C H A P T E R - IV

MANAGEMENT OF A TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

4.1 GOVERNANCE OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM

4.2 EXISTING PARTICIPATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN DECISION-MAKING

4.3 EXPECTED PARTICIPATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN DECISION-MAKING

4.4 DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN EXISTING AND EXPECTED DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

4.5 ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM - I

4.6 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH AND EXISTING DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

4.7 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH AND EXPECTED DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

4.8 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXISTING DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION AND EXPECTED DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

CHAPTER : IV

MANAGEMENT OF A TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

This chapter covers the objective No.I given in the Second Chapter. Governance of the Education System-I has been studied on the basis of documentry records and informal interview with the members of the system. Scoring processes for O.H.Q., Decision-making participation instruments (Existing and Expected) have been adopted as per the guidelines established for this purpose in Chapter third. Three main variables have been considered: Organizational Health of the Education System; Decisional participation (Existing); Decisional participation (Expected). Organizational health contains ten dimensions. For convenience point of view, following code have been used in doing statistical analysis:

Variable I Dimension-I of the Organizational Health
Variable 2 Dimension-II of the Organizational Health
Variable 3 Dimension-III of the Organizational Health
Variable 4 Dimension-IV of the Organizational Health
Variable 5 Dimension-V of the Organizational Health
Variable 6 Dimension-VI of the Organizational Health
Variable 7 Dimension-VII of the Organizational Health
Variable 8 Dimension-VIII of the Organizational Health
Variable 9 Dimension-IX of the Organizational Health
Variable 10 Dimension-X of the Organizational Health
Variable 11 for total score (all dimensions combined) of the Organizational Health

Variable 12 for Decisional participation (Existing)

Variable 13 for Decisional participation (Expected)

In various tables while showing means standard deviations, these code numbers for different variables have been used frequently.

Forty decision situations are given in the Decision-making participation instruments alongwith category of responses. Forty items of Organizational Health Questionnaire are also given with reference to the dimensions in Chapter-III.

Table IV -1: Categorywise Percentages of respondents (Professors) showing existing and expected participation in decision-making for various decision situations.

Education System - I						N = 30				
Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
1.	7	40	20	23	10	46	30	17	7	0
2.	7	33.5	33.5	13	13	43.5	33.5	20	3	0
3.	3	30	10	27	30	17	40	30	6.5	6.5
4.	30	23	10	20	17	57	7	33	3	0
5.	10	17	13	17	43	43	37	17	0	3
6.	23.5	13	13	23.5	27	16.5	27	33	7	16.5
7.	7	17	20	23	33	50	33	3.5	10	3.5
8.	7	13	10	23	47	37	33	13.5	13.5	3
9.	7	7	20	26	40	37	37	20	3	3
10.	7	10	33	27	23	27	43	13	10	7
11.	33	47	13	7	0	63	27	10	0	0
12.	30	37	20	6.5	6.5	63.5	23.5	13	0	0
13.	33	40	7	13	7	47	33	13	3.5	3.5
14.	30	30	27	10	3	53	33.5	13.5	0	0
15.	7	37	30	16	10	40	40	10	7	3
16.	7	27	23	20	23	30	37	23	7	3
17.	3	7	23	30	37	37	33	20	7	3
18.	0	13	13	27	47	13	40	30	7	10
19.	23	20	47	10	0	43	30	23.5	0	3.5
20.	10	47	30	10	3	37	33	20	7	3

contd...

Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
21.	7	20	36.5	10	26.5	10	13	40	17	20
22.	33	27	30	7	3	46	27	10	17	0
23.	27	33	27	6.5	6.5	53.5	33.5	10	0	3
24.	30	33	27	3	7	53.5	33.5	10	0	3
25.	20	40	30	10	0	50	33.5	13.5	3	0
26.	23	27	17	20	13	23	37	27	3	10
27.	0	13	17	13	57	7	40	16.5	20	16.5
28.	3	10	17	13	57	3	17	17	23	40
29.	0	80	7	13	0	7	16.5	36.5	20	20
30.	7	23	20	23	27	7	27	33	20	13
31.	0	0	10	17	73	13	10	17	17	43
32.	3	17	17	13	50	10	23.5	20	3	43.5
33.	33	23.5	23.5	13	7	50	30	17	3	0
34.	20	40	33	0	7	20	40	33	0	7
35.	7	36.5	30	10	16.5	7	37	30	10	1.6
36.	10	23.5	30	23.5	13	10	23.5	30	23.5	13
37.	10	23.5	33.5	13	20	10	23	33.5	13.5	20
38.	13	10	53	17	7	13	10	53	7	17
39.	0	23	40	17	20	7	17	53	10	13
40.	13	17	37	13	20	17	23	33	20	7

Table IV -2: Categorywise Percentages of respondents (Readers) showing existing and expected participation in decision-making for various decision situations.

