the State Government, 20 members are represented by Zilla Parishads, Graduate students, academic staff and institutions, and 2 members representing donors whether individual or institutions donating more than Rs 50,000 (at present both are vacant).

The Court meets twice in a year. The Pro-Chancellor, (Agriculture Minister of the State) is the ex-officio Chairman of the Court. According to the Act, the Court exercises following powers and perform the following duties:

i) to outline broadly what programmes the university should have;

ii) to discuss the review the annual report of the university and make suggestions thereon;

iii) to consider the annual financial estimates prepared by the Executive Council and make suggestions thereon;

iv) to establish and maintain constituent colleges, departments, hostels, research stations, farms, school, libraries, laboratories, and demonstration centres and other facilities for students and employees;

v) to make provisions for instruction, teaching and training in such a branches of learning and courses of study as it may think fit, for conduct of research and for the advancement and dissemination of knowledge;

vi) to institute and maintain professorship, associate professorship, lecturership, Demonstratorship and other posts like research specialists, teachers and the like, required by the University, as prescribed by the Statutes;

vii) to make, amend and repeal the statutes;

viii) to grant affiliation to colleges and post-graduate institutions;

ix) to recognise institutions of higher learning and research and withdraw recognition thereof;

x) to sanction fellowships (including travelling fellowship) scholarships, studentships, medals and prizes;

xi) to recommend the conferent of degrees, diplomas, certificates and other academic distinctions, to the Chancellor;

xii) to sanction honarary degrees or other academic distinctions;

xiii) to lay down scales of pay and conditions of employment of members of staff in affiliated colleges and recognised institutions and to ensure the observance thereof through the Executive Council.

However, the Act imposes onerestriction by putting, the
powers and duties $\underline{/}$ Under clauses (iv) to (vi) and (vii) to (viii)
all inclusive$\underline{7}$ shall not be exercised and performed, except upon
recommendations made by the Executive Council. It may be noted that
besides some people at the apex level, there is no provision for any
officer, faculty, student or any other employee of the MPKV to be a
member of the Court. As reported earlier, whether the functions of
the Court stated above necessitate such State representation to parti-
cipate in the University activities - needs examination. There was a
feeling amont the faculty members that the Court did not represent
the academic staff fully.

THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The next important body at the apex level is the Executive
Council. From MPKV, besides Vice-Chancellor, who is ex-officio Chairman
of the Executive Council, Directors of Instruction, Research and
Extension, one Dean of Faculty elected, by Academic Council by rotation,
one academic staff member elected by the Academic Council (other than
Directors and Deans) and the Registrar as ex-officio Secretary. Thus,
out of 19 Executive Council members, 7 are from MPKV, 8 are elected
by the Court, 3 are from Maharashtra State Government (Directors of
Animal Husbandry, Agriculture and one nominated by the State Government)
and one ICAR representative.

The Executive Council meets once in every two months. The
Executive Council exercises the following powers and performs the
following duties:

i) to frame the annual financial estimates of the University and submit the same to the Court for consultation before finalisation;

ii) with the approval of State Government, to borrow on the security of University property, money for the purposes of the University;

iii) to accept subject to the statutes, on behalf of the University bequests, donations and transfers of movable or immovable property to the University;

iv) to transfer any movable or immovable property on behalf of the University, a report to which is made to the Court, if the transaction pertains to any immovable property;

v) to manage and regulate the finances, accounts and investments of the University;

vi) to fix, demand and receive payment of such fees and other charges as may be prescribed;

vii) to approve the academic standards in affiliated colleges and recognized institutions and ensure the observance thereof;

viii) to make provision for - i) extension education for rural people; ii) in-service training for the staff of university and government departments; iii) physical and military training; iv) sports and athletic clubs; v) students' welfare;

ix) to arrange for and direct the inspection of affiliated colleges and recognized institutions and issue instruction for maintaining their efficiency and for ensuing proper conditions of employment for members of their staff; and in case of disregard of such instructions, to recommend modifications of the conditions of their affiliation or recognition to take such other steps as it may deem proper;

x) to make, demand and repeal the regulations for matters solely concerning itself;

xi) to accept, reject or refer back the regulations framed by the Academic Council;

xii) to appoint examiners, fix their remuneration (if any) and to arrange for the conduct of, and for publishing the results of the University examinations and other tests;

xiii) to appoint such Board and Committtes whether standing or temporary as it may deem necessary for the proper functioning of the University and define their constitution, functions, and tenure;

xiv) to delegate by regulations any of its power to the Vice-Chancellor, or such officer of the University, or Board or Committee appointed by it as it may deem fit;

xv) to determine the form, provide for the custody and regulate the use of the common seal of the University;

xvi) to make provisions for consumers' cooperative societies to serve the needs of the students and staff of the University and of the colleges and institutions under its control;

xvii) to exercise other such powers and perform such other duties as may be conferred or imposed on it by under the Act and the Statutes;

xviii) to exercise all powers of the University not otherwise provided for in the Act or the Statutes and all other powers which are requisite to give effect to the provisions of the Act and Statutes.

Like the Court, the Executive Council is also not well represented by the faculty and students. In fact, the Executive Council should have representation from all its institutes like GPCs Agriculture Schools, Research Station and College faculty.

THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

The Academic Council i an advisory body of the University and have the right to advise Vice-Chancellor and the Executive Council on all academic research and extension education matters. The Academic Council consists of the following members: Vice-Chancellor, Directors of Instruction, research, extension education, student welfare, Deans of faculties, Associate Deans, Principals of recognized institutions and affiliated colleges, Heads of the departments, and faculties, Chief Research Officer in-charge of research station, Chief Extension Education Officer, one academic staff member from each faculty, other than HOD elected by the faculty, two members elected by Court from amongst its members who are not employees of government or university, and the Registrar is ex-officio Secretary to the Academic Council.

The Academic Council meets at least once before the beginning of each trimester. It has following powers and duties:

i) to make proposals for establishment of colleges, departments, research stations, libraries, laboratories, demonstration stations, and such other activities necessary in the interest of agricultural development;

    ii) to make recommendations to the Executive Council for the institution of professorship, assistant professorship, lecturership, demonstratorship and posts at research stations, including extension education and in regard to their qualifications, duties, emoluments, and other conditions of service;

    iii) to formulate, modify and revise schemes for the constitution or reconstitution of departments of teaching, research and extension education;

iv) to make regulations relating to courses of study leading
to degrees, diplomas, and certificates, in consultation with
the faculty and Board of studies;

v) to make regulations regarding the admission of students to
the University;

vi) to make recommendations to the Executive Council regarding
post-graduate teaching, research and extension education;

vii) to make regulations regarding the examinations conducted by
the University and the conditions on which students shall be
admitted to such examinations;

viii) to make proposals for allocating subjects to the different
Faculties;

ix) to exercise such other powers and perform such other duties
as may be conferred or imposed on it by or under the provision
of the Act.

The structure of the Academic Council seems tobe well repre-
sented by various institutions. There is scope to make it more autonomous
and powerful. All the academic matters should be finalised by it as a
final authority.

THE FACULTIES

The MPKV has three faculties at present - i) Agriculture,
ii) Agriculture Engineering, and iii) Lower Agriculture Education.
However, the Act provides the scope for the following more faculties
in due course of time - i) Faculty of Basic Science & Humanities,
ii) Faculty of Fisheries, iii) Faculty of Home Science, iv) Faculty of
Vaterinary Science, and v) Faculty of Forestry.

The Vice-Chancellor is empowered to decide the scope and extent of any of the above faculties and to include or delete such branches of that subject as he may decide. Each faculty has its Dean. He is the Chief academic officer of the faculty, responsible for the due observance of the Statutes and Regulations. He is ex-officio Chairman of the faculty. Except the Faculty of Lower Education, each faculty is consisted of the following members:

i) Dean of the faculty, ex-officio Chairman,

ii) The Associate Dean in the faculty,

iii) The Heads of the departments,

iv) One professor of each department other than HOD elected by the academic staff members of the department,

v) The Chief Research Officer,

vi) The Chief Extension Education Officer,

vii) The Principals of affiliated colleges and recognised institutions in the related faculty,

viii) Two associate professors and two lecturers elected by the various groups.

