



Paving The Way For Responsible Management: A Study On Implementation Of UN PRME In B-Schools Of Gujarat

Dr. Kaushal Bhatt^{1*}, Dr. Ashok Bantwa², Dr. Krunal Bhuva³

^{1*}Associate Professor, Gujarat Technological University School of Management Studies, Ahmedabad

²Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management Studies, GLS University, Ahmedabad

³Associate Professor, Jayshukhlal Vadher Institute of Management Studies, Jamnagar

Abstract

The study explores the implementation of the UN Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME) in Gujarat's business schools, assessing their alignment with sustainability, ethics, and corporate social responsibility. Through a structured PRME Index, the research evaluates student engagement, faculty involvement, curriculum integration, research culture, and institutional policies. A sample of 50 institutions was analyzed using qualitative and quantitative methods, identifying key trends and challenges in embedding responsible management education. Findings reveal a strong emphasis on student engagement through workshops and live projects, yet gaps remain in research exposure, industry collaboration, and conference participation. While 73.1% of institutions excel in defining educational purpose, challenges persist in integrating ethical values, with half of the schools struggling in this domain. Teaching methodologies primarily focus on case studies and presentations, but low student interest in key subjects suggests a need for pedagogical innovation. Research culture is improving, with increasing academic publications, though financial support and global exposure remain limited. Industry partnerships and social responsibility initiatives show potential but require stronger institutional commitment. Despite widespread environmental sustainability efforts, formal research publications and structured communication remain underdeveloped. The study highlights areas for enhancement, such as faculty training, interactive learning, and industry-academic collaboration, to strengthen PRME adoption. While business schools in Gujarat demonstrate progress in responsible management education, strategic reforms are necessary to ensure comprehensive integration of PRME principles and sustained excellence in management education.

Keywords: Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME), PRME Implementation in business schools, Sustainability and Ethics, Student Engagement.

• Introduction

The Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME) is a United Nations-supported initiative launched in 2007 to integrate sustainability, ethics, and corporate responsibility into business education (PRME Secretariat, 2010). It serves as a global framework for academic institutions to develop responsible leaders who can address contemporary business challenges while upholding ethical and sustainable practices (Tavanti, 2012). PRME is aligned with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), encouraging institutions to incorporate sustainability into their curricula, research, and institutional strategies. It fosters dialogue between academia and industry, enhancing the relevance of business education and shaping a sustainable global economy. Given their critical role in management education, business schools have been increasingly held accountable for corporate failings and financial crises (e.g., Enron, Siemens, UBS) and ecological system failures like global warming (Khurana, 2010; Khurana and Nohria, 2008). As a response, efforts have been made to advance business ethics and corporate social responsibility education (Orlitzky and Moon, 2010). However, the challenge remains in rethinking management and leadership education to meet evolving societal demands. In this context, PRME has emerged as a key catalyst for the transformation of business education (Waddock et al., 2011; Rasche and Kell, 2010; Haertle, 2012).

PRME is structured around six key principles, each emphasizing different aspects of responsible management education:

- 1. Purpose:** Business schools play a critical role in shaping future leaders who create sustainable value for society. Institutions must integrate ethics, corporate responsibility, and sustainability into curricula while fostering critical thinking and experiential learning. Practical exposure through internships, case studies, and community engagement enhances students' ethical decision-making and social impact.
- 2. Values:** Institutions should align academic activities, curricula, and policies with global social responsibility standards, such as the UN Global Compact. Embedding ethics, sustainability, and corporate responsibility ensures that students develop integrity, accountability, and a commitment to social impact.
- 3. Method:** Business schools should adopt innovative teaching methodologies, including experiential learning, case studies, simulations, and interdisciplinary projects. Such approaches cultivate leaders who prioritize sustainability and ethical decision-making, equipping them to navigate complex business challenges.
- 4. Research:** Academic institutions should conduct interdisciplinary research on corporate ethics, business sustainability, and long-term value creation. By analyzing corporate strategies and governance models,



research can inform responsible business practices and policy development, contributing to inclusive economic growth and environmental stewardship (Khurana, 2010; Khurana and Nohria, 2008).

5. Partnership: Collaboration between academia and industry is crucial for bridging the gap between theory and practice. Engaging with business leaders through case studies, joint research, and practical initiatives ensures that responsible business strategies are both actionable and impactful. This strengthens the connection between business education and the corporate world, fostering ethical leadership (Waddock et al., 2011; Rasche and Kell, 2010).

6. Dialogue: Open discussion among educators, students, business leaders, policymakers, and civil society is essential to promote responsible management education. Conferences, research symposiums, and interdisciplinary forums facilitate knowledge-sharing and collaborative problem-solving, helping shape business policies and sustainable development strategies (Matten and Moon, 2005; Moon and Orlitzky, 2011; Orlitzky and Moon, 2010).

Despite PRME's global recognition, its adoption varies across regions due to differences in institutional priorities, faculty engagement, and industry expectations. While previous research has examined PRME integration at global and national levels, a significant gap remains in understanding its implementation at the regional level.

This study aims to bridge that gap by analyzing PRME adoption in Gujarat's business schools, focusing on institutional support, pedagogical strategies, and industry collaborations. It seeks to evaluate curriculum alignment, faculty involvement, institutional challenges, and the overall impact on student learning, ethical decision-making, and employability. Given that PRME aspires to equip students with sustainability-oriented competencies, it is essential to assess whether its implementation meets local industry expectations and prepares students for ethical leadership roles. Additionally, teaching methodologies play a vital role in PRME integration. While experiential learning techniques—such as simulations and debates—are widely regarded as effective, it remains to be seen whether business schools in Gujarat have embraced these approaches or continue to rely on traditional methods. This research will contribute to academic discourse and policy discussions by offering recommendations to enhance PRME adoption in alignment with regional educational and economic

• Literature Reviews

The Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME) have been widely explored as a transformative framework for integrating sustainability, ethics, and social responsibility into business education. However, the discourse around PRME reveals a tension between its aspirational goals and its practical implementation. Smith et al. (2023) critique PRME's effectiveness in challenging neoliberal paradigms, advocating for a complementary approach that integrates responsible management alongside capitalism. This perspective contrasts with the institutional and curricular dimensions emphasized by scholars like Tavanti (2012) and Tavanti and Wilp (2021), who position PRME as a strategic mechanism for fostering institutional commitment and leadership engagement. The alignment of PRME with global initiatives such as the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) further reinforces its potential role in shaping business education.

Despite these theoretical affirmations, Russo et al. (2023) highlight practical barriers to PRME implementation, such as institutional fragmentation and an overreliance on individual faculty champions rather than systemic adoption. This challenge is echoed by Forray and Leigh (2010), who stress that meaningful PRME implementation requires deep institutional commitment rather than superficial compliance. Their concerns align with Alcaraz and Thiruvattal (2010), who advocate for experiential learning as a means of embedding ethical leadership within PRME. This emphasis on hands-on learning is reinforced by Eckhaus et al. (2017), whose study on game-based education supports experiential methodologies in responsible management education. The need for pedagogical innovation in PRME adoption is further underscored by scholars addressing broader shifts in management education. Sharma (2017) proposes a competency-based model (CAMB) to address the erosion of ethics and values in business education, a framework that aligns with Anderson et al. (2018), who highlight the necessity of continuous pedagogical adaptation. Goyal et al. (2021) add to this discussion by examining the forced digital transition in management education due to the COVID-19 pandemic, proposing hybrid learning models that echo Sharma's (2017) competency-based approach and Anderson et al.'s (2018) emphasis on adaptive methodologies. These studies collectively reinforce the call for an educational paradigm that bridges theoretical understanding with real-world applications.