Education System - I						N = 70				
Decision situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
1.	14	9	7	21	49	27	28	20	9	16
2.	4	11.5	17	16	51.5	17	33	26	10	14
3.	1	4	14.5	26	54.5	16	18.5	28.5	16	21
4.	16	17	20	17	30	34	33	16	13	4
5.	6	11	14	20	49	27	31.5	21.5	11	9
6.	10	10	9	24	47	19	29	24	14	14
7.	0	4	6	16	74	13	24	21.5	20	21.5
8.	0	4	4	10	82	13	28	23	16	20
9.	4	2	10	27	57	30	30	23	8.5	8.5
10.	0	9	10	24	57	34	23	27	7	9
11.	11.5	26	24	17	21.5	51.5	30	13	4.5	1
12.	16	22	31	17	14	47.5	30	17	4.5	1
13.	17	27	23	14	19	50	25.5	15.5	6	3
14.	26	24	24	17	9	49	31	16	3	1
15.	10	19	17	30	24	30	27	24	12	7
16.	4	10	17	27	42	29	23	27	11	10
17.	6	6	11	20	57	37	27	21	9	6
18.	3	3	4	14	76	20	19	20	11	30
19.	12	23	27	24	14	43	30	20	6	1
20.	6	11	23	21	39	33	27	21	13	6

contd..

Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
21.	17	17	20	22	24	24.5	27	24.5	7	17
22.	17	23	27	13	20	36	30	24	9	1
23.	13	21	29	17	20	34	28	26	6	6
24.	14	16	31.5	21.5	17	34	31.5	21.5	7	6
25.	9	21	31	16	23	39	33	21	6	1
26.	7	14	23	19	37	27	23	26	14	10
27.	4	6	7	27	56	8.5	13	28.5	17	33
28.	9	4	7	16	64	7	11.5	14	21.5	46
29.	7	20	20	27	26	14	20	24	22	20
30.	4	13	23	24	36	16	18.5	21	26	18.5
31.	1	4	6	16	73	8.5	18.5	24	13	36
32.	3	1	13	13	70	14	11	30	9	36
33.	7	30	30	17	16	41.5	29	21.5	4	4
34.	1	14	42	14	29	21.5	27	36	11.5	4
35.	3	13	23	20	41	16	16	34	20	14
36.	0	6	8	16	70	18.5	23	23	8.5	27
37.	0	9	17	24	50	16	20	23	20	21
38.	1	7	17	22	53	11	27	23	16	23
39.	0	10	20	19	51	13	23	30	14	20
40.	8	18.5	18.5	23	32	30	26	21	13	10

Table IV -3: Categorywise Percentages of respondents (Lecturers) showing existing and expected participation in decision-making for various decision situations.

Education System - I						N = 100				
Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participational (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
1.	8	6	7	29	50	21	29	22	11	17
2.	5	4	9	20	62	19	31	20	13	17
3.	3	4	6	17	70	12	24	21	15	31
4.	7	11	15	18	49	31	21	22	11	15
5.	2	6	16	11	65	22	18	28	16	16
6.	4	3	15	13	65	14	16	29	15	26
7.	1	2	2	4	91	13	16	15	13	43
8.	1	3	3	5	88	12	15	19	12	42
9.	3	3	10	12	72	30	21	30	7	12
10.	3	1	12	13	71	21	23	30	7	19
11.	12	6	25	18	39	45	25	24	1	5
12.	9	11	26	22	32	40	26	24	5	5
13.	11	12	17	29	31	42	32	18	2	6
14.	15	24	35	11	15	42	32	19	3	4
15.	13	13	23	21	30	27	34	20	12	7
16.	8	6	16	17	53	22	29	23	18	8
17.	3	4	7	15	71	26	26	21	12	15
18.	4	2	7	10	77	15	14	25	14	32
19.	17	18	24	14	27	40	32	23	3	2
20.	5	5	13	10	67	22	18	29	5	26

contd...

Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participational (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
21.	8	21	19	13	39	17	24	16	14	29
22.	22	11	22	16	39	38	26	18	7	11
23.	7	17	20	19	37	40	25	21	6	8
24.	10	17	13	24	36	36	31	24	4	5
25.	10	14	18	22	36	39	31	21	3	6
26.	5	8	7	19	61	22	21	24	15	18
27.	2	3	9	11	75	14	16	13	20	37
28.	4	7	14	6	69	12	10	17	18	43
29.	7	17	24	15	37	20	23	25	14	18
30.	7	12	19	17	45	22	18	31	18	11
31.	3	2	2	11	82	16	16	23	8	37
32.	2	3	2	12	81	15	24	17	9	35
33.	9	16	23	25	27	41	33	17	2	7
34.	5	11	23	15	46	29	30	11	14	16
35.	4	8	19	9	60	21	20	21	13	25
36.	3	3	8	6	80	17	19	16	14	34
37.	4	14	14	18	50	23	22	22	18	15
38.	2	8	13	15	62	17	19	26	18	20
39.	3	4	15	11	67	14	22	27	15	22
40.	6	10	14	30	40	30	20	32	10	8

Table IV -4 : Categorywise Percentages of respondents (Faculty Members) showing existing and expected participation in decision-making for various decision situations.

