

Journal of Institutional Research South East Asia

JIRSEA

**Volume 12 Number 2
2014**

ISSN 1675-6061

Editor:

Nirwan Idrus PhD*Monash IQA London*

All papers are refereed by two appropriately independent, qualified experts and evaluated according to:

- Significance in contributing new knowledge
 - Appropriateness for the Journal
 - Clarity of presentation
 - Technical adequacy

JIRSEA is indexed with the Directory of Open Access Journals, SCOPUS, EBSCoHost (Education Research Index/Education Research Complete) and currently applying to INFORMIT (Australasian Scholarly Research). As provided in the Ulrich's Directory, all journals in the DOAJ are also indexed in the Ulrich's Directory



<http://www.seairweb.info>

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor

Professor Dr Nirwan Idrus

Faculty of Engineering and Technology, Multimedia University, Malaysia.
nirwan.idrus@gmail.com

Members

Professor George Gordon

Director, Centre for Academic Practice, University of Strathclyde, Scotland

Dr Raj Sharma

Senior Consultant in Higher Education, Melbourne, Australia

Dr. Sutee Sujitparapitaya

Associate Vice President, Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics, San Jose State University, USA

Dr John Muffo

Director, Office of Academic Assessment, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, East Virginia, USA

Professor Somwung Pitiyanuwat

Chulalongkorn University, and
Director, Office of Education Standard & Evaluation, ONEC, Bangkok, Thailand

Professor Dr Narend Baijnath

Pro-Vice-Chancellor, University of South Africa, South Africa

Professor Dr Zoraini Wati Abas

Director of Learning, Sampoerna Education Foundation, Jakarta, Indonesia

Dr Ng Gan Chee

Principal, Australasian Consultants, Melbourne, Australia

THE SHARED GOVERNANCE PRACTICES IN THE JORDANIAN UNIVERSITIES: FACULTY MEMBERS PERSPECTIVE

Kamal E. Bani-Hani

President

Aieman A. AL-OMARI

Dean, Faculty of Educational Sciences

The Hashemite University, Zarqa 13133, Jordan

Abstract

This study investigated the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities, and analyzes the significant differences based on their "gender, years of teaching, academic rank, classification of college", by using the participants' practices shared governance instrument. The study was carried out among 231 faculty members who worked in Hashemite University.

The results of study reveals that the practice of faculty members of shared governance in all aspects (university board's role, the president's board's role, faculty members role, Joint Decision-Making, Organizational Environment, Climate for Governance) was in low degree. No differences were found in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance based on their gender, and the classification of the college. Significant differences were found in the degree of practice of faculty members based on their years of teaching in (University Board's Role, President Role, Faculty Members Role, Joint Decision Making, and Climate for Governance). And differences were found based on their academic rank.

The researchers recommended that the Jordanian universities should pay attention to the leadership structure in their universities, and developing policies that will serve to encourage faculty inclusiveness in shared.

Key words: Shared governance, Jordanian Universities, Faculty members

Introduction

Despite the rapid growth rate of universities in Jordan, very little is written about the role of faculty participation in the governance of these universities. It remains unclear what the role of faculty is in the shared governance, and to what extent they value an environment of a participatory decision-making.

Shared governance, although a corporate concept, holds major benefits in the academy, and universities could benefit tremendously from this process. Shared governance, by its very nature of inclusiveness, creates an environment where stakeholders have more vested interest in the process and are held accountable for their role in the process. However, Kezar, Lester, and Anderson (2006) suggest that shared governance has been an important part of higher education institutions over the last 75 years.

Shared governance is widely appreciated as a laudable goal, Tierney and Minor (2003) and Minor (2003) report that 82% of respondents at master's degree universities agreed that shared governance is an important part of the institution's values and identity. Shared governance can be found in all three constituent groups on campus: 96 percent of [academic VPs], 86 percent of Senate leaders, and 78 percent of faculty indicated their belief that shared governance is important."

Despite the fact that universities have functioned for more than 50 years in Jordan, all major decisions about governance of these universities are made generally without significant input and participation from the educational stakeholders, such as department chairpersons, faculty, staff, and students (Abdelkader, Al-Hussami, Al barmawi, Saleh, & Shath, 2012) . With this level of centralization of governance along with what seems to be a circuitous reporting relationship, the department chairpersons appear to be responsible only for decisions regarding the day-to-day operations of their departments. Faculty members have almost no voice in the administration or planning at their universities. Their roles appear to be limited to their classroom interaction with students. By structuring participation so that the presidency level are the parties responsible for making the most important decisions regarding universities, the faculty role in governance seems diminished and perhaps, nonexistent. This practice impacts the autonomy of universities and shapes how these universities structure their own governance at the individual college level (Gonzalez & Royer, 2004).

The concept of shared governance has been in the consciousness of American academic institutions since 1915. The governance of universities and colleges should be an inclusive process and that the faculty perspective should be given great consideration, especially in areas that are exclusively the faculty's domain (American Association of University Professors AAUP, 1966). AAUP (1966) also suggested that all stakeholders should participate in creating an environment that would allow for joint participation in the planning and running of their institutions. All persons in the institution have a stake in its governance and, therefore, should play a role in how it is governed and that faculty should play a critical role in the areas in which they have expertise (AAUP, 1966).

Tierney (2004) posits that the failures of shared governance often result from different individuals on campus having different concepts about what shared governance is supposed to mean. Del Favero (2003) recognizes administrators and faculty have different values, interests, and responsibilities. These differences lead to an unreliable foundation for decision making. Faculty are specialized. They have a passion for a certain subject and they are immersed in it. They are not as connected to broader university goals. They are not as concerned with administrative details, and so they easily overlook them or do not understand them. They frequently perceive money spent on administration as a misuse of funds. They frequently have few institutional incentives to participate in governance.

The literature on shared governance contains multiple definitions and as such, it presents a challenge to identify any one suitable definition for all situations. Lanning (2006) indicated that some institutions may define shared governance as a process that will involve the people who are affected by the decisions that are made; for example, faculty and staff are involved in the decisions that are made about them. However, other institutions may define shared governance by the culture of the institution; for example, the decision making culture of the institution will play a major role in who participates in decision-making, and at what level is the participation included. Regardless of how it is defined, there are common themes that emerge in most definitions; for example, words like collaboration, mutuality, participation, responsibility and advisory can be found as a theme in almost all of the definitions.