Each faculty may co-opt concerned officers of the State Government or of any Zilla Parishad, as members whose number shall not be chosen for such period and in such manner as may be prescribed, so as to provide adequate representation of extension education workers. Each faculty meets at least once in a trimester, but sufficiently in advance of the Academic Council meeting in order that the recommendations of the faculty can be considered by the Academic Council. The faculties though subordinate to the Academic Council in respect of taking

decisions, may consider and make recommendations to the Council on all administrative and technical matters. As far as possible the Academic Council is guided by relevant faculty in its decision-making. Barring the policy matters, the Dean of each faculty shall take action on the resolution adopted/the faculty, but under intimation to the Vice-Chancellor. Each faculty can constitute such Board of Studies, for such subjects, consisting of such members for such period and in such manner as may be prescribed.

The statutes described the following powers and duties of faculties:

i) to consider and report recommendation referred to it by a Board of Studies;

ii) to refer any matter to a Board of Studies comprised within the faculty for consideration and report;

iii) to consider any report or recommendation referred to it by a Board of Studies;

iv) to appoint a committee of the faculty for any purpose lying within its functions;

v) to hold meetings of the faculty or a Committee there of for the discussion of any matter common interest;

vi) to make any recommendation to the Executive Council and the Academic Council;

vii) to initiate proposals for conferring Honarary Degrees;

viii) to initiate any proposal in respect of any administrative or technical matter covering teaching, research and extension education.

BOARD OF STUDIES

A Board of Studies for a subject or a group of subjects is
constituted by the concerned faculty subject to the approval of Executive
Council. The Board consists of the following members - i) the Head of
the Department of Studies of that subject is ex-officio Chairman,
ii) professor of the subject or subjects for which the Board is consti-
tuted from constituent and affiliated colleges and recognized insti-
tutions, iii) one academic staff members of that subject other than
the professor nominated by the constituent and affiliated colleges and
recognized institutions, iv) two members from the Agriculture Department
(i.e, Development Officer, Campaign Officer, District Agricultural
Officer, or Extension Officers, nominated by the Vice-Chancellor).

The Board may consider and make recommendations to the
faculties on all administrative and technical matters. Though subordinate
to the faculties, a Board of Studies is the basic authority for a subject
or a group of subjects and primary responsibility of giving a shape
to the development of that subject or group of subjects shall rest on
Board of Studies. It may, therefore, initiate any resolution in respect
of all and each of the powers exercised by any of the authorities of
the University.

Each Board of Studies meets at least once in a trimester, but
sufficiently in advance of the concerned faculty meeting in order that
the recommendations of the Board of Studies can be considered by the
faculty. However, the Chairman of the Board of Studies is competent to
call for additional meetings of the Board of Studies whenever necessity

arises, subject to prior approval of the concerned Dean. It recommends text books and reference books, courses of studies related to the subjects under the Board of Studies referred to it by the faculty, Academic Council or Executive Council. It reports all the matters referred to it by Faculty, Academic Council or Executive Council.

Thus the University has its apex level bodies like the Court, Executive Council, Academic Council, Faculties and Board of Studies, to take decision and the administrators like the Vice-Chancellor, Registrar, Comptroller, Directors of Instruction, Research, Extension Education, Student Welfare, Associate Dean and Heads of the department. To facilitate quick decisions delegation of powers should decentralised at all levels. There should be committee to look into delegations of powers to assure quick and proper use. The research scientists and HODs should be given some administrative powers to do their routine activities. The respondents generally feel during their interviews that a thorough analysis of the working of these bodies is urgently required.

-- oOo --

CHAPTER 3

ORGANISATIONAL HEALTH OF MPKV

As discussed in the earlier chapter, 19 areas of organisational
health have been identified. The main basis for these dimension was the
existing task-structure in the University. One way of finding out these
dimensions may have been through factor analysis of the responses given
to various items by the respondents. The factor analysis approach would
have yielded some dimensions that are psychologically meaningful from a
theoretical point of view. Since we are not interested in such dimensions
of organisational health, we used a functional analysis. The number of
items in each category reflects the magnitude of concerns people have
in that particular dimension.

Chapter 2 discusses the task structure and decision making
systems in the MPKV at the macro level. It is likely that a study of
organisational health of the MPKV through the perceptions of its members
will reflect the impact of such structure on the psychological orientat-
ion of the employees to the organisation. The OHI was used to study such
orientations and organisational health asking them to react to the
existing university systems.

Institution Wise Differences and Overall Trends

Table 3.1 shows the institution wise differences on each item
of the 19 areas of organisational health. The MPKV has four teaching

institutions - Rahuri, Poona, Dhule and Kolhapur. These four

colleges are treated as seperate institutions. Instead of giving

seperate identity for each research station, we have combined together

all the research stations to form one group. Except a few major research

stations, most of them are having 4 to 7 technical staff members.

This formed our fifth category for analysis purpose. In the same way

both GTCs and Agriculture Schools were also combined. Before the

formation of MPKV these were running by the State Agriculture Depart-

ment. From teaching institutions and GTCs more than 70% staff members

were included in the study. The results in Table 3.1 are based on the

opinions expressed by the faculty of different institutions at the

time of study (Feb. to May, 1975) by which time the MPKV had about

eight years of existance. Since the MPKV is in its childhood, there

be
seems to/a great scope for the organisational health to change as

time passes and the MPKV grows. However, except PG College, Rahuri,

the other three teaching colleges had a long history before they

became a part of MPKV.

Group wise differences on each dimension of OHI can be seen

from the Table 3.1. The general pattern of organisational health for

the total university can be seen from the total percentages of

respondents for each item (seventh row of percentage for each item

where overall total is given) only. In interpreting the tables

percentages in 'strongly agree' and 'agree' are combined together

although they are shown separately in the tables. Similarly, the

percentages of 'strongly disagree and 'disagree' are taken together.

Since the tables are self explanatory, no attempt is made here to go

into the each item. The following general conclusions can be drawn from the Table 3.1. The fourth column of percentage indicating 'not applicable' to a particular respondents was discarded in interpretation.

1.0 Respondents from College of Agriculture, Kolhapure perceived better general administration and efficiency as compared to other institutions. However, people working at various research stations, GTCs and Agriculture Schools felt consistently poor administration and efficiency in the University.

1.1 A great majority of the respondents ranging from 28 to 46% of the total sample felt that instructions from Central office are not clear, they have to report too many people in their work, delays in announcement of funds leading to lapse of grants, no proper planning is done, lack of interpersonal trust and favouratism.

1.2 One striking area where as many as 63% of the respondents from GTCs and Agriculture Schools realised congruence in opinion that in their daily work they have to report too many people. This point was repeatedly mentioned in their personal interviews also. Perhaps this needs due attention. This also holds true for research scientists.

1.3 There seemed to be general feeling among all the faculty members, except Kolhapur, that changes are made without systematic thinking and planning in the University.

1.4 The Rahuri (59.9%) and Poona (41.1%) faculty strongly felt that there were no opportunities for professional growth for interested teachers.

1.5 Respondents from GTCs and Agriculture Schools experienced to be highly affected by the favouritism in the University, followed by the Dhule (65.8%), research scientists (58.8%) and Poona faculty (42.5%). This is a general concern among the respondents and needs immediate action.

2.0 There is a general feeling that decisional efficiency is very in the University authorities as most of them expressed frequent delays in decision-making, decisions made are not implemented fast and consequently affecting their efficiency adversely.

2.1 Ranging from 44 to 72% of the respondents from various institutions regarded that decisions in the university are taken without consulting those affected. The scientists from research stations revealed a high concern for it.

3.0 Respondents also have stated to experience bureaucratic orientation on the part of university authorities. This was revealed through procedural requirements hindering academic work, having too many administrative hierarchical levels and too many formalities involved even in purchasing simple things. However, faculty members from Poona and Rahuri experienced greater hinderances in their academic work due to procedural requirements.

4.0 The results suggested that respondents considered non-academic administrators (eg., Registrar, Comptroller, etc.) being more powerful in the University.

4.1 There was a stron feeling (ranging from 45 to 83%) among the respondents in various institutions that many of the delays could be avoided if at all the top administation becomes slightly more responsible. There appears to be a lot of frustrations among the respondents.

4.2 The respondents felt that people in the central office at Rahuri are power hungry. Interestingly, the Rahuri respondents themselves expressed the concern for it. However, respondents from Dhule experienced central office people as more power hungry than other respondents.