Education System - I N = 200

Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participational (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
1.	10	12	9	25.5	43.5	27	29	20.5	9.5	14
2.	5	11	15.5	17.5	51	22	32	22	10.5	13.5
3.	2.5	8	9.5	21.5	58.5	14	24.5	25	14	22.5
4.	13.5	15	16	18	37.5	36	27	17.5	10.5	9
5.	4.5	9.5	15	15	56	27	25.5	24	12	11.5
6.	9	7	12.5	18.5	53	16	22	28	13.5	20.5
7.	1.5	5	6	11	76.5	18.5	21.5	15.5	15	29.5
8.	1.5	5	4.5	9.5	79.5	16	22.5	19.5	13.5	28.5
9.	4	3	11.5	19.5	62	31	26.5	26	7	9.5
10.	2.5	5	14.5	19	59	26.5	26	26.5	7.5	13.5
11.	15	19	23	16	27	50	27	18	2	3
12.	14.5	18.5	27	18	22	46	27	20	4	3
13.	16.5	21.5	17.5	21.5	23	45.5	30	16.5	3.5	4.5
14.	15.5	23	27.5	17.5	16.5	46	32	17	2.5	2.5
15.	11	18.5	22	23.5	25	30	32.5	20	11	6.5
16.	6.5	10.5	17.5	21	44.5	25.5	28	24.5	14	8
17.	4	5	11	19	61	31.5	27.5	21	10	10
18.	3	4	7	14	72	16.5	19.5	24	12	28
19.	14	14	23	15.5	33.5	41.5	31	22	3.5	2
20.	6	13.5	19	14	47.5	28	23.5	25	8	15.5

Decision Situation No.	Decisional Participation (Existing)					Decisional Participation (Expected)				
	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %	a %	b %	c %	d %	e %
21.	11	19.5	22	15.5	32	18.5	23.5	22.5	12	23.5
22.	17	17.5	25	13.5	27	38.5	27.5	19	9	6
23.	12	21	24	16.5	26.5	40	27.5	21	5	6.5
24.	14.5	19	21.5	20	25	38	31.5	21	4.5	5
25.	11	20.5	24.5	18	26	40.5	32	20	4	3.5
26.	8.5	13	14	19	45.5	24	24	25	13	14
27.	2.5	5.5	9.5	17	65.5	11	18.5	19	19	32.5
28.	5.5	6.5	12	10.5	65.5	9	11.5	16	20	43.5
29.	6	27.5	20	19	27.5	16	21	26.5	17.5	19
30.	6	14	20.5	20.5	39	17.5	19.5	28	21	14
31.	2	2.5	4.5	13.5	77.5	13	16	22.5	11	37.5
32.	2.5	4.5	8	12.5	72.5	14	19.5	22	8	36.5
33.	12	22	25.5	20.5	20	42.5	31	18.5	3	5
34.	6	12.5	30.5	15	36	25	30.5	23	11	10.5
35.	5.5	10.5	19.5	14.5	50	22	16	27	15	20
36.	2.5	6	8.5	13	70	16.5	21	20.5	13.5	28.5
37.	2.5	13.5	16	21.5	46.5	18.5	21.5	24	18	18
38.	1.5	8.5	16.5	19	54.5	14.5	20.5	29	15.5	20.5
39.	1.5	9	20.5	14.5	54.5	12.5	21.5	32	14	20
40.	8	14	19	25	34	28	22.5	28.5	12.5	8.5

Table IV -5 : showing X^2- values for significance of the difference between existing decisional participation and expected decisional participation for each decision situation perceived by the faculty members (respondents) of Education System-I (N=200)

Df=4

Decision Situation No.	X^2-Value	Decision Situation No.	X^2-Value
1.	232.45	21.	15.65
2.	275.33	22.	186.57
3.	183.57	23.	219.11
4.	230.27	24.	305.79
5.	410.22	25.	440.57
6.	150.49	26.	187.07
7.	220.11	27.	108.35
8.	261.48	28.	55.97
9.	729.78	29.	27.58
10.	430.23	30.	111.54
11.	636.52	31.	156.67
12.	392.06	32.	135.86
13.	363.16	33.	348.48
14.	395.28	34.	181.78
15.	170.25	35.	122.73
16.	394.25	36.	180.13
17.	630.76	37.	130.57
18.	209.77	38.	162.50
19.	1129.73	39.	161.22
20.	187.09	40.	219.33

Table IV-6 showing means and standard deviations of different variables calculated from the responses of Professors. (N = 30)

Measures \ Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Mean	9.53	9.00	8.50	8.53	8.70	8.93	9.30	9.00	8.27	7.23	87.00	73.60	105.47
S.D.	3.00	2.93	3.23	3.02	2.54	2.80	3.15	3.28	3.18	3.50	24.84	25.86	18.73