Bingham (2000) defined shared governance as an organizational process of collective decision making and implementation in which participants are individually and collectively held accountable and responsible to executive bodies and/or constituents being served. Maloney (2003) suggested that it is a social system of self-governance, wherein decision-making responsibility is shared among those that are most affected.

The American Federation of Teachers (AFT, 2002) described shared governance as a process where the set of practices under which college faculty and staff participate in significant decisions about the operation. According to the academic senate of the California State University (CSU, 2001), shared governance describes the relationship between the administration and the faculty in which the faculty participate in giving direction and advice to the university on important policy decisions.

Kaplan (2004) admitted that there is a lingering perception that sharing decision-making is a great source of discontent among college administrators and faculty. In a study about shared governance conducted at four year institutions (both public and private), Kaplan concluded that there was little evidence that shared governance is ineffective and was unable to confirm the perception that shared governance negatively impacts the ability to get the work done.

Kezar (2004) suggested that the call for doing away with shared governance may not be what is needed. Rather, institutions may need to pay more attention to relationships among stakeholders, creating an atmosphere of trust, and for leadership to lead. Kezar further pointed out that leadership and leadership styles play a crucial role in the types of relationships that are engendered, which is critical to the outcome of governance in academia.

Trombley (1997) rejected the notion that shared governance is more of a problem than a solution. Further, Love (2005) supported the notion that shared governance promotes open communication because it demands that all stakeholders be involved in the decision making. One key advantage is that it creates a climate for people to agree and disagree (Walker, 1979). Such open communication allows for ideas to be aired and for necessary changes to be made, requiring faculty involvement and accountability. When faculty members become involved, they feel more like a part of the process. Subsequently, they feel empowered and more inclined to participate in the process (Birnbaum, 1992).

Research shows that participation in shared governance is not as attractive as it used to be. Younger faculty members are indicating a disinterest, which concerns older members who are major proponents and who are getting ready to retire (Arreola, Aleamoni, & Theall, 2001). The faculty respondents in the CSU (2001) study, *Shared Governance Reconsidered*, provided several solutions for how the institution can increase faculty participation in its decision-making activities. This study suggested that if these issues were addressed, it would be more encouraging to faculty and would increase their participation. Some of the solutions included: (a) a need for holistic change in the environment; and (b) improvement in areas such as communication among constituents, (c) board attitudes towards faculty and faculty toward the boards, (d) environmental factors, structures and processes, and; (e) a reduction in disincentives.

Abdelkader, Al-Hussami, Al barmawi, Saleh, & Shath (2012) study about the perception of academic nursing staff toward “shared governance” was assessed in a nonexperimental survey research design. Using a nonprobability sampling method, all academic nursing staff had the opportunity to respond to the Collaborative Behavior Scale (CBS) at the pre-implementation of shared governance model. Four universities, including public and private universities were included in the study. Both surveys contained a short demographic section and the Collaborative Behavior Scale CBS adapted from Stickler 1991. Results showed a low level of perception which presented by the collaborative behaviors toward shared governance. Interestingly, commitment to shared governance was neither sufficient nor satisfied during this time. Long experiences with advanced ages for MSc and PhD holders' had significantly higher scores on perception than other groups. The results of the survey indicated that academic staff members recognized shared governance as a process, not a project, and that it takes time to share responsibility, accountability, and authority for faculty members. Overall, Jordanian academic nursing staff have not enough willingness nor commitment to shared governance principles.

For shared governance to be sustained, Birnbaum (1988) posited that a way to sustain shared governance is that the parties involved be very clear and specific in their intentions. He argued that shared governance usually lacks clarity and specificity. Mitchell, Grant and Rossa (1992) theorized that shared governance works very well in the corporate world and that it can work equally well in academia. However, they contended that the first thing that must happen in making shared governance work is that necessary changes must be made. For example, they noted that a negative attitude towards shared governance does not benefit the process. Instead, they recommended that participants see themselves as being responsible and must be ready to commit to the decisions that emerge as a result, whether they agree or not.

Schuetz (1999) posited that governance is a function of structure and of how people act within that structure. The models of shared governance in higher education institutions are not all similar. In a shared governance environment, there are three fundamental assumptions that institutions should use to develop the guiding principles: (a) governance should result from the interdependence and cooperation among the various governance components; (b) shared governance and academic freedom are inextricably linked; and (c) faculty participation in governance is an ethical obligation (Ramo, 1997).

Gerber (2001) appeared to agree with the notion that academia should adopt abandon that model and adopt the corporate philosophy. He suggested that most critics of shared governance believe that it is no longer a useful model in higher education, and that the shared governance model should be replaced with a hierarchical corporate model.

Birnbaum (1988) insisted that academia must create models of shared governance that can work for the academic environment. In order to accommodate a model that works, academic leadership needs to take into account issues such as the interdependence of the various divisions and the interplay between and among these divisions in these institutions. interdependence is clearly manifested whenever change occurs in the institution. For example, if one area of the college goes through a significant change, then other areas will need to change in order to accommodate the initial changes.

Giordani (2005) explained that there are three basic types of governance models that exist in organizations, and all organizations will avail themselves of one of these models. However, he argues that in academia, management and governance systems are structured according to how institutions are perceived. For example, the top- down (administrative or corporate) model in academia espouses the belief that consulting too extensively with faculty prevents the institution from responding rapidly; this model is characterized by speed and efficiency.

The collective bargaining models said to work best for faculty that sense growing antagonism between the administration and themselves. This model creates a sense of empowerment for faculty and is characterized by “us” and “them” (Giordani, 2005, p. 1). The shared governance model is utilized by academic institutions and implies that there is shared responsibility for decision making. It also implies that constituents understand the interdependence among the stakeholders and try to be cooperative about it. In this model, one of the basic assumptions of faculty members and administrators is that they are all peers and they all share the same values about their institutions (Giordani, 2005).

Theoretical Framework

Van (1999) noted that personal characteristics such as age affect faculty members’ participation in shared governance, that older faculty members (over 55years) are generally more satisfied than younger ones (early 20s and 30s). The more satisfied faculty members are, the more willing they are to participate in shared governance processes in their institutions. Younger faculty are less interested in shared governance (Van, 1999), and shared governance becomes less important in the institution as older faculty members retire.

Ramo's (1997) six tenets of frame this study. These tenets are: (a) the University board's role, (b) the president's role, (c) the faculty's role (d) joint decision making, (e) climate for governance, and (f) organizational environment. Ramo (1997), in his body of work on shared governance, provided a basic description of the indicators of shared governance, with the expectation that colleges and universities can modify these basic indicators to suit their own institutional cultures. This framework provides the indicators to examine governance practices to determine whether shared governance was evident in the Jordanian universities.