4.3 There was a general feeling that people in administration use the rules to suit themselves.

5.0 Personnel functions in the university, however, seem to be satisfactory as perceived by the respondents except in one place where they seem to be dissatisfy with the university. About 68% of the total respondents feel that there is no proper evaluation of faculty work-load, hence some are over-loaded and some are under-loaded.

6.0 Excessive administration emerged as an area of great concern for faculty members. However, being the agricultural scientists one can assume some attention to administrative work. However, this should not dominate academic and research work. About 70% of the respondents expressed their views that too much time of principals and HODs is spent on routine administration. At the

same time, they felt that there is a lot of scope for simpli-
fying routine administrative procedures to reduce the work load.
This emerged a single area where 80% of the respondents agreed
for it.

6.1 A general feeling about the central • university office was that
it collects too many details and too often from each department
thus wasting time in preparing unnecessary statements.

7.0 More than one third of the respondents regarded that the various
committees formed by the university do not go at the deeper
level of issue and are rarely clear about their objectives. The
members from GTCs and Agriculture Schools however, felt that
committees in the university are formed for personal benefits.

8.0 A great majority of the faculty experienced that academic people
in the Academic Council do not express their opinions freely
as they are afraid.

8.1 The research scientists as well as GTCs and Agriculture School
Staff experienced lack of concern for not expressing the views
freely by academic people in the Academic Council.

9.0 There seems to be very little inter-departmental and inter-
project communication of academic matters in the various insti-
tutions of university.

10.0 Respondents from Rahuri, Poona and GTCs (including Agriculture
Schools) felt poor communication amongst administrators in the
colleges.

10.1 Faculty from Dhule (63.4%) strongly felt that central admini-
stration (Rahuri) dominates college administration resulting
into lack of freedom in the college.

11.0 The interpersonal relations between college administrators and
departmental academics were perceived as equal. Hence there is
no question of inferior treatment.

12.0 Majority of the faculty members realised that junior faculty
generally do not get adequate guidance from seniors as seniors
are always over-loaded with administrative work. This feeling
is adversely affecting their output and creating a sense of
frustration.

13.0 Teaching is one of the important activities of the university.
The faculty from Rahuri and Dhule expressed inadequate emphasis
on teaching.

13.1 Except the respondents from Kolhapur, majority of them from other
institutes thought that persons without having adequate teaching
experience or skills are permitted to teach in this university.

14.0 College teaching climate was perceived as adequate in most of the
institutions except the respondents from Dhule who regarded as
inadequate in their college.

15.0 Departmental teaching climate was found to be generally adequate
in teaching institutions.

16.0 Research scientists from various research stations strongly
felt that research results are not used in teaching, most

research workers have too many projects to work on simultaneously, decisions on research grants are taken by non-technical people, and too much delay in between submission of research project and the time they are sanctioned.

16.1 Faculty from Dhule had a feeling that research objectives of the university are not clear.

16.2 Delays in sanctioning of research proposals emerged as general consensus among the respondents. This could be avoided by taking appropriate actions.

16.3 Faculty from research stations experienced that they were not allowed to submit research proposals to outside agencies directly. About 70% of them felt that there were no opportunities for professional growth of interested research workers. This feeling was also supported by the respondents from Rahuri, Dhule and Poona institutions.

17.0 There was a general concern about the research council that it has no organisational mechanism which ensures to understand the needs of interested research workers.

18.0 There seems to be strong agreement among the respondents that University has clear cut admission policies and procedures for students' admission, admission criteria are communicated to college principals, admissions are based on academic considerations and students preference and employment are given due attention by the university.

19.0 Again there seems to be common feeling that university is very prompt in announcing the examination results but there is a lot of scope for the simplification of examination procedures.

In conclusion it can be said that there exists a great scope to improve the various task structures in the university. The respondents from the college of agriculture, Kolhapur, felt better organisational health on most of the task areas.

Designation wise Differences on OHI

Designation on achieved status has been found to be an important factor influencing the organisational health of the employees. OHI responses were analysed by designation wise to determine the influence of it on organisational health. The obtained results are given in Table 3.2. For classifying the respondents into various designational categories, salary (pay scale) was taken as a basis for classification. The designations mentioned in Table 3.2 are, infact, include other similar grades also. Here also for the purpose of interpretation columns 5 and 6 (on the one hand (agreeable responses) and 8 and 9 (disagreeable) the other one combined together. For analysis purpose column 4 (not applicable) was not taken into consideration. Only those areas are discussed below where the respondents experienced poor organisational health. However, the first row where one member did not mention his designation may be discarded since it has practically no meaning. Somewhere while interpreting the second and third categories (Senior professor, Associate Dean etc., and Professor) were combined together as most of them are HODS and members of various

university committees. The following observations may be drawn from the Table 3.2:

1.0 Results in Table 3.2 revealed no significant differences by designation on general administration and efficiency. However, respondents at the higher level showed a tendency to perceive poor administration and efficiency as compared to low level. Routine activities, daily paper work, release of funds, lapse of funds, and no systematic planning appeared to be some important areas where poor administrative efficiency was expressed. Most of the professors felt lapse of fund because of delays in announcing.

1.1 Commitment to work is there in the university, but the respondents feel that people do not trust each other and this creates a feeling of frustration and favouratism among them. Opportunities for professional growth are less in the university. This was a common concern.

2.0 Respondents from most of the categories expressed that decisional efficiency in the university is very poor. People at the higher level as well as at the lower level feel that delays in implementation of decisions had adversely affected the production work (Item 7). Arbitrary decisions are also taken without consulting the persons who are affected.

3.0 Excessive administration and bureaucratic functioning in the university appeared to be of great concern to all respondents. Faculty at the higher level revealed strong opinion that rules and procedural requirements hindered the academic work with too many administrative hierarchical orders.

4.0 Purchase system in the university is found to be an important
area for causing frustration in the faculty of GTCs, professors,
specialists and associate professors. Q ality of materials was
also not good. The junior research assistants, professors and
associate professors expressed that rules in the university give
the impression that people cannot be trusted.

In general, the university administrators were perceived as close-
minded (100% by the senior professors and associate deans) hence
not open to any suggestion and at the same time do not learn anything
from their experiences.

4.1 The academicians general do not feel that they are powerful in
the present university structure but people at the lower categories
such as research assistants etc. somehow feel that they are powerful.

4.2 Half of the respondents regarded that non-academic people (Registrar,
clerks etc) in the University are very powerful. This is a great
concern for professional academicians.

4.3 A general feeling was that if the people at the central office
become more responsible, most of the delays and other problems could
be solved. About half of them think that these are power   hungry
and suit the rules to their needs.

4.4 Professors, associate professors, and assistant professors showed
that university authorities are not interested in developmental
activities.

4.5 Respondents from all categories agree that selection of academic personnel is done on merit and posts are created on the university needs.

5.0 There appears to be no proper evaluation of faculty work load in the university, so some are over-worked and some under-worked as expressed by their opinion. One third of the respondents feel that faculty members are not encouraged to go for higher studies.

6.0 Interesting, 80 to 100% of the Associate Deans, professors, associate professors, and assistant professors (all are directly involved in teaching activities) agree that too much time of principals and HODs is spent on routine administrative jobs, and there is scope to simplify it. People at the lower level also agree with this.

7.0 The various committee formed by the university are perceived as escaping from their responsibilties than to study the issue at the deeper level. Particularly people at the higher level (perhaps who are members of these committees) felt it more strongly than at the lower level.

7.1 Senior research assistants felt that the various committees formed by the University are rarely clear about their objectives. Associate professors also regarded that various committees formed by the university are escaping from their responsibilities.

8.0 About one third of the respondents pointed out that people in Academic Council lack concern as they do not express their opinion freely and they are not serious to make the university distinguished in agriculture.

9.0   More than one third of the respondents perceive little inter-
      departmental communication on academic matters and interproject
      work. This was realised greater at higher positions.

10.0 Poor coordination amongst the administratrators was realised by
      the respondents at the lower level while more than one third felt
      at all levels that college administrators are dominated by the
      central office.

11.0 There was a general expression that college administrators do
      not treat departmental academics as inferiors.

12.0 There was a genuine feeling from all the respondents that junior
      faculty do not get adequate guidance from seniors as they are
      always overloaded with administrative work.

13.0 The teaching climate in the university showed that persons with-
      out having adequate teaching experience or skills are permitted
      to teach (49%) in the university.