Table IV-7 showing intercorrelations among different variables calculated from the responses of Professors (N = 30).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	1	.63	.59	.60	.31	.49	.71	.64	.57	.75	.78	.01	-.09
2		1	.81	.44	.56	.48	.70	.50	.65	.78	.81	-.02	-.22
3			1	.44	.57	.70	.74	.49	.71	.74	.84	-.01	-.14
4				1	.51	.49	.51	.70	.72	.63	.75	.08	.05
5					1	.48	.49	.48	.67	.62	.70	.05	-.03
6						1	.61	.39	.77	.61	.74	.20	-.07
7							1	.66	.73	.79	.87	.06	-.24
8								1	.57	.70	.77	.14	-.05
9									1	.76	.89	.26	-.02
10										1	.92	.01	-0.15
11											1	.10	-.12
12												1	.43
13													1

Table IV-8 showing means and standard deviations of different variables calculated from the responses of Readers (N=70)

Variable / Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Mean	9.21	8.80	8.94	7.94	8.33	9.11	9.33	8.71	8.64	7.76	87.36	49.74	95.20
S.D.	3.31	3.94	3.42	3.65	3.46	3.36	3.62	3.83	3.93	3.87	31.32	24.64	28.19

Table IV-9 showing intercorrelations among different variables calculated from the responses of Readers (N=70)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	1	.72	.62	.64	.62	.52	.60	.63	.64	.76	.79	.003	.02
2		1	.71	.75	.68	.75	.62	.76	.65	.80	.87	-.07	-.07
3			1	.71	.71	.79	.66	.61	.71	.78	.85	-.01	-.06
4				1	.65	.80	.75	.70	.79	.74	.88	-.06	-.24
5					1	.78	.70	.68	.72	.74	.84	.04	-.05
6						1	.78	.74	.78	.79	.91	-.07	-.05
7							1	.79	.71	.71	.85	-.05	-.11
8								1	.63	.76	.85	-.11	-.08
9									1	.72	.86	.12	.04
10										1	.91	.004	.02
11											1	-.02	-.07
12												1	.40
13													1

Table IV-10 showing means and standard deviations of different variables calculated from the responses of Lecturers (N=100)

Measures \ Variables	1	2	3	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Mean	8.84	8.63	9.60	8.54	9.00	9.68	9.71	8.73	9.24	7.94	89.91	39.3	89.98
S.D.	3.45	3.67	3.54	3.36	3.31	3.08	3.30	3.17	3.25	3.64	27.61	28.55	30.98

Table IV-11 showing intercorrelations among different variables calculated from the responses of Lecturers (N=100)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	1	.66	.64	.70	.66	.55	.61	.60	.62	.71	.84	.34	.13
2		1	.61	.65	.59	.61	.54	.51	.59	.60	.78	.24	.08
3			1	.62	.66	.68	.51	.54	.61	.69	.81	.34	.01
4				1	.66	.65	.63	.57	.60	.65	.82	.31	.19
5					1	.71	.62	.64	.71	.60	.83	.31	.19
6						1	.71	.66	.70	.63	.85	.37	.19
7							1	.68	.64	.64	.80	.38	.27
8								1	.63	.67	.79	.32	.22
9									1	.64	.82	.29	.18
10										1	.84	.44	.31
11											1	.41	.21
12												1	.36
13													1

Table IV-12 showing means and standard deviations of different variables calculated from the responses of faculty members (combined) (N=200)

Measures \ Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Mean	9.08	8.75	9.21	8.35	8.90	9.37	9.52	8.77	8.89	7.77	88.58	43.10	94.13
S.D.	3.35	3.67	3.48	3.43	3.26	3.16	3.40	3.43	3.51	3.71	28.62	29.23	23.96

Table IV-13 showing intercorrelations among different variables calculated from the responses of faculty members (combined) (N=200)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	1	.68	.61	.66	.60	.61	.62	.62	.60	.73	.81	.20	.08
2		1	.66	.66	.62	.64	.58	.61	.61	.70	.82	.12	.003
3			1	.63	.67	.73	.60	.55	.66	.73	.82	.12	.05
4				1	.64	.69	.66	.63	.69	.68	.83	.13	.02
5					1	.71	.64	.63	.71	.65	.82	.16	.08
6						1	.72	.66	.74	.69	.36	.14	.06
7							1	.72	.68	.69	.83	.15	.07
8								1	.62	.70	.81	.13	.08
9									1	.69	.84	.16	.08
10										1	.88	.19	.14
11											1	.18	.07
12												1	.41
13													1

Table IV -14 showing significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of Professors.

Education System-I		N = 30			df = 29	
Type of decisional participation	Mean	S.D.	r	S.Ed.	D	't' Value
Existing	: 73.60	25.86	.43	4.56	31.87	6.98
Expected	:105.47	18.73				

Table IV -15 showing significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of Readers.

Education System-I		N = 70			df = 69	
Type of decisional participation	Mean	S.D.	r	$S.E_D$	D	't' Value
Existing	: 49.74	24.64	.40	3.502	45.46	12.98
Expected	: 95.20	28.19				

Table IV -16 showing significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of Lecturers.