University Board's Role. The board forms the central governing body of the institution with the ultimate responsibility for the management and effectiveness of the institution. Board members are either appointed or elected and their length of service varies (Ramo, 1997). The success of shared governance depends heavily upon establishing effective working relationships among trustees, college administrators, the academic senates, faculty and classified staff. Shared governance assumes that there will be collegiality in the working relationships among all stakeholders for the good of the "collegium" (Birnbaum, 1998). This is especially true of the relationship among the boards of trustees and other administrators and faculty.

Trust is a major hurdle that boards of trustees and faculty must overcome. Kezar (2004) noted that the whole idea that shared governance can be effective, is predicated on the notion that there will be trust in these shared decision making relationships; it has been established that there is a relationship between trust and accountability in shared governance relationships.

President's Role

The president is the chief academic administrative officer for the institution. One of the main functions of the leader of any institution is to shape the culture of that institution (Baldrige et.al, 1978). The culture of the institution will be important in what the members expect from the institution, and the president is a major factor in the creation of this culture (Ramo, 1997).

Faculty Role

The faculty role in shared governance is the most complicated of all the roles. Often, administrations are accused of encroaching on areas that are of faculty purview and this often results in disquiet among faculty (Ramo, 1997). However, it is of critical importance that faculty members have a voice in the decisions that are made about the areas where they maintain some levels of autonomy. AAUP (1966) declared faculty have primary responsibility in the fundamental areas of what they do in the institution; for example, faculty must be involved in decision-making about curriculum, methods of instruction and faculty status and for the aspects of student life related to students' academic success.

Faculty is generally perceived as embodying a lackluster attitude toward participation in the governance process, and apathy and cynicism is ranked high as negative attitudes from faculty (Center for Higher Education and Policy Analysis , CHEPA, 2003). A lack of participation in the

process is perceived as lack of interest in the institution (CSU, 2006) and can leave senior administrators with negative impressions of faculty.

The perception of effectiveness of people in their roles is persistent between administrators and faculty. In a study conducted with academic vice presidents, senate leaders and faculty, it was revealed that faculty influence in the decision making process is high. However, while senior administrators believed that faculty have great influence in the decision making process, faculty believed otherwise.

Birnbaum (1988) argued that faculty and administrators are in a no-win situation. Frequently, faculty feels their roles are threatened or oppressed and that the vacuum between them and administrators could widen. Birnbaum (1988) posited that when faculty perceives their roles as being threatened, they usually respond with antagonism, sometimes expressing this antagonism in very explicit ways.

The AAUP (1966) regarded any attempt by administrations to engage in bureaucratic control as an attempt to create instability in the institution. Currie (2005) argued that faculty must deal with the perception that is harbored about them in the institution. In a study conducted by Currie (2005), the respondents cited faculty's lack of involvement in budgetary matters as the biggest impediment to shared governance in academia. For example, their lack of participation in the budgetary process may be seen as a challenge to their role in the effective functioning in the shared governance process.

Senge (1990) argued that mental models in many institutions are a prohibitive factor to people participating effectively in organizational processes. He explained that faculty and administrators who cooperate and work together in a climate of shared governance can achieve a more positive cultural climate, which ultimately benefits the institution.

Joint Decision-Making

Decisions that are made on behalf of the institution should be made within a framework of consultation with the stakeholders of the institution, primarily the faculty. Long-term plans such as vision and mission, long range budgeting plans, the search for a new president and other academic administrators, should all be done on the basic assumption that there will be consultation with all members of the academic community, including faculty (Ramo, 1997).

Joint decision-making involves consultation and participation. The AAUP (1966) suggested that before any decision is made regarding any change in the institution, the parties involved should be consulted and decisions should be made by involving the participation of the board, administration and faculty. For example, any long range plans for the institution or any changes in the physical structure must be achieved through a joint decision-making process.

Climate for Governance.

Climate refers to the perceptions and attitudes that are held by members towards the institution (Ramo, 1997). The climate for governance in academia is usually measured by faculty morale. Institutions that have effective participatory leadership usually enjoy a good climate within which to govern effectively (Ramo, 1997).

Spitzerberg (1989) stated that climate in the institution is determined by the unity exhibited on the campus. He argued that the quality of relationships, working conditions and the respect shown on the campus all helped to form the campus climate. The overt challenges displayed among stakeholders will help to determine this. For example, recurring tensions between trustees, administrators, and faculty are not new (Birnbaum, 1998) and play a major role in determining the campus climate.

The shared governance model that the institution adopts also indicates its culture. The connection between corporate and academic cultures is a persistent issue in higher education dialogue. Mangrum & Mangrum (2000) supported the idea that shared governance is academia's version of the corporate world's total quality management. Historically, a large percentage of trustees have been business people who are more likely to be conservatives. They have limited understanding of academic institutions, may be more likely to support the top down model of governance, least likely to support the principles of academic freedom, and more likely to scoff at academic realities, such as shared governance (Birnbaum, 1988).

Organizational Environment

Ramo (1997) defined the organizational environment as those organizations and systems that influence the government of the campus. These influences range from governmental regulations, to professional faculty organizations. Oftentimes, other campuses of the same institution or other colleges within the same system may influence the organizational environment.

Ramo (1997) suggested that faculties and other players in the shared decision-making process should strive for cooperation as a day-to-day method of conducting business, or as a desired end when cooperation does not currently exist. But as Rhodes (2005) indicated, this will be a major challenge for academia because as colleges move toward the corporate way of life, shared governance models as they exist now may not be receptive to deal with the "academic capitalism" that the corporate culture demands.

Problems of the Study

In examining the literature on shared governance in the Jordanian universities, it is apparent that few studies have focused on faculty at these universities, especially as they perceive their interaction with administration, or the concept of shared governance. The governance of universities in Jordan appears complex and relatively under-examined. As universities mature, the role of the faculty will become more critical (Roberts, 2003). The question of faculty attitudes toward sharing the responsibility for how their institutions are governed, gives rise to a concern for the future of shared governance in these institutions.

There is little evidence

- a. that universities are involved in how decisions are made about their institutions in relationship to the overall higher education landscape in Jordan
- b. that universities have identified and articulated what their role should be in the creation of policy and procedures that affect them, and
- c. that the practice of faculty towards the shared governance practices have been solicited

Consequently, this study will investigate, (a) the degree of practice by faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities, and (b) any correlations between their personal and/or institutional characteristics and the degree of practice in shared governance.