Extending the discourse on PRME's pedagogical impact, Gadelshina (2018) explores active learning through Model UN debates, aligning with Godemann et al. (2014), who argue that business schools must play a transformative role in addressing corporate corruption and ecological crises. Similarly, Hesselbarth and Schaltegger (2014) stress the importance of competence-based sustainability education, a perspective shared by Lans and Wesselink (2014), who advocate for bridging entrepreneurship and sustainability disciplines to develop future business leaders. O'Brien and Sarkis (2014) complement this view by presenting a deep



learning framework that uses sustainability consulting projects to enhance students' integrative and reflective skills, an approach that resonates with Haertle et al. (2017), who emphasize PRME's role in promoting responsible management education through case studies and consulting projects.

The discussion on ethical education within PRME finds further support in Valente et al. (2021), who examine the ethical perceptions of business students and their correlation with future corporate behavior. Their findings align with Srivastava et al. (2019), who explore the relationship between academic optimism and sustainability in higher education, highlighting the role of internal branding and extra-role behavior in fostering a culture of sustainability. However, while these studies present a positive outlook on PRME's ethical impact, Seraphin et al. (2020) reveal gaps in PRME's integration within tourism education, suggesting that responsible management principles remain inconsistently embedded across disciplines. Their findings align with Seraphin and Thanh (2020), who propose an ambidextrous management approach to educating children as responsible tourists, underscoring the need for sustainability education at an early stage.

The challenge of assessing PRME's impact is critically examined by Stough et al. (2018), who identify inconsistencies in sustainability assessment methodologies in higher education. Their critique resonates with Wright (2002), who reviews emerging themes in institutional policies and highlights the need for robust evaluation frameworks to measure sustainability education's effectiveness. This concern is further elaborated by Pizzi et al. (2020), who conduct a bibliometric analysis on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and business education, identifying key research themes such as technological innovation, firm contributions in developing countries, non-financial reporting, and education for SDGs. Their study reinforces the argument that PRME must integrate ethical, technological, and financial dimensions to prepare students for the complexities of sustainable business management.

Overall, the literature underscores both the promise and challenges of PRME as a vehicle for responsible management education. While scholars agree on its transformative potential, issues of institutionalization, pedagogical adaptation, and assessment remain central to its evolution. The discourse suggests that for PRME to achieve its intended impact, business schools must move beyond individual efforts and superficial compliance, embracing systemic and interdisciplinary approaches to responsible management education.

• **Methodology and Data Collection**

The study examines the regional adoption of the UN-initiated Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME) in Gujarat's business schools, which aim to integrate sustainability, ethics, and corporate social responsibility into management education. While PRME enjoys global recognition, its regional implementation remains inconsistent, often reliant on individual faculty efforts rather than institutional integration. There is also limited empirical evidence on its impact on students' ethical decision-making, sustainability awareness, and employability. This research investigates the challenges of institutionalizing PRME, its alignment with industry expectations, and its effectiveness in advancing responsible management education.

The study develops an index to assess PRME implementation based on student engagement, faculty involvement, and academic practices. It also examines how co-curricular activities like clubs, workshops, and conferences promote PRME principles and evaluates the integration of sustainability, ethics, and CSR into curricula, research, and institutional policies. The data is analyzed using quantitative and qualitative methods, with an index-based scoring system ranging from Outstanding (A+) to Poor (D) to measure PRME alignment. Focusing on business schools affiliated with Gujarat Technological University (GTU) and those meeting specific enrollment criteria, the study selects a sample of 50 institutions, ensuring diverse representation across public and private schools. Primary data is collected through a structured questionnaire targeting directors and principals, assessing six key principles: student engagement, curriculum relevance, academic practices, research culture, institutional partnerships, and sustainability initiatives.

Despite its contributions, the study has limitations, including its focus on Gujarat, reliance on self-reported data, variations in PRME interpretation, and an emphasis on quantitative metrics that may overlook qualitative insights. External factors like government policies and industry trends are also beyond its scope. Nevertheless, the research provides valuable insights into responsible management education in Gujarat's business schools, contributing to academic discourse and institutional strategies for PRME implementation.

• **Data Analysis and Discussion**

○ **Principle 1: Purpose**

The "Purpose" principle emphasizes that business schools should instill in students a sense of responsibility toward society and the environment. It calls for integrating social, environmental, and ethical considerations into the core mission of the institution. A business school embracing this principle ensures that its programs go beyond profit-driven motives, encouraging students to think critically about their role in promoting sustainable development. The purpose should align with creating leaders who are not only business-savvy but also



committed to contributing positively to society. This principle also encourages schools to develop programs that promote long-term value creation over short-term gains.

Table 1: Overview of implementation of principle 1: Purpose

| Variable | Options | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Clubs in Business Schools | Have | 35 | 70% |
| | Don't have | 15 | 30% |
| | | | |
| Paper Presentation by students in conferences | Present | 26 | 52% |
| | Don't Present | 24 | 48% |
| | | | |
| Students' participation in workshops | Participate | 38 | 76% |
| | Don't Participate | 12 | 24% |
| | | | |
| Students' participation in Management Fest/Competitions | Participate | 30 | 60% |
| | Don't Participate | 20 | 40% |
| | | | |
| Organization of conferences by business schools | Organize | 27 | 54% |
| | Doesn't organize | 29 | 58% |
| | | | |
| Organization of workshops by business schools | Organize | 39 | 78% |
| | Doesn't organize | 11 | 22% |
| | | | |
| Organization of management fest by business schools | Organize | 30 | 60% |
| | Doesn't organize | 20 | 40% |
| | | | |
| Teaching Pedagogies used by business schools | Through Case Studies | 37 | 28.46% |
| | Through Presentations/Seminar | 33 | 25.38% |
| | Through Role Plays | 21 | 16.15% |
| | Through Projects | 32 | 24.62% |
| | Through Simulation | 2 | 1.54% |
| | Through Lectures | 1 | 0.77% |
| | Decision-making skills, virtues of social-commercial responsibility, and ethical outlook | 1 | 0.77% |
| | Human resources, infrastructure, technical materials, laboratories, industrial exposure, and training | 1 | 0.77% |
| | Skill-based education and peer learning | 1 | 0.77% |



| | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----|--------|
| | AAC, UBP, ESL, Active learning | 1 | 0.77% |
| | | | |
| Live projects by students with companies/organizations | Undertaken | 31 | 62.00% |
| | Not undertaken | 19 | 38.00% |

(Source: Structured Questionnaire)

The study of business schools in Gujarat highlights a strong emphasis on student engagement through clubs, workshops, and live projects, though there remain areas for improvement. While 70% of institutions have established student clubs covering diverse fields such as marketing, finance, HR, entrepreneurship, analytics, and cultural activities, 30% lack such structures, which may limit extracurricular engagement. Conference participation remains an area for growth, as only 52% of business schools provide students with opportunities to present their research. However, workshops are widely adopted, with 76% of institutions encouraging student participation, and 78% actively organizing them, demonstrating a commitment to practical learning. Management fests and competitions are held in 60% of institutions, indicating a moderate focus on experiential learning. Teaching methodologies are diverse, with case studies (37 schools), presentations/seminars (33 schools), and projects (32 schools) being the most commonly used pedagogies, alongside role plays and, in some cases, simulations and skill-based education. A key strength of Gujarat's business schools is their emphasis on industry interaction, as 62% of institutions actively involve students in live projects with companies, enhancing their practical exposure and employability. However, with 46% of institutions not organizing conferences and 38% not engaging students in live projects, there is scope for further strengthening academic-industry linkages and research exposure. Overall, Gujarat's business schools demonstrate a balanced approach to management education, integrating practical and theoretical learning, though a greater focus on conference participation and structured extracurricular engagement could further enhance student development.