Education System-I		N = 100			df = 99	
Type of decisional participation	Mean	S.D.	r	$S.E_D$	D	't' Value
Existing	: 39.30	28.55	.36	3.391	50.68	14.94
Expected	: 89.98	30.98				

Table IV-17 showing significance of the difference between means of the existing decisional participation of Professors and Readers.

Education System - I				df = 98		
Faculty type	Mean	S.D.	N.	$S.E_D$	D	't' Value
Professors :	73.60	25.86	30	5.644	23.86	4.22
Readers :	49.74	24.64	70			

Table IV-18 showing significance of the difference between means of the existing decisional participation of Professors and Lecturers

Education System - I				df = 128		
Faculty type	Mean	S.D.	N.	$S.E_D$	D	't' Value
Professors :	73.60	25.86	30	5.594	34.30	6.13
Lecturers :	39.30	28.55	100			

Table IV-19 showing significance of the difference between means of the existing decisional participation of Readers and Lecturers

Education System - I				df = 168		
Faculty type	Mean	S.D.	N.	$S.E_D$	D	't' Value
Readers :	49.74	24.64	70	4.127	10.44	2.52
Lecturers	39.30	28.55	100			

Table IV-20 showing significance of the difference between means of the expected decisional participation of Professors and Readers.

Education System - I						df = 98
Faculty type	Mean	S.D.	N	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't' Value
Professors :	105.47	18.73	30	4.85	10.27	2.11
Readers :	95.20	28.19	70			

Table IV-21 showing significance of the difference between means of the expected deciaional participation of Professors and Lecturers

Education System - I						df = 128
Faculty type	Mean	S.D.	N	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't' Value
Professors :	105.47	18.73	30	4.668	15.69	3.36
Lecturers	89.98	30.98	100			

Table IV-22 showing significance of the difference between means of the expected decisional participation of Readers and Lecturers

Education System - I						df = 168
Faculty type	Mean	S.D.	N	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't' Value
Readers	95.20	28.19	70	6.090	5.22	.90
Lecturers	89.98	30.98	100			

Table IV-23 showing significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of the Faculty members.

Education System - I		N = 200		df = 199			
Type of decisional participation		Mean	S.D.	r	$S.E_{D.}$	D	't' Value
Existing	:	43.10	29.23	.41	2.07	51.03	24.62
Expected	:	94.13	23.96				

4.1 GOVERNANCE OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM :

This university was established for the development of engineering, technology and allied sciences and for furthering the advancement of learning and prosecution of research in engineering technology and allied sciences. It should serve as a centre for fostering co-operation and exchange of ideas between the academic and research community on the one hand and the industrial and Governmental employers on the other. The authorities of the university are syndicate, the Academic Council, the Finance Committee, Faculties and Board of Studies of each Faculty.

THE SYNDICATE :

In this university, Syndicate, the top most authority consists of the following members:

(a) the Vice-Chancellor; (b) two persons from among the

Deans and Directors of the University nominated by rotation by Chancellor; (c) two teachers other than Deans and Director of the University elected from among themselves; (d) two officers of the Government from the department with the subject of technical education, nominated by the Government; (e) four persons representing public and private sectors, industries and research institutions having special knowledge and practical experience in industry and commerce nominated by the Chancellor; (f) one member elected by the Academic Council from its members (g) one member elected by the members of the Legislative Assembly of the State among themselves; (h) one member elected by the member of the Legislative Council of the State from among themselves.

The Vice-Chancellor is the ex-officio Chairman of the Syndicate. The term of office of the members of the Syndicate other than ex-officio members shall be three years and such members shall be eligible for re-election or re-nomination for not more than one successive term. The Syndicate may, from time to time, make statutes and amend or repeal the statutes, in the manner. It is empowered for (i) the financial requirements and approval of the annual financial estimates of the University; (ii) the administration of any funds placed at the disposal of the University for the purposes intended; (iii) the arrangement for the investment and withdrawal of funds of the University; (iv) the borrowing money subject to the approval of the Government for capital improvements repayment; (v) the acquisition, holding and disposing of

property on behalf of the University; (vi) the determination of form, provision for the custody, and regulating the use, of the common seal of the University; (vii) the appointment of such committees, either standing or temporary, as it may consider necessary and specify the terms of reference thereof subject to the provisions of the Act and these statutes; (viii) the financial provision for the instruction, teaching research, advancement and dissemination of knowledge in such branches of learning and courses of study as may be determined by the Academic Council; (ix) the establishment and maintenance of colleges, hostels, laboratories and other facilities necessary for carrying out the purposes of the Act; (x) the conferment of degrees, diplomas and other academic distinctions; (xi) the accepting trust, bequest, donation and transfer of any movable or immovable property on behalf of the University; (xii) the entering into any contract on behalf of the University; (xiii) the provision of scholarships, fellowships, studentship, medals, prizes.