Research Questions

Research Question One:

What is the degree of practicing shared governance by faculty members in the Jordanian universities?

Research Question Two:

Are there statistical significant differences in the degree of practicing shared governance by faculty members in Jordanian universities based on "gender, *years of teaching*, *academic rank*, *classification of college*", of respondents in the Jordanian universities?

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in its attempt to increase published research about universities in Jordan. The information in this study is specific to the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities, with a focus on faculty perspectives. The education policymakers in the Jordanian universities may be able to benefit from this body of work. This study will focus on Jordanian universities and their governance processes.

The data from this study hopefully will provide contribution toward understanding how faculty members perceive their role in the decision-making process and better inform policy makers about the necessity for the inclusion of faculty in this process in Jordanian universities. Additionally, policy makers can use this information to construct policies that will require faculty participation in areas where faculty believe they should be active participants.

Methodology

Research Design

This is a quantitative study that contains descriptive components. It consists of forty eight questions of which analyzed quantitatively. The quantitative data were summarized using descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether there were significant differences in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on personal and institutional characteristics. An alpha level of 0.05 was required for the difference to be considered significant.

Population and sample of study

A total of 231 faculty members, or XX% of the entire population of XXX faculty members (Professors, Associate professors, Assistant professors) enrolled during the first semester 2012/2013 term, participated in the survey, a purposeful sampling process was used to select the participants for the study. A majority of respondents (128, 55.4%) were male, (103, 44.6%) were female. Data by faculty rank showed that (38, 16.5% of respondents were full professors, (83, 5.9%) were associate professors, and (110, 47.6%) were assistant professors. Data for years of teaching were (87, 37.7%) low years, (83, 35.9%) mid years, and (61, 26.4%) high years of experience. Data for classification of institution were (123, 53.2%) humanities colleges, and (108, 46.8%) scientific colleges.

Instrument

Ramo's (1997) tenets formed the basis of the instrument used in this study to measure participants' practices shared governance. The measure of practices shared governance was the degree of practices by participants to each of these tenets. Research questions were developed to investigate these practices.

The *Faculty Survey* developed by Baker-Brown (2011), was used as the primary survey instrument for this study. The first section of the instrument focused on the personal and institutional characteristics. The second section contains six dimensions of Faculty Survey: First dimension; "*University board role*" covered the board's role in institutional governance, there were six items about the board's role in the institution. The second dimension "*faculty member's role*" with three items about the faculty role. The third dimension "*president role*", it had eight items covering president role. The fourth dimension "*joint decision making*" with five items covered joint decision making. The fifth dimension "*organizational environment*" with nine items. And the sixth dimension "*organizational climate*" with three items.

Each item is accompanied by a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). All of these items were used to determine the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities. The total scores were interpreted as following: it should notice that the researcher used the response scale of each item which ranged

from 1 to 5 to determine these cut points according to the following manner: 1-2.33= low, 2.34-3.67=moderate, 3.68-5.00=high. The alpha level was set at .05 a priori.

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients were computed for each variable. Results showed acceptable reliability for all measures. The validity of the questionnaire was assessed by 10 people specialist in the field of education in the Hashemite University. Alpha reliability for six dimensions as follows: "*university board's role*" = 0.86, "*faculty members role*" = 0.87, "*president role*" = 0.84, "*joint decision making*" = 0.81, "*organizational environment*" = 0.79, and "*organizational climate*" = 0.88.

Findings

Research Question One: What is the degree of practicing shared governance by faculty members in the Jordanian universities?

The findings are given under the following sub-sections:

- University Board's role
- Faculty Members' role
- President's role
- Joint Decision Making
- Organizational Environment, and
- Organizational Climate

University Board's Role

The following describes the means and standard deviation of the responses that were provided to the items of this section.

- a. "*Faculty members representatives can access the information necessary to make informed decisions and recommendations to the university board* ", indicated that it was low practices with mean (M=1.32, SD= 0.776)
- b. "*Information is provided in reasonable time to make informed decisions*", reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.16, SD= 0.501)
- c. "*Faculty members views are communicated to the principal and the board, and vice versa, accurately*", reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.62, SD= 1.060)
- d. "*There is effective communication among college employees and the administration, including the university board*", reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.76, SD=0.895)

- e. *"There is good faith and an atmosphere of trust when it comes to communication across the campus and with the university board"*, reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.61, SD=0.971)
- f. *"There is consultation between the board and the faculty members, on policy decisions, when key policies and issues are being discussed"*, reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.55, SD=1.136)
- g. *"That the governing board is involved in day-to-day operations of the institution"*, reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.49, SD=0.889)
- h. The total mean for the university board's role was low with (M=1.50, SD=0.569)

President's Role

Eight questions were used to respond to this section and the means and standard deviation of the responses are provided below.

- a. *"The president's human relations skills"*, reported that it was moderate practices with mean (M=2.45, SD=1.452)
- b. *"The president's conceptual skills"*, reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.85, SD=1.036)
- c. *"The president's technical skills"*, reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.04, SD=1.313)
- d. *"The relationship between president and faculty members"*, reported that it was moderate practices with mean (M=2.37, SD=1.226)
- e. *"That there is consultation with faculty members on policy decisions when key policies and issues are being discussed"*, reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.80, SD=0.911)
- f. *"The relationship between president and university board"*, reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.86, SD=.950). *"The relationship between faculty and president"*, reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.97, SD= 0.908)

- g. *"The relationship between faculty members and university board"*, reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.90, SD=1.012)
- h. The total mean for the president's board's role was low with (M=2.03, SD=0.608)

Faculty Members Role

The means and standard deviation of the responses are provided below.