PRME Index for principle 1 : Purpose

The first principle of the PRME index representing 'purpose' has been designed based on nine parameters, including Student Clubs Presence, Paper Presentation in Conferences, Student Participation in Workshops, Participation in Management Fests/Competitions, and Organizing Conferences, utilizing the following ranking framework.

Table 2: Index Framework for Principle 1: Purpose

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| 1. Student Clubs Presence | | | |
| ✓ Yes | → | 5 | points |
| ✗ No → 1 point | | | |
| • Bonus Points: More student clubs with diverse focus areas (e.g., entrepreneurship, marketing, sustainability) can add +1 point for every 3 clubs. | | | |
| 2. Paper Presentation in Conferences | | | |
| ✓ Yes | → | 5 | points |
| ✗ No → 1 point | | | |
| • Bonus Points: | | | |
| ○ International Level → +2 points | | | |
| ○ National Level → +1 point | | | |
| ○ Regional Level → 0.5 points | | | |
| 3. Student Participation in Workshops | | | |
| ✓ Yes | → | 5 | points |
| ✗ No → 1 point | | | |
| 4. Participation in Management Fests/Competitions | | | |
| ✓ Yes | → | 5 | points |
| ✗ No → 1 point | | | |
| • Bonus Points: | | | |
| ○ International Level → +2 points | | | |
| ○ National Level → +1 point | | | |
| ○ State Level → 0.5 points | | | |



| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|---|---|--------|
| 5. Organizing Conferences | | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Yes | → | 5 | points |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No → 1 point | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bonus Points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ International Conference → +2 points ○ National Conference → +1 point ○ State Conference → 0.5 points | | | | |
| 6. Organizing Workshops | | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Yes | → | 5 | points |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No → 1 point | | | |
| 7. Organizing Management Fests | | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Yes | → | 5 | points |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No → 1 point | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bonus Points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ International Level → +2 points ○ National Level → +1 point ○ State Level → 0.5 points | | | | |
| 8. Teaching Pedagogy Used | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Studies → 1 point • Role Plays → 1 point • Presentations/Seminars → 1 point • Projects → 1 point • Other Innovative Methods → 1 point | | | | |
| (Maximum 5 points if all are used effectively) | | | | |
| 9. Student Projects for Companies/Organizations | | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Yes | → | 5 | points |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No → 1 point | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bonus Points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More than 10 projects annually → +2 points ○ International Company/NGO projects → +2 points | | | | |
| Ideal Score Interpretation | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 41-50 → Outstanding (A+) (Highly committed to PRME, best practices in place) • 31-40 → Excellent (A) (Strong PRME alignment with room for enhancement) • 21-30 → Good (B) (Moderate engagement, needs improvement) • 11-20 → Average (C) (Limited PRME adherence, many areas for growth) • 1-10 → Poor (D) (Minimal focus on PRME, requires significant improvement) | | | | |

The performance evaluation of business schools in Gujarat based on the first principle of the PRME Index, "Purpose," highlights a strong overall standing, with 73.1% of institutes securing Outstanding (A+) or Excellent (A) grades, demonstrating a robust alignment with the principle. This suggests that these institutes have well-structured curricula, effective teaching strategies, and active institutional engagement in responsible management education. However, a moderate 13.5% of institutes fall under the Good (B) category, indicating satisfactory but improvable performance, while 11.5% are in the Average (C) range, suggesting potential challenges in fully implementing Principle 1. The presence of one institute (1.9%) in the Poor (D) category, though a minority, warrants attention to identify underlying issues and provide targeted support. To enhance performance, institutes in the lower categories can benefit from additional mentoring, coaching, and curriculum improvements, while those in the Good (B) range can be encouraged to progress through peer learning and interactive sessions. Maintaining excellence among top-performing institutes is equally important, ensuring continued success through innovative teaching and continuous assessment. Overall, the strong performance across Gujarat's business schools is commendable, but focused efforts should be made to uplift the lower-performing institutes and sustain excellence across the board.

○ Principle 2: Value

The "Values" principle calls for business schools to integrate ethical principles into their teaching, research, and operations. It emphasizes the importance of values such as honesty, integrity, fairness, and respect for diversity. Business schools that adopt this principle foster an environment where students are encouraged to



make decisions that are morally sound and socially responsible. The integration of these values into the curriculum helps prepare students to navigate complex ethical dilemmas in the business world. Additionally, faculty members play a crucial role in modeling these values, ensuring that ethical leadership is consistently reinforced in both academic and real-world contexts.

Business schools were asked to assess the level of interest their students had in various subjects within the curriculum. The ratings were provided on a scale from 1 to 5, where a score of 1 represented a high level of interest, and a score of 5 indicated a low or no interest in the subject matter. This evaluation aimed to gain insights into which topics students find most engaging and which ones might need to be restructured or adjusted to better align with their interests and career goals.

Table 3: Overview of implementation of principle 2: Value

| Subjects | Average Rating |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Managerial Communication | 1.96 |
| Micro & Macro Economics | 2 |
| Organizational Behavior | 2.28 |
| Business Ethics and CSR | 2.26 |
| Legal Aspects of Business | 2.38 |
| Financial Management | 2.24 |
| Strategic Management | 2.26 |
| Marketing Management | 2.16 |
| Human Resource Management | 2.18 |
| Research Methods | 2.28 |
| Quantitative Techniques | 2.28 |
| Company/Industrial Visit | 2.18 |
| Summer Internship Program | 2.12 |
| Corporate Governance | 2.34 |
| Comprehensive/Capstone Project | 2.36 |

(Source: Structured Questionnaire)

The data reveals that students from business schools in Gujarat exhibit relatively lower levels of interest across various subjects, indicating potential challenges in student engagement and curriculum effectiveness. Subjects such as Managerial Communication (1.96), Micro & Macro Economics (2), and Organizational Behavior (2.28) receive lower average ratings, suggesting that students may struggle to find these topics engaging or relevant to their career aspirations. Similarly, Legal Aspects of Business (2.38) and Corporate Governance (2.34) also show limited student interest, which may impact their understanding of essential business regulations and ethical considerations. This trend could be attributed to factors such as teaching methodologies, lack of industry-oriented applications, or insufficient interactive learning experiences. To enhance student engagement, business schools in Gujarat may need to adopt more innovative pedagogical approaches, such as case-based learning, industry collaborations, and experiential learning opportunities. Encouraging student participation through role plays, live projects, and company visits could help bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application, making these subjects more appealing. Additionally, integrating real-world examples, guest lectures from industry experts, and interactive discussions could foster greater curiosity and enthusiasm among students.