Academic Council of the University is to exercise general control on teaching and other educational programmes and to maintain and promote the academic standard. The ex-officio members are (a) the Vice-Chancellor; (b) The Deans; (c) The Directors; (d) ten Professors of the University nominated by the Chancellor on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor; (e) five teachers other than Professors, Deans and Directors nominated by the Chancellor on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor; (f) the Librarian of the University;

(g) three educationalists having proficiency in matters relating to education, research and educational administration, general and technical nominated by the Chancellor; (h) the Chairman of the Board of Secondary Education of the State. Other members of the Academic Council are : (i) six Chief Engineers or General Managers to be nominated by the Chancellor on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor from among the Chief Engineers or General Managers of the Departments of the State Government, Railways, Military Engineering Services, Defence, Post and Telegraphs and other autunomous organisations; (j) five persons from Private Industries and research organisations having proficiency in matters relating to industry and research, to be nominated by the Chancellor on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor; (k) four persons from public sector industries of the Central and State Governments, in the State having proficiency in matters relating to industry and research, to be nominated by the Chancellor on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor; (l) two persons from Professional Engineering Societies or Institutions or Bodies or Associations to be nominated by the Chancellor on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor; (m) two persons from Small Scale Industries in the State having proficiency in matters relating to setting up of such Industries with particular reference to the programme of rural development in the State to be nominated by the Chancellor on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor; (n) two persons from among the Office Bearers of the Alumini Associations of the College of Engineering (a particular institution); (o) one person heading any of the

conduct of examination, industrial training, assessment and evaluation of the students performance. It will also advise the Syndicate on all academic matters including the control and management of libraries, formulation and revision of schemes for the constitution of departments of teaching and research. It can also advise the Syndicate on all academic matters including the control and management of libraries, institution of different posts and fellowships. Academic Council is also enpowered to assess and make recommendations laying down standards of accomodation, equipment, apparatus, library, maintenance and other physical facilities, required for each faculty and to exercise such other powers and perform such other duties as may be prescribed.

There is a Finance Committee to make recommendations to the Syndicate on every proposal involving investment on expenditure for which no provision has been made in the annual financial estimates. It may review the financial position of the University from time to time. Vice-Chancellor is the ex-officio Chairman and the Finance officer is the ex-officio Secretary to the Finance Committee. Other members are :
(1) two officers of the Government one from the Finance department and the other from the department dealing with the subject Technical Education nominated by the Chancellor;
(2) two members nominated by the Syndicate from among its members. All the members of the Finance Committee, other than ex-officio members shall hold office for a period of three years. It will meet at least twice every year to examine the accounts and to scrutinise proposals for expenditure. The

the District Industries Centres set up by the Department of Industries and commerce of the State, to be nominated by the Chancellor on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor;

(p) one person each from the Khadi and Village Industries Board, to be nominated by the Chancellor on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor; (q) one person from the Directorate of Medical Education of the State, having proficiency in matters relating to bio-medical engineering, to be nominated by the Chancellor on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor; (r) one person from among teachers of each of the Institution or University Departments given below to be nominated by the Chancellor on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor.

i) The Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore;

ii) The Indian Institute of Technology of the Zone;

iii) The Department of Engineering and Technology of a particular University located in the State.

iv) The Agricultural Engineering Department of the Agricultural University of the State.

v) The Rural University located in that State.

vi) The Indian Institute of Management (located in that Zone).

(s) two persons from the other engineering colleges located in the State, to be nominated by the Chancellor on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor; (t) Members of the Syndicate not included in any of the above items (a) to (s).

It will be the duty of the Academic Council to make regulations regarding admission procedure, courses of study,

annual accounts and the financial estimates of the University prepared by the Finance Officer shall be laid before the Finance Committee for consideration and comments and thereafter submitted to the Syndicate for approval. The Finance Committee can recommend limits for the total recurring expenditure and the total non-recurring expenditure for the year based on the income and resources of the University which in the case of productive works, may include the proceeds of loans.

The University includes different Faculties and each Faculty has a Dean. Each Faculty comprises of such departments of teaching with such assignment of subjects of study as may be prescribed. Each Faculty has got Board of Studies having prescribed constitution and functions. All the managing authorities of the University shall have power to constitute or reconstitute committees and to delegate to them such of their powers.

The Vice-Chancellor is the principal executive and academic head of the University, made by the Chancellor from out of a panel of three names recommended by the Committee. The Committee shall consist of three persons of whom one shall be nominated by the Syndicate; one shall be nominated by the Academic Council, and one shall be nominated by the Chancellor.

Every Dean and every Director shall be appointed in such manner and shall exercise such powers and perform such duties as may be prescribed by the statutes.

The Registrar shall be a whole time officer of the University appointed by the Syndicate for such period and on such terms as may be prescribed by the statutes. In all suits and other legal proceedings by or against the University, the pleadings shall be signed and verified by the Registrar and all processes in such suits and proceedings shall be issued to and served on, the Registrar.

4.2 EXISTING PARTICIPATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN DECISION-MAKING :

Table No.IV-1 reveals the perceived existing decisional participations of the Professors. More than 50% of the Professors perceived less participation (participation to a less extent or no participation) in decision situations no.3,5,6,7,8,9,17,18,27, 30,31,32. From table No.IV-6, it could be inferred that the mean of the existing decisional participation is 73.60, which is less than 80 i.e. mean for the considerable participation.