14.0 However, the respondents feel that emphasis on teaching is adequate
      in colleges and departments.

15.0 Professors think that research objectives of the university are
      not clear, projects are not in accordance with their objectives,
      rese-arch results are not used in teaching, decisions on research
      grant are taken by non-technical people, delay in sanctioning of
      projects, and no opportunities for growth in the university.
      These concerns are shared by other people also.

16.0 Decision making on research projects seems to be poor as their
      is no proper adequate representation of research workers on it
      and no organisational mechanism to ensure the needs of research
      workers.

17.0 Regarding students admission and allotment there was a general
feeling that admission policies are clear-cut, admission criteria
are communicated to college principals, admission is based on
academic consideration, allotment is done in consultation with the
concerned teachers and students preferences are given due attention.

18.0 A high percentage of respondents, however, feel that there is a
lot of scope for simplification of examination procedures in the
university. People at the higher level perceived this need more
strongly than at the lower areas like general administration,
purchase system, bureaucratic procedural orientation, decisional
efficiency, poor coordination among the administrators, research
activities and simplification of examination procedures need
immediate attention by the university. Respondents from various
categories showed greater similarity in their responses. However,
respondents at higher level showed greater dissatisfaction from
various task structures as compared to lower level respondents.

Department Wise Differences on OHI

Departmental climate varies from department to department.
Therefore one can assume some difference in organisational health also.
All the respondents were classified in 11 departments. The research
scientists in all the stations are working under the technical guidance
of a particular head of the department of Rahuri. These research
scientists were also included in the sample with respect to their
affiliation of a particular department. The analysis will help to
understand at the macro level. As many as 36 respondents did not

mention their departments. These formed a seperate category 'unidenti-
fied' and while discussing the results these were neglected. Like the
earlier two tables, here also the percentages of 'strongly agree' and
'agree' were combined together. Similarly for 'strongly disagree' and
'disagree' were taken together. If any of these two exceeded above 30%
then only results were considered significant. Column four 'not applicable'
was dropped while discussing the results. Here only a comprehensive trend
is discussed. If any one who is interested in detail of these results
may look into Table 3.3 Broadly the following conclusions can be drawn
from the data.

1.0   Department wise differences do exist in perception of general
       efficiency dimension of the university. Respondents from the
       Horticulture, Agriculture Extension & Plant Pathology departments
       regarded that frequent confusing orders are issued from the central
       office. People from Horticulture department felt that the language
       used in these orders is not polite and offensive.

1.1   A greater percentage of respondents feel that in their work they
       have to report too many people. This shows excessive bureaucratic
       orientation in the general administration.

1.2   Release of funds, delays in announcement, no systematic planning,
       less mutual trust, no consideration for some important units, no
       opportunities for professional growth for interested teachers
       and prevailing favouritism in the university are reported by
       most of the respondents in various department.

1.3   There was a great concern for these issues by the respondents of Horticulture department.

2.0   Decisional efficiency seems to be an important concern for the respondents irrespective of departments. For example the respondents in general feel that implementation of decisions is poor (43%), delays in decision making (51.3%) and without consulting those who affected from these decisions (51.6%).

2.1   Respondents from the Agricultural Engineering department somehow feel that there is no proper representation of teachers in the University Court.

3.0   More than half of the faculty felt that bureaucratic orientation, hierarchical systems, too many formalities in daily work and poor quality of materials purchased by the university have created frustration among the respondents. For an academic institute such bureaucratic orientations may hinder the work of faculty members. These issues need a close look by the University.

4.0   Regarding the administrators in the university the respondents expressed a mixed feeling from various departments. They feel that academic, non-academic, clerical staff etc. are very powerful in the present system. Administrators do not take genuine interest in the development of university, no interest to learn from the past experiences and make the rules to suit themselves.

4.1   People from the departments of Agriculture Chemistry, Agriculture Economics and Agricultural Engineering feel that central

administrators (both academic and non-academic) treat college administrators as **inferiors.**

5.0 There is a strong need to design a proper system to evaluate the faculty work load in the university. As many as 67.6% of the respondents feel that at present no proper system exists. One third respondents also feel that they are not encouraged to go for higher studies.

6.0 Excessive administration in the university is a great concern to the respondents. 69.4% of the respondents feel that HODs and college principal spend their time on routine jobs which can be simplified to reduce the load (79.6%). This is because the central office collects too many details thus wasting their time (64.5%).

7.0 People in the university do not have favourable attitudes toward various committes. They feel that these are formed to escape responsibilities than to study the issues at deeper levels and are not clear about their objectives. However, respondents from agri Engineering Language and Horticulture departments seem to have more unfavourable attitudes toward these committees.

8.0 About one third of the respondents express their views that people in Academic Council do not express their views freely because they lack concern, and afraid. Respondents from agricultural Economics department strongly agreed for it.

9.0 There appears to be little inter-project communication on research and academic matters in the university. This was realised by all the departments. _

10.0 Poor coordination amongst the campus administrators was perceived by the Horticulture and Agricultural Chemistry respondents. All the departments expressed that college administrators are dominated by the central administration.

11.0 No conflict was realised between departmental academic and college administrators.

12.0 The HODs do treat department faculty as equal and do trust but the junior faculty do not get adequate guidance from seniors as they always overloaded with administrative work.

13.0 Generally respondents feel that emphasis on teaching is adequate in this university and the teaching climate is good. However, they feel that (particularly Agricultural Engineering, Agricultural Economics, Agricultural Botany, and Agronomy department). Persons without having adequate experience are permitted to teach in this university.

14.0 Respondents in general feel that emphasis on teaching is adequate in colleges.

15.0 Departmental teaching climate is also perceived adequate by the respondents.

16.0 Horticulture and Agricultural Engineering departments feel that the research objectives of the university are not clear and are not in accordance with the objectives of the university.

16.1 About one third of the respondents in all departments feel that research results are not used in teaching and most of the researchers have to work simultaneously on various projects.

16.2 Decisions on research grants are taken by the non-technical people in the university. This was felt by 36% of the total sample. The respondents from Horticulture, Plant Pathology and Agricultural Engineering realised this very much as compared to other departments.

16.3 Similar views are expressed about research activities in the university like delays in sanction, faculty are not allowed to submit research proposals to outside agencies and competent persons are not encouraged to submit research proposal. Professional growth for research staff has no place in the present system.

17.0 A great majority of the respondents feel lack of organisational mechanism to understand the needs of researcher worker in the university. Respondents from Agri Extension, Entomology, and Economics particularly feel about it.

18.0 Respondents from the departments of Plant Pathology and Agricultural Chemistry strongly feel that allotment of students is done without consulting the concerned teachers.

19.0 Examination system revealed that respondents perceived a great scope for the simplification of examination procedures in the university.

The results revealed that respondents from various departments showed variations on different task areas. The results are discussed above by task area.

Taking together, it can be concluded that organisational health as perceived the respondents is poor in the MPKV. Areas like general administration, decisional efficiency, personnel function, research and examination system seem to be important areas where they expressed poor organisational health. Bodies like the Academic Council, Research Committees etc were also found to cause poor organisational health. Improvement in the general administration was the sole concern for the respondents.

-- oOo --

CHAPTER 4

PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING

The Decisional Participation Scale was used to measure
decision making systems in the university. It consisted of 41 items
as seen in Appendix B. The scale measures four categories of parti-
cipation as given below:

1. Decisional Irrelevance indicating that the respondent does not
   participate at present in decisions related to that issue and
   has no desire to participate in future also.

2. Decisional Satisfaction indicating that the respondent is parti-
   cipating at present in decisions related to that issue and desire
   to continue participation.

3. Decisional Deprivation indicating that the respondent is not
   participating at present but desires to participate.

4. Decisional Over-participation indicating that the respondent is
   participating at present although he is not interested in
   participation.

The obtained responses were analysed into these four
categories of decisional participation. The various items of the
scale were grouped into different task areas. There were in total
10 task areas which covered 41 items. The following 10 task areas
were covered.

1. <u>Goal Setting</u>: This includes the decisions on departmental goals and work plans.

2. <u>Institutional Policies</u>: This deals with the policies and procedures of the University and its institutions.

3. <u>Financial Planning</u>: Decisions related to planning and allocation of departmental and institutional budgets, funds etc formed this task area.

4. <u>Personnel Function</u>: Decisions related to faculty recruitment, promotions, development etc, are included in this area.

5. <u>Curricular</u> decisions including development of courses, allotment, time-table, syllabus etc.