- a. *"That there is faculty members participation in areas where faculty members lack authority"*, reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.70, SD=1.088)
- b. *"That there is faculty members participation in areas where faculty members have authority"*, reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.49, SD=0.762)
- c. *"That there is collaboration between faculty members and administration when it comes to institutional projects"*, reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.07, SD=1.029)
- d. The total mean for the faculty members role was low with (M=1.75, SD=.663)

Joint Decision-Making

The findings for joint decision-making as followed:

- a. *"The selection process for members of the board for the institution"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.29, SD=1.194)
- b. *"The evaluation process for members of the board of the institution"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.14, SD=.874)
- c. *"The board interaction with faculty regarding issues impacting faculty"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.02, SD=.969)
- d. *"The selection process for the president of your institution"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.97, SD=1.142)
- e. *"The selection process for faculty for your institution"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.10, SD=1.199)

- f. The total mean for the Joint Decision-Making was low with (M=2.10, SD=.863)

Organizational Environment

Faculty involvement in the following organizational environment as follows:

- a. *"Faculty Involvement in Establishing Budget Priorities"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.81, SD=1.108)
- b. *"Faculty Involvement in Library Priorities"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.56, SD=.837)
- c. *"Faculty Involvement in Creating New Academic Programs"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.12, SD=1.055)
- d. *"Faculty Involvement in Hiring New Faculty"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.32, SD=1.235)
- e. *"Setting Priorities for Construction/ Repair of Buildings"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.07, SD=.892)
- f. *"Evaluation of Colleagues' Teaching"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.05, SD=1.003)
- g. *"Evaluation of Colleagues' Service Contributions"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.00, SD=1.168)
- h. *"Setting Tenure and Promotion Standards"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.02, SD=1.174)
- i. *"Making Individual Tenure and Promotions Decisions"* reported that it was low practices with mean (M=1.81, SD=1.152)
- j. The total mean for the Organizational Environment was low with (M=2.01, SD=.709)

Climate for Governance

The following three questions were explored and the frequency distributions of the responses are provided below.

- a. "The faculty is able to monitor the relationships that the institution has with outside organizations" reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.16, SD=.913)
- b. "That the level of influence from outside organizations on governance of this institution is kept to a minimum" reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.06, SD=1.022)
- c. "That relationships between the outside organizations and the institution be kept to a minimum" reported that it was low practices with mean (M=2.05, SD=.877)
- d. The total mean for the Climate for Governance was low with (M=2.09, SD=.877)

Research Question Two: Are there statistically significant differences in the degree of practicing shared governance by faculty members in Jordanian universities based on their "gender, years of teaching, academic rank, classification of college"?

The findings are presented below:

Gender

Table 1 shows t-test for differences in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their gender.

Table 1. t-test for differences in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their gender

Dimensions	Discipline	N	Means	SD	t	P
University Board Role	Female	102	1.48	0.524	.399	.690
	Male	129	1.51	0.603		
President Role	Female	102	2.06	0.573	.643	.521
	Male	129	2.01	0.635		
Faculty Members Role	Female	102	1.79	0.586	.744	.457
	Male	129	1.72	0.718		
Joint Decision-Making	Female	102	2.09	0.815	.200	.841
	Male	129	2.11	0.903		
Organizational Environment	Female	102	1.99	0.644	.430	.667
	Male	129	2.03	0.759		
Climate for Governance	Female	102	2.06	0.800	.409	.638
	Male	129	2.11	0.937		

Table 1 reveals that no differences were found in the degree of practicing shared governance by faculty members in Jordanian universities based on their gender. Male and female faculty members did not differ significantly in their degree of practice of shared governance in, university board role, president role, faculty role, joint decision-making, organizational environment, or climate for governance.

Years of Teaching

Based on their years of teaching, Table 2 shows differences in the means and Standard Deviation on the question.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviation in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their years of teaching

	<i>Years of Teaching</i>	Mean	SD
University Board Role	low	1.68	.619
	med	1.28	.411
	high	1.53	.585
	Total	1.50	.569
President Role	low	1.96	.758
	med	2.28	.393
	high	1.77	.464
	Total	2.03	.608
Faculty Members Role	low	1.73	.711
	med	1.55	.420
	high	2.05	.760
	Total	1.75	.663
Joint Decision-Making	low	1.95	.979
	med	1.99	.530
	high	2.46	.961
	Total	2.10	.863
Organizational Environment	low	1.98	.856
	med	1.92	.450
	high	2.20	.743
	Total	2.01	.709
Climate for Governance	low	1.99	.995
	med	1.88	.635
	high	2.52	.847
	Total	2.09	.877

Table 3 shows One Way Analysis of Variance for differences in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their years of teaching. (low=88, Med=83, and high=60).

Table 3. One Way Analysis of Variance for differences in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their years of teaching.

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
University Board's Role	Between Groups	6.948	2	3.474	11.731	.000*
	Within Groups	67.521	228	.296		
	Total	74.469	230			
President Role	Between Groups	9.690	2	4.845	14.647	.000*
	Within Groups	75.423	228	.331		
	Total	85.114	230			
Faculty Members Role	Between Groups	8.446	2	4.223	10.391	.000*
	Within Groups	92.665	228	.406		
	Total	101.111	230			
Joint Decision-Making	Between Groups	10.593	2	5.297	7.501	.001*
	Within Groups	160.995	228	.706		
	Total	171.588	230			
Organizational Environment	Between Groups	2.871	2	1.436	2.895	.057
	Within Groups	113.046	228	.496		
	Total	115.917	230			
Climate for Governance	Between Groups	15.509	2	7.755	10.928	.000*
	Within Groups	161.790	228	.710		
	Total	177.299	230			

Table 3 reveals significant differences in the degree of practicing shared governance by faculty members of in the Jordanian universities based on their years of teaching. Faculty members differed significantly in the University Board's Role $F(2, 230)=11.731$, $p=0.00$, in President Role $F(2, 230)=14.647$, $p=0.00$, in Faculty Role $F(2, 230)=10.391$, $p=0.00$, in Joint Decision Making $F(2, 230)=7.501$, $p=0.001$, in Climate for Governance $F(2, 230)=10.928$, $p=0.00$. Based on the results of the least significant difference (Scheffe) post hoc test were used as shows in Table 4.

Table 4. Scheffe post hoc test for differences in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their years of teaching

		Med	High
University Board's Role	Low	.401*	.152
	Med		.248*

		Med	High
President Role	Low	.322*	.187
	Med		.509*
Faculty Members Role	Low	.179	.312*
	Med		.491*
Joint Decision-Making	Low	.040	.506*
	Med		.465*
Climate for Governance	Low	.104	.531*
	Med		.635*

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

In University Board's Role, significant differences were found between low experience in teaching ($M = 1.68$, $SD = 0.619$) and Med ($M = 1.28$, $SD = 0.411$) in favor of low experience, and significant differences were found between Med experience in teaching ($M = 1.28$, $SD = 0.411$) and high ($M = 1.53$, $SD = 0.353$) in favor of Med experience. In President Role, significant differences were found between low experience in teaching ($M = 1.96$, $SD = 0.758$) and Med ($M = 2.28$, $SD = 0.393$) in favor of Med experience, and significant differences were found between Med experience in teaching ($M = 2.28$, $SD = 0.393$) and high ($M = 1.77$, $SD = 0.464$) in favor for Med experience.