PRME Index for Principle 2 (Values)

The second principle of the PRME index representing 'value' has been designed utilizing the following ranking framework.

Table 4: Index Framework for Principle 2 (Values)

| Scoring Criteria (Ideal Ranking System) | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|-------------------|---|---|--------|
| Each subject is ranked based on student interest, using the provided scale: | | | | | |
| 1 | = | Highly Interested | → | 5 | points |
| 2 | = | Interested | → | 4 | points |



3

=

Neutral

→

3

points

4

=

Not Interested

→

2

points

5

=

Highly Not Interested

→

1

point

Subject-wise Ranking Interpretation

The ideal ranking should promote subjects that are most valued in management education, with a strong emphasis on practical application and relevance in the business world.

| Particular | Ideal Score Interpretation |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Managerial Communication | 4 - 5 (Critical for leadership & soft skills) |
| Micro & Macro Economics | 4 - 5 (Foundation for business decision-making) |
| Organizational Behavior | 4 - 5 (Vital for leadership & HR roles) |
| Business Ethics and CSR | 4 - 5 (Aligns with responsible management values) |
| Legal Aspects of Business | 3 - 4 (Important for compliance & business law) |
| Financial Management | 4 - 5 (Core for financial decision-making) |
| Strategic Management | 4 - 5 (Key for business growth & innovation) |
| Marketing Management | 4 - 5 (Essential for market strategy) |
| Human Resource Management | 4 - 5 (Critical for workforce development) |
| Research Methods | 3 - 5 (Needed for data-driven decision-making) |
| Quantitative Techniques | 3 - 4 (Useful for analytics & forecasting) |
| Company/Industrial Visit | 4 - 5 (Practical exposure to industry) |
| Summer Internship Program | 5 (Hands-on experience, career readiness) |
| Corporate Governance | 4 - 5 (Crucial for ethical leadership) |
| Comprehensive/Capstone Project | 5 (Integrates learning, problem-solving) |

Ideal Ranking Interpretation Based on Score

- 65-75 → Outstanding (A+) (Strong student engagement, well-aligned curriculum)
- 55-64 → Excellent (A) (High interest, slight room for improvement)
- 45-54 → Good (B) (Moderate engagement, some subjects need improvement)
- 35-44 → Average (C) (Low interest in key areas, needs curriculum revamp)
- Below 34 → Poor (D) (Serious lack of interest, major re-evaluation required)

The performance evaluation of Gujarat's business schools on PRME Principle 2, "Value," reveals significant challenges, with half of the institutes receiving a Poor (D) grade and another substantial portion rated Average (C). This indicates widespread difficulty in understanding or applying this principle. Only a small fraction achieved Outstanding (A+) or Excellent (A), while a limited number secured a Good (B) grade, highlighting a lack of mastery. Compared to Principle 1, the weaker performance suggests a need for better teaching methods and engagement strategies. To address this, urgent remedial support, including extra coaching, peer mentoring, and practice sessions, is necessary for struggling institutes. Revamping teaching approaches through interactive learning, real-world applications, and case studies can enhance comprehension. Encouraging excellence through critical thinking exercises, competitions, and workshops is crucial, along with continuous assessments and personalized feedback to track progress. Given the significant performance gap, immediate intervention is essential to improve institute outcomes and strengthen their alignment with responsible management education.

○ Principle 3: Method

The "Method" principle stresses the importance of employing innovative teaching methods that promote responsible leadership. Business schools embracing this principle incorporate case studies, simulations, and experiential learning opportunities that highlight the challenges of balancing profit with social and environmental responsibility. The use of interactive methods such as group discussions and problem-solving workshops enables students to actively engage with ethical and sustainable business practices. By combining traditional learning with hands-on experiences, schools can equip students with the necessary skills to address real-world challenges. This principle encourages teaching practices that encourage critical thinking, ethical decision-making, and a holistic approach to business problems.

Table 5: Overview of implementation of principle 3: Method

| Variable | Options | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Norms for Social Responsibility | Don't have | 26 | 52.00% |



| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|----|--------|
| | Have | 24 | 48.00% |
| Students' performance measurement | Performance Presentations in | 34 | 32.69% |
| | Performance in Class Tests | 28 | 26.92% |
| | Performance Assignments in | 27 | 25.96% |
| | Performance in Mid Semester Exam | 15 | 14.42% |
| Internal committee for maintaining code of conduct | Don't have | 17 | 34.00% |
| | Have | 33 | 66.00% |
| Designated Authority for Awarding Internal Marks | Subject Teacher | 47 | 94.00% |
| | Principal/Director | 3 | 6.00% |
| Subdivision of CEC Marks | Don't have | 1 | 2.00% |
| | Have | 49 | 98.00% |
| Type of CEC components | Presentation | 11 | 23.91% |
| | Assignments | 8 | 17.39% |
| | Quiz | 5 | 10.87% |
| | Project Work | 4 | 8.70% |
| | Attendance | 9 | 19.57% |
| | Exams (Mid-Term, Mid-Semester, SEE) | 4 | 8.70% |
| | Classroom Behaviors | 1 | 2.17% |
| | CIE (1, 3) | 2 | 4.35% |
| | Simulation | 1 | 2.17% |
| | Viva | 1 | 2.17% |
| System of taking students' feedback | Not taken | 3 | 6.00% |
| | Taken | 47 | 94.00% |
| Book bank facility for students | Not Offered | 5 | 10.00% |
| | Offered | 45 | 90.00% |
| Mode of book bank facility | A set of books is given to group of two students | 3 | 6.00% |
| | A set of books is given to Individual Student | 38 | 76.00% |
| | Other | 9 | 18.00% |
| | Occasionally | 17 | 34.00% |



| | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----|--------|
| Frequency of Journal Access by students | Rarely | 3 | 6.00% |
| | Regularly | 30 | 60.00% |
| | | | |
| Organization of Guest Lectures in each semester | Not organized | 7 | 14.00% |
| | Organized | 43 | 86.00% |
| | | | |
| Organization of Study tours | Not organized | 7 | 14.00% |
| | Organized | 43 | 86.00% |
| | | | |
| Type of study tours | Within the State | 46 | 75.41% |
| | Other States of India | 12 | 19.67% |
| | International | 3 | 4.92% |

(Source: Structured Questionnaire)

The data on business schools in Gujarat provides key insights into their approach to social responsibility, student performance measurement, internal governance, evaluation systems, and academic support services. In terms of social responsibility norms, 48% of business schools in Gujarat have integrated such practices into their educational process, while 52% have not, reflecting a mixed level of commitment towards socially responsible education. Regarding student performance measurement, presentations (68%), class tests (56%), and assignments (54%) are the most commonly used assessment methods, while mid-semester exams are less frequently utilized (30%), indicating a stronger emphasis on continuous assessment through interactive methods. Additionally, 66% of business schools in Gujarat have established internal committees to maintain the code of conduct, emphasizing ethical governance, though 34% still lack such committees. When it comes to internal marking, subject teachers are the primary authorities in 94% of business schools, signifying a decentralized approach where faculty members assess students' academic progress based on their coursework and participation. Furthermore, 98% of business schools in Gujarat follow a structured subdivision of Continuous Evaluation Component (CEC) marks, allowing for a more detailed and diversified assessment strategy. The mode of evaluation reveals a balance between presentations, class tests, assignments, and project work, with attendance playing a more significant role compared to other regions, highlighting a focus on regular student engagement. Student feedback systems are widely adopted, with 94% of institutions implementing structured mechanisms to collect and act upon student input, reinforcing a student-centric approach to academic quality improvement.