6. <u>Student admission and discipline</u> related decisions formed this area.

7. <u>Teaching</u> related issues including teaching load, teaching policies were included in this task area.

8. <u>Examination</u> related decisions including appointment of examiners, examination system formed this decisional participation on area.

9. <u>Research</u> related decisions including research work load, allotment of projects etc were included here.

10. <u>Work Facilities</u> task area included decisions related to the day-to-day requirement of staff, library facilities etc.

Decisional Participation Patterns:
Institution-wise Differences

Table 4.1 shows the percentage of respondents falling in four decisional participation categories. Column 4,5,6 and 7 in the table

deal with decisional irrelevance, deprivation, overparticipation
and satisfaction respectively. Respondents who checked both the
categories in the decisional participation scale were analysed.
Those who checked one of the category were dropped while analyzing
the data. Respondents who circled the item as irrelevant were
excluded (circling zero as per instructions in the questionnaire)
in calculating the percentage. Thus the number of respondents differs
from item to item and indicates the number responding to each item.

Broadly, the following conclusions can be drawn from
the Table 4.1.

1.0   As may be expected, decisional over-participation (partici-
pation at present but no desire to participate in future) is experienced
by very few respondents (generally 0.5 to 3.6% of the respondents)
uniformaly in most of the task-areas.

1.1   Respondents from the College of Agriculture, Kolhapur and
Poona felt such over participation more as compared to others. This
was found in most of the areas.

2.0   Taking a 40% response as a cut off point to indicate the
high presence of a decisional participation category, decisional
irrelevance seems to be experienced more in the areas: of (1) setting
institutional policies and procedures;(ii) formulating rules and
regulations of the college; (iii) planning departmental budget;
(iv) planning institutional budget; (v) allocation of departmental
funds; (vi) deciding teacher promotions, recruiting new faculty,

deciding travel plans, etc; (vii) student admission policies
and procedures, allotment of students to PG teachers, instructional
policies, student admission and appointing examiners; and (viii)
deciding college requirements. These areas may be taken as an indicator
of a sense of apathy of faculty to broad institutional affairs.

2.1   Consistantly about 30% of the total respondents experienced
decisional deprivation in the decision making task areas of the
university. However, areas like goal setting, institutional policies,
laboratory and other financial support, personnel function, appointment
of research staff to work with faculty, decision on staff development
(higher studies etc), teaching, examination, initiating research
project and deciding library and day to day requirement.

2.2   Respondents from all the three agriculture colleges and
research stations experienced more decisional deprivation than the
other respondents.

2.3   Decisional satisfaction was experienced only in a few
areas viz., introduction of new courses, allotment of courses,
deciding time-table (mostly curriculum area); deciding teachers'
work-load, setting up evaluation policies, initiating research
project and deciding library requirements. Areas like institutional
policies, financial planning personnel function, student and
discipline and examination seem to be dissatisfying than other areas
as most of them experienced decisional deprivation on these areas.

3.0   Respondents from Rahuri express decisional irrelevance
on the following areas - institutional policies and procedures (47.8%);

planning institutional budget (73.5%); deciding teacher promotions (51.4%); recruiting new faculty (58.8%) and deciding faculty requirement of the college (57.8%).

3.1   For the Poona respondents the areas of decisional irrelevance include institutional policies, financial planning, personnel function, student discipline, and policies, and decision on student admission .

3.2   Planning institutional budget, recruiting new faculty, student policies, and discipline were the major areas of irrelevance for the Dhule respondents.

3.3   Institutional planning, allocation of departmental funds, personnel functiona, decision on student policies, and appointing of examiners were the few areas where the Kolhapur respondents expressed irrelevance.

3.4   Research scientists generally feel that institutional policies, financial planning, personnel function, curriculum, teaching examination, research and facilities are the areas of irrelevance for them from the decisional participational point of view. It is worthwhile to note that the research scientists revealed a higher percentages of irrelevance as compared to other respondents.

3.5   Respondents from the GTCs and Agriculture Schools, however, expressed less decisional irrelevance on most of the areas as compared to other respondents.

4.0   The Goal Setting task area revealed that the research scientists expressed greater decisional deprivation and the Kolhapur respondents experienced greater decisional satisfaction than the other respondents.

5.0   Institutional Policies seemed to be a major concern for all the respondents. Only a few respondents (17.0%) showed decisional satisfaction against the 41.3% of decisional irrelevance and 39.8 of decisional deprivation. Formulating rules and regulations for colleges also revealed similar picture.

6.0   Financial Planning, however, revealed that about one fourth of the respondents experienced decisional satisfaction for planning departmental budget, but for institutional budget it was only 17.8% respondents were found to be having decisional satisfaction.

7.0   Personnel Function area showed greater percentage of decisional deprivation and irrelevance as compared to overparticipation and decisional satisfaction.

8.0   The Dhule respondents expressed more decisional deprivation on the curriculum task area - like allotment of courses, deciding time table, prescribing text book etc. Finalization of syllabus seems to be a great concern for the Poona respondents as most of them showed deprivation.

9.0   There seems to be a general feeling of decisional irrelevance and deprivation among the all respondents regarding student affairs. Here faculty participation should be encouraged.

10.0   Respondents from Poona and Dhule experienced less participation on the teaching related activities.

11.0   Respondents generally feel that decisions on research activities are satisfying except the Poona respondents who feel less satisfaction on sanctioning and allotment of research work-load. The Dhule faculty also expressed more decisional deprivation on initiating research projects.

12.0   In facilities related tasks the decisional deprivation and irrelevance seemed to be more than the satisfaction.

From these conclusions, it appears that decisional satisfaction is less than the decisional deprivation and irrelevance. Generally, most of the respondents either reveal irrelevance or deprivation on most of the tasks. However, considering the complexity of the organisation, the trend is indicative of participative academic atmosphere. But some areas like facilities, teaching, research, student policies, curriculum, examination etc where participation of faculty can be encouraged. The scope for increasing participation could be explored by seeing the each task area results.

Designations and Decisional Participation

As mentioned in earlier chapter, all the 363 respondents were classified by their designations. Salary (basic pay) was main criteria for classification. Thus, in total 7 categories were formed. For studying the decisional participation by different categories of employees, percentage of respondents under each of the four decisional

participation by different categories of employees, percentage of respondents under each of the four decisional participation categories were computed designation wise. The results are presented in Table __. While computing the percentage those who have checked only one of the response alternative (either current or desired participation) for any item in the questionnaire were not included for final analysis for that particular item. From table 4.2, the following observations can be drawn:

1.0   Table 4.2 shows that there is a continuous increase in the percentages of decisional irrelevance as one goes from high level to the low level of staff. These results are in accordance with the University statutes and act where lower staff members are not allowed to participate in various decision making systems.

2.0   People at the higher level showed more decisional satisfaction on goal setting tasks as compared to lower level. Respondents seem to be equally divided on decisional satisfaction and deprivation.

3.0   Setting institutional policies and procedures tasks revealed that about 80% of the respondents felt irrelevance and deprivation on this area. About 17% of the respondents expressed decisional satisfaction. Like the goal setting task here also respondents like Principals, Professors, Associate Professor, Specialists, etc. felt greater decisional satisfaction as compared to the respondents at lower level.

4.0   Financial planning task also revealed the same trend. Areas
like planning departmental and institutional budget, allocation of
funds, determining laboratry and other developmental needs appear to
be interest of some selected people. That is why most of the respondents
perceived these tasks as irrelevant. However, professors showed signi-
ficantly more deprivation on allocation of departmental funds.

5.0   Personnel function task area also seemed to less interested
for the respondents. Activities like teacher promotion, recruiting
new faculty, appointing research staff etc. are handled by the admini-
strators. The analysis also revealed that only a few respondents showed
decisional satisfaction while decisional irrelevance was the highest.
However, respondents from higher categories feel that they were deprived
in appointing the research staff to work with them. A majority of the
respondents feel decisional deprivation (52.8%) for staff developmental
activities.

6.0   The results about the curricular task area indicate that
employees at lower levels are either uncorned about having a say in
most of the activities and whenever they want to have a say, it is likely
that they would not get involved. Respondents at the lower level show
more decisional irrelevance to these areas. Generally the results
indicate that at the higher level there is a scope for improving the
feelings of participation and to some extent at the lower level too.
As the MPKV is in its formative years, certain amount of directions
are necessary from the top. As a consequence of this some employees
may feel deprived of participation when the University set up is

stabilised, strategies for increasing feelings of participation at all level may be thought of. Such feelings of participation in staff go a long way in ensuring involvement and hard-work.