In Faculty Role, significant differences were found between low experience in teaching ($M = 1.73$, $SD = 0.711$) and High ($M = 2.05$, $SD = 0.706$) in favor of High experience, and significant differences were found between Med experience in teaching ($M = 1.55$, $SD = 0.420$) and high ($M = 2.05$, $SD = 0.706$) in favor of High experience. In Joint Decision-Making, significant differences were found between low experience in teaching ($M = 1.95$, $SD = 0.979$) and High ($M = 2.46$, $SD = 0.961$) in favor of High experience, and significant differences were found between Med experience in teaching ($M = 1.99$, $SD = 0.530$) and high ($M = 2.46$, $SD = 0.961$) in favor of High experience. In Climate for Governance, significant differences were found between low experience in teaching ($M = 1.99$, $SD = 0.995$) and High ($M = 2.52$, $SD = 0.847$) in favor of High experience, and significant differences were found between Med experience in teaching ($M = 1.88$, $SD = 0.635$) and high ($M = 2.52$, $SD = 0.847$) in favor of High experience.

Academic Rank

Table 5 shows differences in the means and Standard Deviation in the degree of practicing shared governance by faculty members in the Jordanian universities based on their academic rank.

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviation in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their academic rank

		N	Mean	SD
University Board Role	Full professor	39	1.62	.650

		N	Mean	SD
	Associate	83	1.28	.411
	Assistant	109	1.62	.595
	Total	231	1.50	.569
President Role	Full professor	39	1.87	.817
	Associate	83	2.28	.393
	Assistant	109	1.89	.597
	Total	231	2.03	.608
Faculty Members Role	Full professor	39	1.61	.781
	Associate	83	1.55	.420
	Assistant	109	1.95	.714
	Total	231	1.75	.663
Joint Decision-Making	Full professor	39	1.71	.955
	Associate	83	1.99	.530
	Assistant	109	2.32	.970
	Total	231	2.10	.863
Organizational Environment	Full professor	39	1.70	.934
	Associate	83	1.92	.450
	Assistant	109	2.20	.731
	Total	231	2.01	.709
Climate for Governance	Full professor	39	1.70	.976
	Associate	83	1.88	.635
	Assistant	109	2.38	.909
	Total	231	2.09	.877

Table 6 shows One Way Analysis of Variance for differences in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their Academic Rank. (Full=39, Associate=83, and Assistant=109).

Table 6. One Way Analysis of Variance for differences in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their academic rank

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
University Board Role	Between Groups	6.118	2	3.059	10.204	.000*

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
	Within Groups	68.351	228	.300		
	Total	74.469	230			
President Role	Between Groups	8.443	2	4.222	12.554	.000*
	Within Groups	76.671	228	.336		
	Total	85.114	230			
Faculty Role	Between Groups	8.278	2	4.139	10.165	.000*
	Within Groups	92.833	228	.407		
	Total	101.111	230			
Joint Decision-Making	Between Groups	12.132	2	6.066	8.674	.000*
	Within Groups	159.456	228	.699		
	Total	171.588	230			
Organizational Environment	Between Groups	8.265	2	4.133	8.753	.000*
	Within Groups	107.652	228	.472		
	Total	115.917	230			
Climate for Governance	Between Groups	18.598	2	9.299	13.360	.000*
	Within Groups	158.701	228	.696		
	Total	177.299	230			

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Based on the results of the least significant difference (Scheffe) post hoc test were used as shows in Table 6.

Table 6. Scheffe post hoc test for differences in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their academic rank.

		Associate	Assistant
University Board's Role	Full professor	.343*	.006
	Associate		.337*
President Role	Full professor	.410*	.016
	Associate		.393*
Faculty Members Role	Full professor	.055	.339*
	Associate		.395*
Joint Decision-Making	Full professor	.284	.610*
	Associate		.325*
Organizational Environment	Full professor	.212	.495*
	Associate		.282*
Climate for Governance	Full professor	.178	.677*
	Associate		.498*

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

In University Board's Role, significant differences were found between full professor (M = 1.62, SD = 0.650) and associate (M = 1.28, SD = 0.411) in favor of full professor, and significant differences were found between associate (M = 1.28, SD = 0.411) and assistant (M = 1.62, SD = 0.595) in favor of assistant. In President Role, significant differences were found between full professor (M = 1.87, SD = 0.817) and associate (M = 2.28, SD = 0.393) in favor of associate, and significant differences were found between associate (M = 2.28, SD = 0.393) and assistant (M = 1.89, SD = 0.597) in favor of associate.

In Faculty Role, significant differences were found between full professor (M = 1.61, SD = 0.781) and associate (M = 1.55, SD = 0.420) in favor of full professor, and significant differences were found between associate (M = 1.55, SD = 0.420) and assistant (M = 1.95, SD = 0.714) in favor of assistant. In Joint Decision-Making, significant differences were found between full professor (M = 1.71, SD = 0.955) and associate (M = 1.99, SD = 0.530) in favor of associate, and significant differences were found between associate (M = 1.99, SD = 0.530) and assistant (M = 2.32, SD = 0.970) in favor of assistant.

In Organizational Environment, significant differences were found between full professor (M = 1.70, SD = 0.934) and associate (M = 1.92, SD = 0.450) in favor of associate, and significant differences were found between associate (M = 1.92, SD = 0.450) and assistant (M = 2.20, SD = 0.731) in favor of assistant. In Climate for Governance, significant differences were found between full professor (M = 1.70, SD = 0.976) and associate (M = 1.88, SD = 0.635) in favor of associate, and significant differences were found between associate (M = 1.88, SD = 0.635) and assistant (M = 2.38, SD = 0.909) in favor for assistant.

Classification of College

Table 7 shows t-test for differences in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their classification of College.

Table 7. t-test for differences in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their classification of College

Dimensions	Discipline	N	Means	SD	t	P
University Board's Role	humanities	122	1.50	.526	.023	.982
	scientific	109	1.50	.615		
President Role	humanities	122	2.10	.566	1.876	.062
	scientific	109	1.95	.645		
Faculty Members Role	humanities	122	1.79	.595	1.052	.294
	scientific	109	1.70	.730		
Joint Decision-Making	humanities	122	2.08	.816	.391	.696
	scientific	109	2.12	.916		

Dimensions	Discipline	N	Means	SD	t	P
Organizational Environment	humanities	122	1.99	.662	.420	.675
	scientific	109	2.03	.762		
Climate for Governance	humanities	122	2.08	.813	.186	.852
	scientific	109	2.10	.948		

Table 7 reveals no significant differences were found in faculty members practicing shared governance based on the classification of the college.