Additionally, 90% of business schools offer a book bank facility, ensuring students have access to necessary academic resources, though some institutions still lack this provision. Regarding journal access, 60% of business schools report that students regularly engage with academic journals, supporting a research-driven learning environment. In terms of industry exposure, 86% of business schools in Gujarat organize guest lectures each semester, and the same percentage arrange study tours, primarily within the state (92%), with fewer opportunities for interstate (24%) and international (6%) visits. Overall, the data highlights a structured yet evolving academic ecosystem in Gujarat's business schools, with a focus on interactive learning, institutional governance, and student support services, while also identifying areas for further development, such as increasing social responsibility integration, strengthening ethical governance, and expanding global exposure opportunities.

PRME Index for Principle 3 (Method)

The third principle of the PRME index representing 'Method' is designed utilizing the following ranking framework. Each question is ranked on a scale of 1 to 5, where a higher score represents stronger alignment with quality management education and PRME principles.

Table 6: Index Framework for Principle 3 (Method)

| Question | Ideal Response | Score |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Scoring Criteria (Ideal Ranking System) | | |
| 17. Social Responsibility Implementation | Yes | 5 |
| 18. Details on Social Responsibility Practices | Strong community engagement, CSR projects, sustainability initiatives | 5 |



| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 19. Student Performance Measurement (Ticked Options) | More than 3 options selected | 5 |
| 20. Internal Committees for Code of Conduct | Yes | 5 |
| 21. Names of Committees | Includes Ethics, Discipline, Grievance Redressal, Anti-Ragging, etc. | 5 |
| 22. Decision Power for Internal Marks | Subject Teacher (academic autonomy) | 5 |
| 23. Common Subdivision for Internal Marks (CEC) | Yes | 5 |
| 24. CEC Heads (Title) | Attendance, Assignments, Presentations, Class Participation, etc. | 5 |
| 25. Student Feedback System on Teaching | Yes | 5 |
| 26. Key Areas of Feedback | Faculty Knowledge, Teaching Methodology, Engagement, Course Content, etc. | 5 |
| 27. Book Bank Facility | Yes | 5 |
| 28. Book Set Distribution | Individual student or small groups (2 max) | 5 |
| 29. Journal Access in Library | Regularly | 5 |
| 30. Guest Lectures Per Semester | Yes, for every subject | 5 |
| 31. Industrial Visits/Study Tours | Yes | 5 |
| 32. Study Tour Type | Within State + Other States + International | 5 |
| Ideal Score Interpretation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 90-100 → Outstanding (A+) (Highly structured methodology, best academic practices) 75-89 → Excellent (A) (Strong methodology, minor improvements needed) 60-74 → Good (B) (Moderate academic structure, can enhance engagement) 40-59 → Average (C) (Limited structured approach, needs improvements) Below 40 → Poor (D) (Lack of strong academic practices, major revision needed) | | |

The evaluation of Gujarat's business schools on PRME Principle 3, "Method," shows a predominantly moderate performance, with most institutes falling into the Average (C) category, indicating a basic understanding but limited proficiency. A smaller segment performed at a Good (B) level, demonstrating potential for growth, while only a few institutes achieved an Excellent (A) grade, suggesting room for enhancing engagement and mastery. A notable portion struggled, receiving a Poor (D) grade, highlighting the need for targeted academic support. The high number of Average (C) institutes points to gaps in conceptual clarity and critical thinking, necessitating interactive teaching methods, case studies, and group discussions to strengthen understanding. Institutes in the Good (B) category can be guided towards excellence through critical thinking exercises, challenging assignments, and mentoring, while struggling institutes would benefit from remedial classes, tutoring, and personalized feedback. Encouraging excellence through research projects, competitions, and real-world applications can help elevate overall performance. Strengthening conceptual learning, supporting weaker institutes, and fostering high achievers will be crucial in improving the implementation of Principle 3 across business schools.

○ Principle 4: Research

The "Research" principle emphasizes the importance of business schools conducting research that contributes to addressing global challenges, such as climate change, poverty, and inequality. Research within the context of this principle focuses on developing innovative solutions that can drive sustainable business practices. It encourages faculty and students to engage in projects that explore the intersections of business and social good, advancing knowledge that can be applied to real-world scenarios. By prioritizing research that fosters sustainability and ethical business practices, business schools can contribute to the global discourse on responsible management. Additionally, fostering a research culture aligned with the PRME principles helps cultivate a generation of scholars who will lead the way in creating impactful change.

Table 7: Overview of implementation of principle 4: Research

| Variable | Options | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Separate research cell | Don't have | 18 | 36.00% |
| | Have | 32 | 64.00% |



| | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--------|
| Paper Publication by Faculties in last two years | Scopus & Web of Science indexed journals | 34 | 36.56% |
| | UGC CARE listed Journals | 24 | 25.81% |
| | Full Research papers/Book Chapters published in Conference proceedings | 18 | 19.35% |
| | Books published having ISBN No. | 17 | 18.28% |
| | | | |
| Faculties' participation in conferences in last two years | International Level Conference/Seminar outside India | 5 | 2.79% |
| | International Level Conference/Seminar in India | 82 | 45.81% |
| | Natioanl level conference/seminar | 52 | 29.05% |
| | Regional level conference/seminar | 31 | 17.32% |
| | | | |
| Financial support for the students participating in conference/seminar | Not Provided | 35 | 70.00% |
| | Provided | 15 | 30.00% |
| | | | |
| Financial support for the research projects carried out by students/faculties | Not Provided | 35 | 70.00% |
| | Provided | 15 | 30.00% |
| | | | |
| Financial support for the research projects carried out by students/faculties | Not Provided | 36 | 72.00% |
| | Provided | 14 | 28.00% |
| | | | |
| Plan to carry out research project on Business Ethics | Don't have | 26 | 52.00% |
| | Have | 24 | 48.00% |
| | | | |
| Awards received by faculties/students in last two years | Awards Received by students | 102 | 79.69% |
| | Awards Received by faculties | 26 | 20.31% |

(Source: Structured Questionnaire)

The data highlights that business schools in Gujarat have made significant strides in fostering research, academic engagement, and faculty development. A considerable proportion of institutions (64%) have established dedicated research cells, emphasizing structured research initiatives for both faculty and students. The research output is particularly noteworthy, with 34 publications in Scopus and Web of Science indexed journals and a steady rise in UGC CARE-listed journal publications from 9 in 2022-23 to 15 in 2023-24. Additionally, faculty members have contributed to conference proceedings and book publications, further enhancing the research culture. Conference participation among faculty has also seen substantial growth, particularly in international conferences held within India, where participation increased from 16 in 2022-23 to 66 in 2023-24. However, international exposure outside India remains limited, with only a small number of faculty attending such events. These findings suggest that business schools in Gujarat are actively engaging in academic discourse, though there is room for further global outreach.