7.0   Student policies and discipline also showed greater irrelevance to the respondents. For example areas like student admission, discipline policies, allotment of students to a teacher etc. offer scope for teacher to exercise autonomy. The teachers should be given sufficient participation in these activities. People at the higher showed greater decisional satisfaction in these areas.

8.0   A high percentage of employees at the higher as well as lower level state to have been deprived of decisional participation in teaching task area. In cases where there is no participation, there is irrelevance rather than participation. There exists a great scope to involve the faculty members in the areas like setting instructional policies for department, deciding faculty teaching loads and allotment of students.

9.0   A similar trend was observed regarding research and examination task areas. Involvement at the lower level seems to be negligible and they feel more deprivation in these activities.

10.0   There appears to be very low autonomy to the faculty members even for taking their day-to-day decisions. Respondents at the lower and higher feel greater decisional,decisional deprivation on facilities like deciding their faculty requirement, requirement of college, library requirement etc.

To conclude, ranging from 60 to 90% of the respondents feel decisional deprivation and irrelevance on most of the task areas. This is an indicator that participation is very poor by various categories of employees. Areas like curriculu, teaching, research, examination etc where faculty can be involved for participation need due attention. A policy of ensuing participation by the staff in different task areas may be evolved. Such a policy may differ from area to area or within the same task area for different dimension. A blue print may be helpful for the University to set up such policies. Areas like goal setting, personnel policies, financial budget etc. where it is not practically possible to involve all the employees, but a formal consultation
of
will be helpful to create a sense/participation among the employees.

Department-wise Differences on Decisional Participation

Responses on this questionnaire were also analysed to see if there are any department-wise differences in participation pattern. Similar analysis was carried out and the results are presented in Table 4.3. The following observations are made from Table ___ :

1.0   Determining departmental goals and work plans revealed that decisional deprivation was felt by most of the departments in this area. Respondents from the departments of Animal Husbandry, Language, Agriculture Botany and Agricultural Engineering felt greater decisional deprivation. Respondents from the Horticulture Department felt greater decisional satisfaction (69.2%) than the other respondents.

2.0   Respondent from the Horticulture Department again felt
greater decisional-satisfaction on institutional policies. Taking
together irrelevance and deprivation categories as many as 80% of
the respondents either perceived decisional irrelevance or decisional
deprivation on setting institutional policies and formulating rules
and regulations for colleges. A small percentage ranging from 1.6%
to 2.1% felt overparticipation.

3.0   Financial planning task showed that even at the departmental
level faculty members are not involved. Only 24.1% of the total
respondents from various department feel decisional-satisfaction.
Agriculture Economics department is found to have the highest involve-
ment of faculty. Respondents expressed greater decisional irrelevance
for institutional budget planning. Respondents from four departments
did not participate at all in institute budget planning and allocation
of departmental funds. This requires immediate attention. The respondents
from the Agriculture Extension department felt more decisional deprivation
on departmental needs. Horticulture department respondents again revealed
greater decisional satisfaction on decision about departmental needs.

4.0   Respondents from various department feel decisional irrelevance
for teacher promotions, recruiting new faculty and travel plan but
decisional deprivation was greater on appointment of research staff
to work with them, and deciding on staff development. The latter
two areas of importance for faculty and need greater involvement.

5.0   Curriculum task area also revealed poor participation of faculty.
Areas like introducing new courses, designing time table, prescribing

text books, finalising syllabus, decision about the paper etc. where involvement of all faculty members will result into greater satisfaction and efficiency. Agriculture Chemistry, Agriculture Extension, Agriculture Economics, Horticulture and Plant Pathology departments showed greater decisional deprivation on these issues.

6.0   Quite a few respondents in different areas of student policies and teaching tasks feel decisional-satisfaction, while majority of them feel unconcerned about their participation in student admission policies, discipline policies, allotment of students to teachers, setting instructional policies, teaching work load etc. Some selected few people are participating in these areas. The University authorities may work out strategies for involving more scientists from all levels.

7.0   A great variation was found from department to department regarding examination task area. Respondents from Horticulture Department feel greater decisional satisfaction than respondents from other departments. Decisional irrelevance was felt more by the respondents from Plant Pathology Agriculture Botany, Animal Husbandry and Language departments. A high percentage of respondents feel decisional deprivation also. The departments should be given some autonomy in the areas of appointing examiners, setting evaluation policies, deciding timing and procedure of examinations, and appointing examiners for the paper which he teaches.

8.0   Similar observations can be made for research and facilities task areas. It is important to note that a great majority of the respondents feel unconcerned with the research activities and express

greater decisional deprivation on these areas. The research strategies
of the MPKV need a thorough check up since it is a major activity of
the university.

The above discussion makes clear that there are some department-
wise differences in decisional participation patterns of the MPKV. At
present it appears that the University has little scope for decentrali-
sation through delegation of powers. The HODs should be given some
powers to act effectively. Faculty participation in the decision making
of departmental activities should be encouraged. The HODs should be
treated as the administrative head of the departments. It is interesting
to note that the respondents from Horticulture Department consistently
showed greater decisional satisfaction on most of the task areas. This
department should be studied in-depth to understand the mechanism of
faculty participation.

* * *

CHAPTER 5

ORGANISATIONAL DYNAMICS OF MPKV INSTITUTIONS

One of us visited 18 institutions of this University. In
order to assess the problems and dynamics of these institutions interviews
were held with senior as well as junior employees. The main focus of
the interview was to understand in depth problems faced by the University
members, their expectations from the University, their suggestions on
the organisation dynamics, delegation of power etc. The interview was
held with individual. However, there was no structured schedule for it,
but the interviewer had the orientation to understand the issues and
problems dominant in the minds of university members with future impli-
cation. A few problems were similar to those of questionnaires discussed
in Chapter 3 and 4. The list of institutions visited is given in
Appendix 3. The interviews were recorded and the following conclusions
may be drawn:

1.   Heads of the department at Rahuri as well as in colleges should
be given some administrative powers to handle their day-today-routine
activities. At present even for getting simple things they have to
approach the administration. This is developing a feeling of powerlessness
among the HODs.

2.   There was a common feeling expressed at all levels that
extension wing should be strengthened at colleges to carry out the

extension activities. The university should form an "Extension Council" inviting research scientists, extension experts, and professional scientists at each zone.

3.   Research stations are involved only in research activities. No extension or teaching activity is done by the research scientists. In fact, there is no proper coordination at present in teaching, research and extension services. The research scientists should be involved in teaching in extension activities. Unless the research scientists go to villagers and become sensitive to the needs of community, they are likely to produce research needed by ICAR or MPKV rather than what is needed by villagers.

4.   Frequent transfer of research scientists should be stopped. Promotion should be given where a research scientist is working. If there is no post, then provision should be made to create a higher position. Most of the research scientists complained that when they start concentrating on their work, they are transferred.

5.   The confidential report (CR) needs a thorough evaluation. In fact performance appraisal should be based on a systematic, orderly and objective method of evaluating the present potential resources of in the organisation. Respondents from all the institutes express apprehension about the present existing CR systems. A study should be made to analyse the present CR system used in MPKV and whether it facilitates or inhibits the employee growth.

6.   ·   Some of the research scientists are working very effectively. But lack of reward on incentive system has created frustrations. Such system will help the university to keep the people moving. Some research stations (like Kolhapur, Padegaon, Shinde Park, etc.) are getting good receipts from their products-equally to their research stations total budget. These scientists are lacking encouragement from the university. They feel in MPKV good and poor research scientists are getting equal treatment.

7.   In some research stations where research schemes (like ICAR) are going, there is lot of confusions about the roles of the scientists. Some research stations are facing a great threat because of undefined roles. The university should define clearly their powers so/they can work properly.

8.   Associate Deans (who are the administrative heads of the research stations in their respective zones) do not have sufficient time to see the progress of research stations. Same is the case for their technical administrator who sits at Rahuri (the HODs). This dual system has affected the performance of research scientists. A serious thinking should be given to reorganise the existing pattern of research stations.