Table No.IV-2 shows the perceived existing participation of the Readers in various decision situations. In most of decision situations the participation is less excluding 4,11, 12,13,14,19,22,23, 24,25. Table No.IV-8 gives the mean of the existing decisional participation 49.74, which is less than the mean for the considerable participation.

Table No.IV-3 gives the picture of existing participation of the Lecturers in various decision situations. In most of decision situations the decisional participation is quite

less excluding 14 and 19. From table No.10 it could be inferred that the mean of the existing decisional participation is 39.30, which is less than the mean for the participation to a less extent (M=40).

Table No.IV-4 reveals the perceived existing decisional participation of the faculty members (Professors, Readers, Lecturers-all combined). More than 40% of the faculty members perceived less participation in most of the decision situations excluding 12,14. From table No.IV-12, it could be inferred that the mean of the existing decisional participation is 43.10 which is quite less than the 80 i.e. mean for the considerable participation.

On the basis of above inference from various tables it could be interpreted that for education system-I (Technological University), the existing decisional participation of the faculty members is less than the considerable participation.

4.3 EXPECTED PARTICIPATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN DECISION-MAKING :

Table No.IV-1 reveals the perceived expected decisional participation of the Professors. A high percentage of the Professors want good participation (participation always or participation to a great extent) in most of the decision situations excluding 28, 31. From table No.IV-6, it could be inferred that the mean of the expected decisional participation is 105.47, which is more than 80 i.e. mean for the considerable participation.

Table No.IV-2 shows the perceived expected participation of the Readers in various decision situations. Most of the Readers want good participation in various decision situations excluding 27, 28, 31. Table No.IV-8 gives the mean of the expected decisional participation 95.20, which is more than mean of considerable participation.

Table No.IV-3 gives the picture of expected participation of the Lecturers in various decision situations. Excluding 7,8,27,28, in most of the decision situations Lecturers want good participation or considerable amount of the participation. From Table No. IV 10, it could be inferred that the mean of the expected participation is 89.98 which is more than the mean for the considerable participation.

Table No.IV-4 reveals the perceived expected decisional participation of the faculty members (Professors, Readers, Lecturers all combined). Most of the faculty members want good participation in various decision situations excluding 7,8,18,27,28,31,32,36. From Table No.IV-12, it could be inferred that the mean of the existing decisional participation is 94.13 which shows expectations of good participation in decision-making.

It could be interpreted that faculty members want good participation in various decision situations.

4.4 DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN EXISTING AND EXPECTED DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION :

Table IV-14 shows the significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of Professors.Calculated 't' value is 6.98 which is clearly significant at .01 level of confidence (from t-table, for df=29, 't' is 2.76 for .01 level). It could be interpreted that the expected decisional participation mean is higher than the existing decisional participation mean.

Table IV-15 shows the significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of Readers. Calculated 't' value is 12.98 which is clearly significant at .01 level of confidence (from t-table, for df=60, 't' is 2.66, for df=70,'t' is 2.65 for .01 level). It could be interpreted that the expected decisional participation mean is higher than the existing decisional participation mean.

Table No.IV-16 shows the significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of Lecturers. Calculated 't' value is 14.94 which is clearly significant at .01 level of confidence (from t-table, for df=90, 't' is 2.63, for df=100, 't' is 2.63, for .01 level). It could be interpreted that the expected decisional participation mean is higher than the existing decisional participation mean.

Table No.IV-17 shows the significance of the difference between means of the existing decisional participation of Professors and Readers. Calculated 't' value is 4.22, which is clearly significant at .01 level (from t-table, for df=90, 't' is 2.63, for df=100, 't' is 2.63, for .01 level). It could be interpreted that the existing decisional participation mean of the Professors is higher than the existing decisional participation mean of the Readers.

Table No.IV-18 shows the significance of the difference between means of the existing decisional participation of Professors and Lecturers. Calculated 't' value is 6.13 which is clearly significant at .01 level (from t-table, for df=125, 't' is 2.62, for df=150, 't' is 2.61, for .01 level). It could be interpreted that the existing decisional participation mean of the Professors is higher than the existing decisional participation mean of the Lecturers.

Table No.IV-19 shows the significance of the difference between means of the existing decisional participation of Readers and Lecturers. Calculated 't' value is 2.52 which is significant at .05 level and insignificant at .01 level (From t-table, for df=150, 't' is 1.98 and 2.61 for .05 and .01 level respectively; for df=200, 't' is 1.97 and 2.60 for .05 and .01 level respectively). It could be interpreted that the existing decisional participation mean of the Readers is higher than the existing decisional participation mean of the Lecturers at .05 level.