Despite strong research engagement, financial support for research and student participation in academic events remains an area for improvement. While 30% of business schools provide financial assistance for



students attending conferences and research activities, the majority (70%) do not offer such support. Similarly, external funding for research projects remains limited, with only 28% of business schools securing external research grants in 2023-24. On a positive note, nearly half (48%) of the business schools plan to conduct research on Business Ethics, indicating growing awareness of ethical business practices. The academic achievements of both students and faculty in Gujarat's business schools further reinforce their commitment to excellence, with students receiving 102 awards over two years and faculty members securing 26 awards. Overall, while the institutions demonstrate a strong research culture and academic engagement, enhancing financial support and expanding international research collaborations could further strengthen their position in the academic landscape.

PRME Index for Principle 4 (Research)

The fourth principle of the PRME index representing 'Research' is designed utilizing the following ranking framework. Each question is ranked on a scale of 1 to 5, where a higher score reflects stronger research culture and institutional support.

Table 8: Index Framework for Principle 4 (Research)

| Question | Ideal Response | Score |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 33. Separate Research Unit/Cell | Yes | 5 |
| 34. Faculty Publications & Conference Participation | Higher numbers (Scopus, UGC-CARE, ISBN, books) | 5 |
| 35. Financial Support for Student Research Participation | Yes | 5 |
| 36. Financial Support for Faculty/Student Research Projects | Yes | 5 |
| 37. Externally Funded Research Projects in AY 2023-24 | Yes | 5 |
| 38. Details of Funded Research | Multiple projects listed with funding details | 5 |
| 39. Research Project on Business Ethics | Yes | 5 |
| 40. Awards for Research Papers (Students & Faculty) | Multiple awards received | 5 |
| Ideal Ranking Interpretation Based on Score <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40-50 → Outstanding (A+) (Strong research ecosystem, significant institutional support) 30-39 → Excellent (A) (Active research culture, minor areas for improvement) 20-29 → Good (B) (Moderate research activity, needs more faculty/student engagement) 10-19 → Average (C) (Limited research initiatives, needs more institutional backing) Below 10 → Poor (D) (Minimal research activity, major improvements required) | | |

The evaluation of Gujarat's business schools on PRME Principle 5, "Research," reflects a balanced performance distribution, with a notable share of institutes achieving Outstanding (A+) or Excellent (A), indicating strong research capabilities. A significant portion falls into the Good (B) category, showing potential for further development, while those in the Average (C) range highlight the need for additional reinforcement. However, the highest proportion is in the Poor (D) category, suggesting major gaps in research engagement and output. Addressing these challenges requires targeted support through extra sessions, practical applications, and clearer research methodologies. Moderate performers can be elevated through advanced study resources, critical thinking exercises, and mentorship programs, while struggling institutes would benefit from personalized guidance, real-world case studies, and structured feedback. Encouraging excellence through research-driven workshops, competitions, and industry collaborations can further enhance performance. While the presence of high achievers is promising, efforts must focus on improving research culture and engagement to bridge gaps and elevate overall research standards across business schools.

○ Principle 5: Partnership

The "Partnership" principle calls for collaboration between business schools and various external stakeholders, including businesses, governments, NGOs, and civil society. By building partnerships with these groups, business schools can offer students real-world experiences that enhance their understanding of responsible management. Partnerships also create opportunities for research, internships, and community engagement, providing students with the practical tools to address complex societal issues. This principle encourages institutions to collaborate with industry leaders to ensure that their educational programs align with the needs of the business community and global challenges. These collaborations are crucial for fostering innovation and ensuring that academic teachings are relevant and impactful.

**Table 9: Overview of implementation of principle 5: Partnership**

| Variable | Options | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|------------|
| Guest Lectures of business Owners/Corporate leaders/Industrialists | Not Conducted | 19 | 38.00% |
| | Conducted | 31 | 62.00% |
| Joint projects with Business Houses in the vicinity | Not undertaken | 41 | 82.00% |
| | Undertaken | 9 | 18.00% |
| Management Development Programs Organized by business schools | Not organized | 28 | 56.00% |
| | Organized | 22 | 44.00% |
| Financial support to Small/Medium Enterprises | Not provided | 44 | 88.00% |
| | Provided | 6 | 12.00% |
| Seminar/workshops for officials of local government | Not organized | 36 | 72.00% |
| | Organized | 14 | 28.00% |
| Joint research projects with local government organizations | Not undertaken | 32 | 64.00% |
| | Undertaken | 18 | 36.00% |
| Students exchange program at National/International level | Not undertaken | 37 | 74.00% |
| | Undertaken | 13 | 26.00% |
| Joint project with NGOs | Not undertaken | 44 | 88.00% |
| | Undertaken | 6 | 12.00% |

(Source: Structured Questionnaire)

The data highlights that business schools in Gujarat have demonstrated a strong commitment to industry engagement and professional development through various initiatives. Guest lectures by business owners, corporate leaders, and industrialists were organized by 31 business schools (62%), indicating a significant effort to bridge academic learning with real-world business practices. However, 38% of the schools did not conduct such events, pointing to an area where improvements can be made. Additionally, joint projects with business houses remain limited, with only 18% of the institutions engaging in such collaborations. This suggests an opportunity for business schools to strengthen their industry partnerships, which could enhance student exposure, research opportunities, and practical learning experiences. Similarly, Management Development Programs (MDPs) were conducted by 44% of the business schools, highlighting their focus on executive education and professional development, though further expansion of these programs could enhance industry-academic collaboration.

Despite these strengths, there are gaps in areas such as financial support for SMEs, student exchange programs, and partnerships with NGOs. Only 12% of business schools provide financial assistance to SMEs, indicating that most institutions prioritize academic learning over direct financial involvement. Similarly, 74% of business schools do not participate in student exchange programs, which limits students' exposure to national and international academic environments. Additionally, only 12% of institutions collaborate with NGOs, suggesting limited involvement in social impact initiatives. Seminar and workshop engagements with local government officials also remain low, with 72% of business schools not organizing such events. These findings suggest that while Gujarat's business schools have made significant progress in industry engagement and academic excellence, expanding their collaborations with SMEs, NGOs, and government organizations could further enhance their role in the broader economic and social ecosystem.



PRME Index for Principle 5 (Partnership)

The fifth principle of the PRME index representing 'Partnership' is designed utilizing the following ranking framework. For Principle 5: Partnership, an ideal ranking system should evaluate the extent and quality of collaborations between the B-School and businesses, government bodies, NGOs, and international institutions. Below is a structured ranking system based on best partnership practices in management education. Each question is ranked on a scale of 1 to 5, where a higher score reflects stronger engagement, industry collaboration, and global exposure.