9.   Seeing the present situations the research scientists should be given some more financial and administrative powers. The procedure of budgetory allocation needs to be thought of. A simplified system may be thought of for budgetory allocation. The research scientists

generally feel that their funds are diverted to other activities
(particularly at central campus and colleges). This should be avoided.
It has hampered their productivity. After repeated requests for sanction-
ing budget, nothing comes from the University.

10.   Many research scientists expressed concern that they are having
too much paper work. They claimed to spend 50 to 60% of their time in
routine administrative matters. According to them the University collects
unnecessary informations.

11.   According to the existing system only a few staff members can
go for higher studies and training programmes. The participants strongly
feel to have reorientation programmes for research scientists. Faculty
development programmes are also providing limited opportunities for
higher studies, workshop etc. The best thing would be to set up an
internal training development unit to look after these affairs. Since
the research stations are doing different researches, it would be quite
get
helpful to organise activity-based/together of the scientists. The
function of sponsoring to the seminar, workshop, training etc should
be centralised to the research specialist or head of the research
station. At present it goes to the University and at the eleventh
hour they get the permission.

12.   We are disappointed to see poor communication between State
extension workers and the research scientists. More steps should be
taken by the research scientists to keep them in contact with the
extension workers of the state and share their experiences.

13.   A great majority of the respond-nts expressed that the present selection, promotion, demotion, termination etc policies need thorough reevaluation.

14.   It was generally felt by the respondents during their interviews that teaching and technical matters should not be decided in the Court.

15.   We were equally disappointed to see the poorly managed Agricultural Schools. They are not provided with sufficient staff and other facilities. Those who are teaching in these schools are not qualified to teach these students. Since these schools attract poor rural students, special emphasis should be given to reorganise these school to become effective instrument for change.

16.   A full fledge Dean's post should be created for Lower Education.

17.   Scientists feel that work is suffering as most of the posts at the apex level are lying vacant. Alternative arrangements should be made to train next junior person where posts are lying vacant because of employees sent for higher training etc.

18.   Most of the scientists complain that inter personal relation-ship matters a lot in getting things done. Research projects are sanctioned very late and that their productivity is being affected. Process of sanctioning the research projects should be simplified.

19.   Gramsevak Training Centres & Agriculture Schools should be treated equally important as the constituent colleges. The curriculum

in the GTCs and Agricultural School should be prepared by seeing the needs of the people and society.

20.   Some of the research scientists complained that most of the funds are spent at the central office and no attention is given to any of the research station to make distinguished in research.

21.   One serious point, which we feel, 1 of great importance is poor management of university products. Lack of transport, cool storage etc. have destroyed many university products. A full marketing cell should be formed for this.

22.   The faculty members strongly feel that headship should be r.t ted among the all members of the department. Continuous headship is developing alienation and fear among the faculty.

Indian Institute of Management

Ahmedabad

Organisational Health Inventory

Several items are given below that deal with the dynamics of this university and campus. These items have been evolved from the discussions with different faculty groups of university. Different members of this university see this system in different ways. You may not agree with some items and you may agree with some others. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the statements given below on a five-point scale. If you strongly agree with that statement encircle 5, if you agree encircle 4, if you are not sure encircle 3, if you don't agree encircle 2, and if you strongly disagree encircle 1. Please indicate in encircling 0 if an item is not applicable to you.

```
1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Not sure
4 = agree
5 = Strongly agree
```

	Not appli-cable	To little or no degree			1 g d
1. Decisions made in this University are not implemented fast	0	1	2	3	4
2. The rules and procedural requirements here hinder academic work	0	1	2	3	4
3. Administrative authorities in this University are not open to suggestions	0	1	2	3	4
4. Decision makers in this University do not seem to learn from experience	0	1	2	3	4
5. Selection of academic personnel in this University is not made on merit	0	1	2	3	4
6. Posts created here do not reflect University needs	0	1	2	3	4
7. Delays in decisions here affect the productive work adversely	0	1	2	3	4
8. Emphasis on teaching is ainadequate –					
(a) in this University	0	1	2	3	4
(b) in my college	0	1	2	3	4
(c) in my department	0	1	2	3	4
9. There is poor coordination amongst the administrators –					
(a) in the Central Office	0	1	2	3	4
(b) in this campus	0	1	2	3	4
(c) between Central Office and this campus	0	1	2	3	4
10. People working in the University Central Office are very powerful –					
(a) academic administrators, e.g. Director of Research, Post Graduate Studies	0	1	2	3	4
(b) non-academic administrators – Registrar, Director, Purchase etc.	0	1	2	3	4
(c) clerical staff	0	1	2	3	4

....

```
                              1 = Strongly disagree
                              2 = Disagree
                              3 = Not sure
                              4 = Agree
                              5 = Strongly agree
```

	Not appli- cable	To little or no degree			To a very great degree	
11. a. Central administrators treat campus academics as inferiors	0	1	2	3	4	5
b. Campus administrators treat college academics as inferiors	0	1	2	3	4	5
c. College administrators treat departmental academics as inferiors	0	1	2	3	4	5
d. Departmental heads treat department faculty as inferiors	0	1	2	3	4	5
12. There are too many administrative hierarchical levels in this University	0	1	2	3	4	5
13. Conflicting orders are issued often from the central office in confusion	0	1	2	3	4	5
14. The language used in correspondence from the central office is not polite and offensive	0	1	2	3	4	5
15. The instructions from central office are not always clear	0	1	2	3	4	5
16. Academic people in the academic council do not express their opinions freely						
(a) because they are afraid	0	1	2	3	4	5
(b) because they lack concern	0	1	2	3	4	5
17. In your work you have to report to too many people	0	1	2	3	4	5
18. Too much time of the Principals and Heads of the Departments is spent on croutine administration	0	1	2	3	4	5
19. There is scope for simplifying routine administrative procedures to reduce the load	0	1	2	3	4	5
20. The routine administrative work can be not shared with others in the college/department	0	1	2	3	4	5

	Not appli-cable	To little or no degree			To gr de

21. **(a)** The research objectives of the Univ. are not clear — 0 — 1 2 3 4

(b) Research Projects are not in accordance with these objectives — 0 — 1 2 3 4

(c) Research results are not used in teaching — 0 — 1 2 3 4

(d) Research workers don't know clearly what they are expected to do — 0 — 1 2 3 4

(e) Most research workers have too many projects to work on simultaneously — 0 — 1 2 3 4

22. There is very little inter-departmental communication of academic matters in this campus — 0 — 1 2 3 4

23. There is very little inter-project communication of research work in this Campus — 0 — 1 2 3 4

24. The board of management decision-making on academic matters is poor because there is no representation of teaching faculty on it — 0 — 1 2 3 4

25. Research councils decision-making on research projects is poor as there is no adequate representation of research workers on it — 0 — 1 2 3 4

26. There is no organizational mechanism which ensures that the research council understands the needs of research workers — 0 — 1 2 3 4

27. Decisions on research grants are taken by non-technical people — 0 — 1 2 3 4

28. There is too much of a delay between the time of submission of research proposals and the time they are sanctioned — 0 — 1 2 3 4

29. Many of the delays could be avoided if at all the top administration is slightly more responsible — 0 — 1 2 3 4

30. There are too many formalities involved in purchasing even day-to-day requirements of the departments — 0 — 1 2 3

		appli- cable	or no degree				great degree

31. The central purchase system introduced in this university has brought down the quality of material and increased frustrations of staff to get materials in time — 0 — 1 2 3 4 5

32. Funds are often announced or released towards the end of the financial year leading to unnecessary expenditure — 0 — 1 2 3 4 5

33. Many grants lapse here because of delays in announcing them — 0 — 1 2 3 4 5

34. There is misappropriation of funds in this University — 0 — 1 2 3 4 5

35. Students often face problems because the University frequently delays the announcement of examination results — 0 — 1 2 3 4 5

36. There is a lot of scope for the simplification of examination procedures here — 0 — 1 2 3 4 5

37. People in the central office are power hungry — 0 — 1 2 3 4 5

38. Administrative generally don't take a genuine interest in the development of this University — 0 — 1 2 3 4 5

39. Committees are formed to escape responsibilities than to study the issues at deeper levels — 0 — 1 2 3 4 5

40. The committees formed by the University are rarely clear about their purposes — 0 — 1 2 3 4 5

41. In this University members of committees are appointed for their personal benefits — 0 — 1 2 3 4 5

42. There is no proper evaluation of faculty work-load therefore some people are overworked and some underworked — 0 — 1 2 3 4 5