Conclusions

This study investigated the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities. All major decisions impacting the operations of colleges are centralized at the university level, the results of study reveals that the practice of faculty members of shared governance in all aspects (university board's role, the president's board's role, faculty members role, Joint Decision-Making, Organizational Environment, Climate for Governance) in the Jordanian universities was in low degree. The faculty members could be expected to participate in the process, if given the opportunity to. The fact that they don't, but points to the presence of other barriers that are preventing them from participating. Faculty members may value shared governance but they are not able to take advantage of it because the system is preventing it from taking place. Faculty members may see that the system is too autocratic, too inconsistent, unfair, and generally non-inclusive.

Based on the findings of the study, No differences were found in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their gender, and the classification of the college.

Significant differences were found in the degree of practice of faculty members based on their years of teaching in (University Board's Role, President Role, Faculty Members Role, Joint Decision Making, and Climate for Governance). In University Board's Role, significant differences were found between low experience in teaching and Med in favor for low experience, and significant differences were found between Med experience in teaching and high in favor of Med experience. Regarding President Role, significant differences were found between low experience in teaching and Med in favor of Med experience, and significant differences were found between Med experience in teaching and high in favor of Med experience. Regarding Faculty Members Role, significant differences were found between low experience in teaching and High in favor of High experience, and significant differences were found between Med experience in teaching and high in favor for High experience. Regarding Joint Decision-Making, significant differences were found between low experience in teaching and High in favor of High experience, and significant differences were found between Med experience in teaching and high in of High experience. Regarding Climate for Governance, significant differences were found between low experience in teaching and High in favor of High experience, and significant

differences were found between Med experience in teaching and high in favor for High experience.

Differences were found in the means and Standard Deviation in the degree of practice of faculty members of shared governance in the Jordanian universities based on their academic rank. In University Board's Role, significant differences were found between full professor and associate in favor of full professor, and significant differences were found between associate and assistant in favor for assistant. Regarding President Role, significant differences were found between full professor and associate in favor of associate, and significant differences were found between associate and assistant in favor of associate. Regarding Faculty Role, significant differences were found between full professor and associate in favor of full professor, and significant differences were found between associate and assistant in favor for assistant. Regarding Joint Decision-Making, significant differences were found between full professor and associate in favor of associate, and significant differences were found between associate and assistant in favor of assistant. Regarding Organizational Environment, significant differences were found between full professor and associate in favor of associate, and significant differences were found between associate and assistant in favor for assistant. Regarding Climate for Governance, significant differences were found between full professor and associate in favor of associate, and significant differences were found between associate and assistant in favor of assistant.

The literature on shared governance indicates that faculty commitment to shared governance is affected by the length of time faculty members remain in their institutions academic rank, and years of teaching). Professors are more interested in shared governance and are more willing to participate in the process, than associate and assistant professors (CSU, 2001; Giordani, 2005). If the literature is correct, professors, who are also part of high experience in years of teaching, reported high degree of practice of shared governance in the Jordanian universities. One possible explanation of why this may be a factor in Jordan is because of the status quo that exists in these universities.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made in this study for the stakeholders in the shared governance process in Jordan: Policymakers can benefit from the data provided in this study. Based on the findings of this study, the researchers recommend that

- the Jordanian universities pay attention to the leadership structure in their universities
- Developing policies that will serve to encourage faculty inclusiveness in shared governance may result in more meaningful roles for faculty in the process
- Leadership of these universities need to encourage active participation in discussions about the issues that affect them, and should assert themselves more so as to ensure that they are participating in these conversations about level education issues in Jordan

- There is much scope for further studies on shared governance in Jordanian universities. The researchers recommend additional research to include the perspectives of the other stakeholders
- The researchers also recommend that further studies examine the organizational structure of Jordanian universities and the impact of that on shared governance
- The researchers also suggest that it would be beneficial to utilize a qualitative approach for further studies on shared governance in Jordanian universities

References

Abdelkader, R., Al-Hussami, M., Al barmawi, M., **Saleh, A.**, & Shath, T. A. (2012). Perception of academic nursing staff toward shared governance. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, 2(3), 46-53.

American Federation of Teachers (AFT) (2002). *Shared governance in colleges and universities: A statement by the higher education program and council*. Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/higher_ed/shared_governance.pdf

American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (1966). *1966 Statement on government of colleges and universities*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/report/1966-statement-government-colleges-and-universities>

Baker-Brown, C. M. (2011). An analysis of the governance practices in the Jamaican community college system: Faculty perspectives. Dissertation, Morgan State University, USA.

Baldrige, J. Curtis, D., Ecker, G., Riley, G. (1978). *Policy making and effective leadership*. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass.

Bingham, D. (2000). *The participation of faculty in shared governance in the community colleges*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation abstracts online.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency*. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work*. San Francisco, Ca. Jossey-Bass.

California State University (CSU) (2001). *Shared governance reconsidered: Improving decision-making in the California State University*. Retrieved from <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/SharedGovReport.pdf>

Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis (CHEPA) (2003). *Challenges for governance: A national report*. Retrieved from http://www.usc.edu/dept/chepa/papers_publications.html.

Currie, J. (2005 May/June). What makes shared governance work? An Australian perspective. *Academe*, 91(3), 20.

Del Favero, M. (2003). Faculty-administrator relationships as integral to high performing governance systems: New frameworks for study. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46 (7):902-922.

Gerber, L. (2001, May/June). "Inextricably linked": Shared governance and academic freedom. *Academe*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2001/MJ/Feat/gerb.htm>.

Giordani, B. (2005). Chair's remarks for the first senate assembly meeting. Presented at the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs meeting, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Gonzalez, D.D., & Royer, R. (2004). *Community colleges in Jamaica: A commitment relevance*. Kingston, Jamaica: Ministry of Education, Youth and Culture.

Kaplan, G. (2004). How academic ships actually navigate. In G. Ehrenberg (Ed.), *Governing academia: Who is in charge at the modern university?* (pp.165-208). Ithaca, NY: Cornell Press.

Kezar, A., Lester, J., and Anderson, G. (2006). Challenging stereotypes that interfere with effective governance. *Thought & Action* (Fall):121-134.