Table 10: Index Framework for Principle 5 (Partnership)

| Question | Ideal Response | Score |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 41. Guest Lectures by Industry Leaders | Yes | 5 |
| 42. Number of Guest Lectures Arranged | Higher number (10+ per year) | 5 |
| 43. Joint Projects with Business Houses | Yes | 5 |
| 44. Details of Joint Projects | Multiple projects listed with strong industry partnerships | 5 |
| 45. Management Development Programs (MDPs) for Industry | Yes | 5 |
| 46. MDP Details | Conducted multiple programs with reputed companies | 5 |
| 47. Financial Support for SMEs | Yes | 5 |
| 48. Workshops/Seminars for Local Government Officials | Yes | 5 |
| 49. Joint Research with Local Government | Yes | 5 |
| 50. Student Exchange Program (National/International) | Yes | 5 |
| 51. Details of Student Exchange Programs | National + International programs listed | 5 |
| 52. Joint Projects with NGOs | Yes | 5 |
| 53. NGO Collaboration Details | Multiple projects with social impact focus | 5 |
| 54. MoUs Signed with Industry/Institutions | 5+ MoUs signed per year with reputed organizations | 5 |
| Ideal Ranking Interpretation Based on Score <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 65-75 → Outstanding (A+) (Strong industry and government partnerships, global outreach) 55-64 → Excellent (A) (Active partnerships, minor areas for improvement) 45-54 → Good (B) (Moderate industry connections, needs more global exposure) 35-44 → Average (C) (Limited collaborations, needs stronger outreach efforts) Below 34 → Poor (D) (Minimal external engagement, major improvement needed) | | |

The evaluation of Gujarat's business schools on PRME Principle 5, "Partnership," reveals a major performance gap, with an overwhelming majority of institutes in the Poor (D) category, highlighting significant deficiencies in collaboration and external engagement. The minimal number of institutes achieving an Excellent (A) grade and the absence of high performers in the Outstanding (A+) or Good (B) categories further emphasize the need for urgent intervention. The few institutes in the Average (C) range demonstrate some understanding but require additional support to improve. Addressing this issue demands immediate remedial actions, including faculty training, curriculum restructuring, and interactive teaching methods such as case studies and real-world applications. To enhance engagement, institutes should be encouraged to participate in group discussions, peer mentoring, and industry collaborations, while continuous assessments and structured feedback can help track progress. Given the critical importance of partnerships in responsible management education, the lack of strong performers suggests a pressing need for institutional reforms, targeted interventions, and enhanced academic strategies to elevate the overall standard in this area.

○ Principle 6: Dialogue

The "Dialogue" principle encourages continuous conversations about responsible management between all stakeholders, including students, faculty, businesses, and the wider community. By facilitating open discussions on ethics, sustainability, and responsible leadership, business schools can create an inclusive environment where diverse perspectives are shared. This principle emphasizes the importance of dialogue in promoting mutual understanding and fostering solutions to global challenges. Business schools that prioritize dialogue offer platforms for engaging with external experts, hosting conferences, and encouraging debates that challenge traditional business practices. Through ongoing dialogue, business schools can ensure that their



educational offerings remain relevant and adaptable to the changing demands of the global business environment.

Table 11: Overview of implementation of principle 5: Partnership

| Variable | Options | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Publication of newsletter | Not published | 35 | 70.00% |
| | Published | 15 | 30.00% |
| | | | |
| Frequency of newsletter Publication | Annually | 20 | 40.00% |
| | Bi annually | 2 | 4.00% |
| | Monthly | 1 | 2.00% |
| | Quarterly | 27 | 54.00% |
| | | | |
| Active Social Media handle accounts | Facebook | 53 | 29.44% |
| | Instagram | 54 | 30.00% |
| | LinkedIn | 37 | 20.56% |
| | YouTube | 33 | 18.33% |
| | X (formerly Twitter) | 3 | 1.67% |
| | | | |
| Active blog for discussion on latest happening | Don't have | 26 | 52.00% |
| | Have | 24 | 48.00% |
| | | | |
| Mode of communication with students | Through Notice Board | 41 | 28.08% |
| | Through Notice in Classrooms | 29 | 19.86% |
| | Through SMS/Whatsapp | 47 | 32.19% |
| | Through Website | 16 | 10.96% |
| | Through Blog/Facebook Page | 6 | 4.11% |
| | Through E-mail | 7 | 4.79% |
| | | | |
| Journal with ISSN number | Don't have | 33 | 66.00% |
| | Have | 17 | 34.00% |
| | | | |
| Environment Friendly Campus | Don't have | 2 | 4.00% |
| | Have | 48 | 96.00% |
| | | | |
| Formal HR Policies | Don't have | 6 | 12.00% |
| | Have | 44 | 88.00% |

(Source: Structured Questionnaire)

The analysis of business schools in Gujarat highlights key trends in communication, engagement, and institutional practices. A significant finding is that 70% of these institutions do not publish their own newsletters, indicating a gap in structured communication with stakeholders. Among those that do, the majority prefer



quarterly or annual publications, suggesting a focus on comprehensive rather than frequent updates. Similarly, while nearly half of the business schools maintain blogs, the remaining institutions have yet to adopt this medium for academic discussions and institutional outreach. Social media engagement is, however, widespread, with Instagram and Facebook being the most popular platforms, followed by LinkedIn and YouTube. Despite the dominance of digital communication channels, traditional methods such as SMS/WhatsApp and notice boards remain the preferred modes of student interaction, while the use of websites and blogs for official communication remains limited.

Academic engagement and institutional management also present interesting patterns. Only 34% of business schools publish journals with ISSN numbers, suggesting limited participation in formal research publication. This presents an opportunity for institutions to strengthen their academic reputation through increased scholarly output. On a positive note, 96% of business schools in Gujarat have adopted environment-friendly initiatives, reflecting a strong commitment to sustainability. Furthermore, 88% of the institutions have formal HR policies, ensuring structured management of faculty and staff. These findings indicate that while business schools in Gujarat excel in areas such as social media engagement and environmental sustainability, there remains scope for improvement in research contributions and institutional communication strategies.

PRME Index for Principle 6 (Dialogue): The sixth principle of the PRME index representing 'Dialogue' is designed utilizing the following ranking framework. Each question is ranked on a scale of 1 to 5, where a higher score reflects stronger engagement, communication, and sustainability initiatives.

Table 12: Index Framework for Principle 6 (Dialogue)

| Question | Ideal Response | Score |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 55. Newsletter Publication | Yes | 5 |
| 56. Newsletter Frequency | Monthly or Quarterly | 5 |
| 57. Active Social Media Handles | Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, LinkedIn, X (More platforms = Higher Score) | 5 |
| 58. Active Blog for Discussions | Yes | 5 |
| 59. Communication Methods | Multiple options used (Notice Board, WhatsApp, Website, Email, Social Media) | 5 |
| 60. Journal with ISSN Number | Yes | 5 |
| 61. Journal Details | Published regularly, high impact, ISSN verified | 5 |
| 62. Environment-Friendly Campus | Yes | 5 |
| 63. Use of Renewable Energy | Yes | 5 |
| 64. Details of Renewable Energy Use | Solar, Wind, Biogas, etc. | 5 |
| 65. Formal HR Policies | Yes | 5 |
| 66. HR Policies (Promotion, Leave, Financial Assistance, etc.) | Well-documented and implemented | 5 |
| 67. Contribution to Society | Strong social impact initiatives (education, CSR, sustainability projects) | 5 |
| 68. Best Practices in AY 2023-24 | Multiple innovative practices benefiting students & society | 5 |
| 69. Additional Comments | Well-articulated insights on improvements and future goals | 5 |
| Ideal Ranking Interpretation Based on Score <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 65-75 → Outstanding (A+) (Highly active engagement, strong communication, and sustainability focus) 55-64 → Excellent (A) (Very active, minor areas for improvement) 45-54 → Good (B) (Moderate engagement, needs more outreach & sustainability efforts) 35-44 → Average (C) (Limited institutional dialogue, needs structured communication strategies) Below 34 → Poor (D) (Minimal external engagement, lacks transparency and communication strategies) | | |