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Not sure
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

	Not applicable	To little or no degree			
43. Persons without having adequate teaching experience or skills are permitted to teach in this University	0	1	2	3	4
44. The academic council is not serious about making this an academically distinguished agriculture University	0	1	2	3	4
45. Rules here given an impression that 'people can't be trusted and therefore they need constantly to be checked'	0	1	2	3	4
46. The central University office collects too many details and too often from each department, thus wasting time in preparing statements	0	1	2	3	4
47. Changes are made here without systematic thinking and planning	0	1	2	3	4
48. Promotions here are based on merit and not only on seniority	0	1	2	3	4
49. Decisions are made here without consulting those affected	0	1	2	3	4
50. There are no clear cut admission policies and procedures for student admissions	0	1	2	3	4
51. Admission criteria are not communicated to college principals	0	1	2	3	4
52. Final admissions to students are often based on nonacademic considerations	0	1	2	3	4
53. Allottment of students is done without consulting the concerned teachers	0	1	2	3	4

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Not sure
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

	Not appli- cable	To little or no degree			To a ver great degree	
54. Teachers are recognised for PG work even when they don't deserve such recognition	0	1	2	3	4	5
55. Concerned heads of the departments are not consulted while recognizing PG teachers	0	1	2	3	4	5
56. People in administration use rules to suit themselves	0	1	2	3	4	5
57. Student preferences (in the choice of employees and subjects) are often overlooked during admissions time	0.	1	2	3	4	5
58. Many research schemes had to be dropped due to procedural delays and other constraints in this univerity	0	1	2	3	4	5
59. Campus administrators are dominated by the central administration	0	1	2	3	4	5
60. There is no committment to work in this University	0.	1	2	3	4	5
61. People do not trust each other in this University	0	1	2	3	4	5
62. Faculty are not allowed to submit research proposals to outside agencies directly	0	1	2	3	4	5
63. Administration here is careless in handling student records	0	1	2	3	4	5
64. Some important units have been grossly neglected by this University	0	1	2	3	4	5
65. Research proposals from competent persons are not encouraged here	0	1	2	3	4	5

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Not sure
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

		Not appli- cable	To little or no degree			To grea deg

66. There are not good opportunities for profes- sional growth here for interested teachers — 0 — 1 2 3 4

67. There are not good opportunities for profes- sional growth here for interested research workers — 0 — 1 2 3 4

68. Heads of the departments do not trust their faculty . — 0 — 1 2 3 4

69. Junior faculty do not get adequate guidance from seniors as seniors are always overloaded with administrative work — 0 — 1 2 3 4

70. There is favouratism here — 0 — 1 2 3 4

71. Faculty members are not encouraged to go for higher studies — 0 — 1 2 3 4

72. Faculty members are not encouraged to parti- cipate in seminars and conferences to their professional benefit — 0 — 1 2 3 4

73. Teachers are not encouraged to publish research papers — 0 — 1 2 3 4

74. There are no laboratory facilities here to do good work — 0 — 1 2 3 4

75. There are no library facilities here for interested faculty members — 0 — 1 2 3 4

Indian Institute of Management
Ahmedabad

Decisional Participation Scale

         Given below are a few decisional situations that relate to
your work in this institution. Please indicate against each decisional
situation, whether you currently participate in making decisions
relating to that situation and whether you would like to participate.
There are three response columns provided against each decisional
situation. In the first column you have to indicate whether you
participate in that decision by stating 'yes' or 'no' ('yes' indicating
that you do participate currently). In the second column you indicate
whether you wish to participate or not by stating 'yes' or 'no' ('yes'
indicating that you wish to participate).

         The third response column is to be used only when your desire
to participate or not participate does not coincide with the current
practice. There are two situations possible: (1) you want to participate
but currently you are not participating (under participation); and
(2) you do not want to participate but you are participating at present
(over participation). In both these cases you might experience some
dissatisfaction. Please rate the dissatisfaction you experience on a
four point scale in the third column. If you are highly dissatisfied
encircle 3, if you are somewhat dissatisfied encircle 2, and if your
are only slightly dissatisfied encircle 1. Encircle 0 if the item is
irrelevant or if there is no dissatisfaction at all. Leave irrelevant
items unanswered.

Area of Decision	Whether you currently participate or not	Whether you wish to participate	In case of under partion str dissatis experienc
1. Introducing new courses/ curricular changes	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
2. Allotment of courses	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
3. Designing the time-table	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
4. Student admissions, policies and procedures	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
5. Establishing student discipline procedures	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
6. Appointing examiners	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
7. Setting instructional policies for the department	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
8. Deciding teacher promotions	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
9. Selecting and prescribing instructional texts	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
10. Planning department budgets	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
11. Planning institutional budgets	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
12. Recruiting new faculty members	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
13. Allocation of departmental funds	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
14. Setting institutional policies and procedures	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
15. Deciding faculty travel plans	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
16. Deciding faculty requirements of the department	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1
17. Deciding faculty requirements of the college	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1

. . . .

Area of Decision	Whether you currently participate or not	Whether you wish to participate	In case of over/ under participation strength of dissatisfaction experienced
18. Determining faculty teaching loads	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
19. Utilization of secretarial staff of the department	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
20. Determining departmental goals and work plans	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
21. Determining laboratory and other financial support needed by the department	yes /.no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
22. Formulating rules and regulations of the college	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
23. Setting up student evaluation policies and procedures	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
24. Finalising the syllabus for the course I teach	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
25. Decisions related to the courses I should teach	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
26. Initiating the research projects	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
27. Prescribing books for the courses I teach	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
28. Setting up evaluation procedures for the courses taught by me	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
29. Deciding on the allottment of students to work with me	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
30. Sanctioning or allottment of research work	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
31. Appointment of research staff to work with me	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0

. . . .

Area of Decision	Whether you currently participate or not	Whether you wish to participate	In case of under parti tion stren dissatisfa experience
32. Deciding on library requirements	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
33. Deciding my teaching work load	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
34. Deciding my research work load	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
35. Decisions on staff development (higher studies etc.)	Yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
36. Decisions on the allottment of students to Post Graduate Teachers	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
37. Decisions on student admissions	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
38. Decisions on timing and procedure of examinations	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
39. Appointment of examiners for the papers I teach	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
40. Decisions on departmental needs (budget)	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0
41. Decisions on the day-to-day requirements by the saaff	yes / no	yes / no	3 2 1 0

(The information we collect here will be helpful for analysing the data you have given under different sections. Your identity will be kept — confidential and the data you supply will be used for research and — development purposes. If you have any hesitation you may omit your name, but in the absence of other information it will be difficult for us to draw any meaningful conclusion from the data you supplied).

1. <u>Name</u> :   2. <u>Campus</u>:

3. <u>Institution</u>:   4. <u>Deptt/Section</u>:

5. <u>Designation</u>:   6. <u>Your scale of pay</u> :

7. <u>Your present pay</u>:(basic)

8. <u>Your qualifications</u>: (include also if you are studying part-time)

Degree/Diploma	Year of completing	University	Division

9. <u>Your experience</u>:

Period of service	Designation	scale of pay	Institution/ Deptt.

10. <u>Work-load distribution</u>: (in approximate percentages)

   A. Total No.of hours spend in an average week in work —

Nature of work	Percentage of time spend in a week.
Teaching	
Research	
Field Supervision(other than research)	
Administration	
Any other	

11. <u>Total number of research publications</u>:(Give approximately)

Number in Indian journals   _____
Number in foreign journals   _____
Number of Books   _____
Number of papers presented in conferences _____
etc.

Institutes Visited by the Research Team

1. Post-graduate School, Rahuri
2. College of Agriculture Engineering, Rahuri
3. College of Agriculture, Poona
4. College of Agriculture, Kolhapur
5. College of Agriculture, Dhule
6. Gramsevak Training Centre, Manjri
7. Gramsevak Training Centre, Kolhapur
8. Agriculture School, Manjri
9. Agriculture School, Sholapur
10. Agriculture School, Kolhapur
11. Agriculture School, Dhule
12. Agricultural Research Station, Rahuri
13. Agricultural Research Station, Sholapur
14. Agricultural Research Station, Sholapur
15. Agricultural Research Station, Kolhapur
16. Agricultural Research Station, Mahabaleshwar
17. Agricultural Research Station, Dhule
18. Agricultural Research Station, Manjri