Table No.IV-20 shows the significance of the difference between means of the expected decisional participation of Professors and Readers. Calculated 't' value is 2.11 which is significant at .05 level (From t-table, for df=90, 't' is 1.99 and 2.63 for .05 and .01 level; for df=100, 't' is 1.98 and 2.63 for .05 and .01 level). It could be interpreted that the expected decisional participation mean of the Professors is some what higher than the expected decisional participation, mean of the Readers at .05 level).

Table No.IV-21 shows the significance of the difference between means of the expected decisional participation of Professors and Lecturers. Calculated 't' value is 3.36 which is significant at .01 level (From t-table, for df=125, 't' is 2.62 and for df=150, 't' is 2.61 for .01 level). It could be interpreted that the expected decisional participation mean of the Professors is higher than the expected decisional participation mean of the Lecturers.

Table No.IV-22 shows the significance of the difference between means of the expected decisional participation of Readers and Lecturers. Calculated 't' value is .90 which is insignificant at .05 level (From t-table, for df=150, 't' is 1.98; for df=200, 't' is 1.97, for .05 level). It could be interpreted that the expected decisional participation mean of the Readers is nearly equal to the expected decisional participation mean of the Lecturers.

Table No.IV-23 shows the significance of the difference between means for the existing and expected decisional participation of the faculty members (Professors, Readers, Lecturers-all combined). Calculated 't' value is 24.62 which is highly significant at .01 level (From 't' table for df=150, 't' is 2.61 and for df=200, 't' is 2.60 at .01 level). It could be interpreted that there is a significant difference between existing and expected decisional participation of the faculty members. Expected decisional participation mean is higher than the existing decisional participation mean.

Table No.IV-5 shows the Chi-square (X^2) values for finding the significance of the difference between existing decisional participation and expected decisional participation for each decision situation perceived by the faculty members (Professors, Readers, Lecturers, all combined) for the Education System-I. For df=4, the Chi-square value is 13.277 from the standard chi-square table. It could be inferred from the table No.IV-5 that all the values of Chi-square for forty decision situations are higher than the standard value from the Chi-square table. It could be interpreted that there is a significant difference between the existing decisional participation and expected decisional participation of the faculty members for various decision situations.

4.5 ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEM - I :

Table No.IV-6 gives the mean score of the organizational health as 87.00 based on perception of thirty Professors.

Table No.IV-8 gives the mean score of the organizational health as 87.36 based on perceptions of seventy Readers. Table No.IV-10 shows the mean score of the organizational health as 89.91 based on perceptions of hundred Lecturers. Table No.12 shows the mean score of the organizational health as 88.58 based on perceptions of two hundred faculty members (Professors, Readers, Lecturers - all combined). It could be inferred that the mean scores of organizational health perceived by Professors, Readers and Lecturers are in the range of 85 to 90. Average organizational health for the forty items could be taken as 80 (40 x 2). Here it could be interpreted that Education System-I has got average organizational health.

4.6 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH AND EXISTING DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION :

Relationship between organizational health and existing decisional participation could be found out on the basis of the correlation co-efficient calculated from the organizational health score and existing decisional participation score (table Nos.IV-7, IV-9, IV-11, IV-13). Table No.IV-11 gives r=.41 which shows significant relationship between organizational health and existing decisional participation (From the Standard table, for df=90, r=.205 or .267 for .05 and .01 level respectively; for df=100, r=.195 or .254 for .05 and .01 level respectively). Table No.IV-13 gives r =.18 which also shows significant correlationship between organizational health

and existing decisional participation of the faculty members (from the standard table, for df=150, r=.159 or .208 for .05 and .01 level respectively for df=200, r=.138 or .181 for .05 and .01 level respectively). It could be interpreted that there is a correlation between organizational health and existing decisional participation based on the Lecturers participation).

4.7 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH AND EXPECTED DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION :

Relationship between organizational health and existing decisional participation could be found out on the basis of the correlation co-efficient calculated from the organizational health, score and existing decisional participation score (table Nos. IV-7, IV-9, IV-11, IV-13). Only table No.IV-11 gives r=.21 which shows relationship between organizational health and expected decisional participation at .05 level. Otherwise no relationship is observed from the other remaining tables mentioned above. It could be interpreted that there is correlation between organizational health and expected decisional participation based on the Lecturers' perception.

4.8 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXISTING DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION & EXPECTED DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION :

From Table No.IV-7 it could be observed that r = .43 which is significant at .05 level (From the standard table, for df=28, r = .361 or .463 for .05 and .01 level). From

Table No.IV-9, it could be seen that r = .40 which is significant at .01 level (From the standard table. For df = 60, r = .250 or .325, for .05 and .01 level respectively; For df = 70, r = .232 or .302 for .05 and .01 level respectively).

From Table No.IV-11, it could be observed that r = .36 which is significant at .01 level (From the standard table, for df = 90, r = .195 or .254 for .05 and .01 level respectively; for df = 100, r = .195 or .254 for .05 and .01 level respectively).

From Table No.IV-13, it could be observed that r = .41 which is significant at .01 level.

On the basis of above inferences, it could be interpreted that there is relationship between existing and expected decisional participation.