The evaluation of Gujarat's business schools on PRME Principle 6, "Partnership," highlights significant performance gaps, with a majority of institutes falling into the Poor (D) category, suggesting fundamental difficulties in understanding or applying this principle. While a considerable number of institutes are in the Average (C) range, indicating a basic grasp of the concept, only a small fraction have reached the Good (B) level, and none have achieved Excellent (A) or Outstanding (A+), pointing to a lack of high achievers. This distribution suggests that current teaching methods and engagement strategies may not be effectively fostering deep comprehension or enthusiasm for the subject. Addressing these challenges requires targeted remedial



interventions for struggling institutes, peer learning initiatives, and more interactive teaching methods such as case studies, real-world applications, and gamified learning techniques to boost interest and participation. Encouraging excellence through advanced learning materials, project-based tasks, and structured mentorship programs is crucial to pushing institutes beyond mediocrity. Additionally, reviewing teaching methodologies and incorporating faculty training programs can help bridge the learning gap. Without these strategic improvements, institutes may continue to struggle, impacting not only their individual performance but also the overall academic standing of business schools in the region.

Conclusion

The study concludes that while business schools in Gujarat have made commendable strides in fostering responsible management education, there remain significant areas for improvement. Institutions have demonstrated strong engagement through student clubs, workshops, and industry collaborations, yet challenges persist in research participation, conference involvement, and structured extracurricular activities. The assessment of PRME principles indicates a mixed performance, with some institutions excelling while others struggle to align with key objectives. To bridge these gaps, there is a need for enhanced faculty training, curriculum enrichment, and the adoption of more interactive teaching methodologies. Furthermore, increasing global exposure through student exchange programs, research collaborations, and international conferences can strengthen the academic ecosystem. By fostering industry-academic partnerships and implementing targeted interventions, business schools can further advance their commitment to responsible management education. Future research can explore the long-term impact of PRME implementation on graduate employability, ethical leadership, and sustainable business practices to assess its effectiveness over time.

Acknowledgement:

This paper is based on the funded minor research project approved by Indian Council for Social Science Research, New Delhi to Project Director Dr. Kaushal Bhatt, Associate Professor, Gujarat Technological University. The Project Team is thankful to all the heads/directors of the B-Schools for providing relevant details for the project and paper.

References

1. Alcaraz, J. M., & Thiruvattal, E. (2010). An interview with Manuel Escudero The United Nations' principles for responsible management education: a global call for sustainability. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9(3), 542-550.
2. Anderson, L., Hibbert, P., Mason, K., & Rivers, C. (2018). Management education in turbulent times. *Journal of Management Education*, 42(4), 423-440.
3. Eckhaus, E., Klein, G., & Kantor, J. (2017). Experiential learning in management education. *Business, Management and Economics Engineering*, 15(1), 42-56.
4. Forray, J. M., & Leigh, J. (2010). Principles of responsible management education (PRME). *Journal of Management Education*, 34(5), 775-776.
5. Gadelshina, G. (2018). Meaningful learning and the integration of responsible management education in the business school courses. *International Journal of Modern Education Studies*, 2(1), 23-34.
6. Godemann, J., Haertle, J., Herzig, C., & Moon, J. (2014). United Nations supported principles for responsible management education: Purpose, progress and prospects. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 62, 16-23.
7. Goyal, J. K., Daipuria, P., & Jain, S. (2021). An alternative structure of delivering management education in India. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 49(3), 325-340.
8. Haertle, J., & Miura, S. (2014). Seven years of development: United Nations-supported principles for responsible management education. *SAM Advanced Management Journal* (07497075), 79(4).
9. Haertle, J., Parkes, C., Murray, A., & Hayes, R. (2017). PRME: Building a global movement on responsible management education. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 66-72.
10. Hesselbarth, C., & Schaltegger, S. (2014). Educating change agents for sustainability—learnings from the first sustainability management master of business administration. *Journal of cleaner production*, 62, 24-36.
11. Kell, G. (2013). 12 years later: Reflections on the growth of the UN Global Compact. *Business & Society*, 52(1), 31-52.
12. Khurana, R. (2010). From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession. In *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands*. Princeton University Press.
13. Khurana, R., & Nohria, N. (2008). It's time to make management a true profession. *Harvard business review*, 86(10), 70-77.



14. Lans, T., Blok, V., & Wesselink, R. (2014). Learning apart and together: towards an integrated competence framework for sustainable entrepreneurship in higher education. *Journal of cleaner production*, 62, 37-47.
15. Lozano, J. M., Bofarull, I., Waddock, S., & Prat-i-Pubill, Q. (2020). Avoiding the iron cage of business school rankings. *Higher Education Policy*, 33, 135-157.
16. O'Brien, W., & Sarkis, J. (2014). The potential of community-based sustainability projects for deep learning initiatives. *Journal of cleaner production*, 62, 48-61.
17. Orlitzky, M., & Moon, J. (2010). Assessing corporate social responsibility education in Europe. *Toward Assessing Business Ethics Education*, 143.
18. Pizzi, S., Caputo, A., Corvino, A., & Venturelli, A. (2020). Management research and the UN sustainable development goals (SDGs): A bibliometric investigation and systematic review. *Journal of cleaner production*, 276, 124033.
19. Russo, F., Wheeldon, A. L., Shrestha, A., & Saratchandra, M. (2023). Responsible Management Education in Business Schools—High on principles but low on action: A systematic literature review. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(3), 100843.
20. Secretariat, P. (2010). An Interview With Manuel Escudero The United Nations' Principles for Responsible Management Education: A Global Call for Sustainability JOSE M. ALCARAZ.
21. Seraphin, H., & Thanh, T. V. (2020). Investigating the application of the principles for responsible management education to resort mini-clubs. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 18(2), 100377.
22. Sharma, R. R. (2017). A competency model for management education for sustainability. *Vision*, 21(2), x-xv.
23. Smith, S. M., Cripps, K., Stokes, P., & Séraphin, H. (2023). The principles for (ir) responsible management education: An exploration of the dynamics of paradox, the hidden curriculum, competencies and symbolization. *Management Learning*, 54(3), 384-395.
24. Srivastava, A. P., Mani, V., & Yadav, M. (2019). Evaluating the implications of stakeholder's role towards sustainability of higher education. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 240, 118270.
25. Stough, T., Ceulemans, K., Lambrechts, W., & Cappuyns, V. (2018). Assessing sustainability in higher education curricula: A critical reflection on validity issues. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 172, 4456-4466.
26. Tavanti, M. (2012). Responsible management education in practice: The principles and processes for educating socially responsible and world engaged leaders. In *Handbook of research on teaching ethics in business and management education* (pp. 546-563). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
27. Tavanti, Marco, and Elizabeth A. Wilp. "Globally responsible management education: From principled challenges to practical opportunities." *Handbook of research on business ethics and corporate responsibilities* (2015): 196-220.
28. Valente, M., Sa, C., Soares, N., & Sousa, S. (2021). Exploring the consistency of ethical perceptions by business and economics higher education students: Looking from academia towards the corporate world. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 19(2), 100499.
29. Wright, T. S. (2002). Definitions and frameworks for environmental sustainability in higher education. *Higher education policy*, 15(2), 105-120.