Kezar, A. (2004). What is more important to governance: Relationships, trust, and leadership or structures and formal processes? *Wiley Periodicals. University of Southern California's Higher Education Program*, 35-46.

Lanning, P. (2006). The implementation year of shared governance at a vanguard community college. Unpublished dissertation. Oregon State University. Retrieved from http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu.dspace/bitstream/1957/2821/1/Implementation+year+shared+governance_2007lanning+pdf.pdf.

Love, J. (2005). Faculty/university collaboration: Differential perceptions of shared governance, presidential leadership styles and decision making at a research university. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

Maloney, M. (2003). Faculty participation in the decision making process: Its impact on job satisfaction at Connecticut community colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bridgeport, 2003). UMI No. 3073289.

Mangrum, F., Mangrum, C. (2000). *The connection between formal and informal meetings: Understanding shared governance in the small college environment*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Communication Association. Detroit, MI. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/16/2d/30.pdf

- Minor, J. T. (2003). Assessing the senate: Critical issues considered. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46 (7):960-977.
- Mitchell, G.N, Grant, A.B., & Rossa, M. (1992, December). Shared governance: Keys to a successful process. *Leadership Abstracts*, 5(10), 5-8.
- Ramo, K. (1997). *Assessing the faculty's role on shared governance: Implications of AAUP standards*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.
- Rhoades, G. (2005, May/June). Capitalism, academic style, and shared governance. *Academe*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2005/05mj/05mjrhoa.htm>
- Roberts, V. (2003). *The shaping of tertiary education in the Anglophone Caribbean*. London, United Kingdom: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Scheutz, P. (1999). *Shared governance in community colleges*. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges
- Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Spitzberg, I. (1989). Governance and aspirations: Leading the diversity of higher education. In Shuster (Ed.), *Governing tomorrow's campus: Perspectives and agendas*. New York: McMillan Press.
- Tierney, W. G. (2004). Improving academic governance: Utilizing a cultural framework to improve organizational performance. In *Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance*, edited by W. G. Tierney. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Tierney, W. G., and Minor, J T. (2003). *Challenges for governance: A national report*. Los Angeles: Center for Higher Education Analysis, University of Southern California.
- Trombley, W. (1997). State structures for the governance of higher education. Retrieved from <http://www.capolicycenter.org/comparative/html>
- Van, J. (1999/Sep). Community college faculty: Making the paradigm shift. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 23(6), 559-579.

Appendix

Evaluation of Shared Governance

The primary purpose of this study was to assess the Faculty practices shared governance in Jordanian Universities.

First: Information:

Please complete following by filling in the blank.

- Gender: Male () Female ()
- Academic Rank: Professor ()
 Associate Professor ()
 Assistant Professor ()
- Years of Teaching:
- Classification of University: Public () Private ()

Second: How critical are the following items to the Faculty practices shared governance in Jordanian Universities. Below is a list of various statements about your institution. Read each statement carefully and decide the extent to which it actually applies to your case. Use the following scale: **Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral (3), Disagree (2), Strongly Disagree (1).**

	Items	5	4	3	2	1
The University Board's Role						
1	<i>Faculty members representatives can access the information necessary to make informed decisions and recommendations to the university board</i>	5	4	3	2	1
2	<i>Information is provided in reasonable time to make informed decisions</i>	5	4	3	2	1
3	<i>Faculty members views are communicated to the president and the university board, and vice versa, accurately</i>	5	4	3	2	1
4	<i>There is effective communication among college employees and the administration, including the university board</i>	5	4	3	2	1
5	<i>There is good faith and an atmosphere of trust when it comes to communication across the campus and with the university board</i>	5	4	3	2	1
6	<i>There is consultation between the university board and the faculty members, on policy decisions, when key policies and issues are being discussed</i>	5	4	3	2	1
7	<i>That the governing board is involved in day-to-day operations of the institution</i>	5	4	3	2	1
The President's Role						
1	<i>The president's human relations skills</i>	5	4	3	2	1
2	<i>The president's conceptual skills</i>	5	4	3	2	1
3	<i>The president's technical skills</i>	5	4	3	2	1
4	<i>The relationship between president and faculty</i>	5	4	3	2	1
5	<i>That there is consultation with faculty on policy decisions when key policies and issues are being discussed</i>	5	4	3	2	1
6	<i>The relationship between president and board</i>	5	4	3	2	1
7	<i>The relationship between faculty members and president</i>	5	4	3	2	1
8	<i>The relationship between faculty members and university board</i>	5	4	3	2	1
The Faculty's Role						
1	<i>That there is faculty members participation in areas where faculty members lack authority</i>	5	4	3	2	1
2	<i>That there is faculty members participation in areas where faculty members have authority",</i>	5	4	3	2	1
3	<i>That there is collaboration between faculty and administration when it comes to institutional projects</i>	5	4	3	2	1
Joint Decision-Making						
1	<i>The selection process for members of the board for the institution</i>	5	4	3	2	1
2	<i>The evaluation process for members of the board of the institution</i>	5	4	3	2	1
3	<i>The board interaction with faculty regarding issues impacting faculty</i>	5	4	3	2	1

4	<i>The selection process for the president of your institution</i>	5	4	3	2	1
5	<i>The selection process for faculty for your institution</i>	5	4	3	2	1
Organizational Environment						
1	<i>Faculty Involvement in Establishing Budget Priorities</i>	5	4	3	2	1
2	<i>Faculty Involvement in Library Priorities</i>	5	4	3	2	1
3	<i>Faculty Involvement in Creating New Academic Programs</i>	5	4	3	2	1
4	<i>Faculty Involvement in Hiring New Faculty</i>	5	4	3	2	1
5	<i>Setting Priorities for Construction/ Repair of Buildings</i>	5	4	3	2	1
6	<i>Evaluation of Colleagues' Teaching</i>	5	4	3	2	1
7	<i>Evaluation of Colleagues' Service Contributions</i>	5	4	3	2	1
8	<i>Setting Tenure and Promotion Standards</i>	5	4	3	2	1
9	<i>Making Individual Tenure and Promotions Decisions</i>	5	4	3	2	1
Climate for Governance						
1	<i>The faculty is able to monitor the relationships that the institution has with outside organizations</i>	5	4	3	2	1
2	<i>That the level of influence from outside organizations on governance of this institution is kept to a minimum</i>	5	4	3	2	1
3	<i>That relationships between the outside organizations and the institution be kept to a minimum</i>	5	4	3	2	1