

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

The history of university education in Nigeria started with the Elliot Commission of 1943, which led to the establishment of University College Ibadan (UCI) in 1948 (Oloyede, 2010). In April, 1959 the Federal Government commissioned an inquiry (The Ashby Commission) to advise it on the higher education needs of the country for its first two decades. The Eastern Region Government before the submission of report by the commission, established its own university at Nsukka (University of Nigeria Nsukka in 1960). The implementation of the Ashby report led to the establishment of University of Ife (now Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife) in 1962 by the Western Region, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria in 1962 by the Northern Region and University of Lagos (1962) by the Federal Government. In 1970, the newly created Mid-Western Region opted for a university known as University of Benin. These became the first generation universities in Nigeria.

In the Third National Development Plan (1975-1980), the government established another seven universities and took over

the four regional universities in 1975 (Oloyede, 2010). The new universities were Universities of Calabar, Ilorin, Jos, Sokoto, Maiduguri, Port Harcourt, and Ado Bayero University Kano. Between 1980 and 1990, five federal universities of technology were established in Owerri, Markurdi, Yola, Akure, and Bauchi. The 1979 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria placed education on the concurrent legislative list. This development encouraged various state governments in Nigeria to establish state universities. This was followed by establishment of private universities by religious bodies, other organizations, and private individuals. As at 2012, there were thirty seven federal universities, thirty eight state universities and fifty private universities in Nigeria. (NUC, 2012).

In addition to being centres for knowledge acquisition, universities are also centres for the pursuit of excellence, cultivation of dignity, respect, self-improvement, and self-actualization. Universities provide the needed manpower to accelerate the growth and development of the economy. According to the National Policy on Education (2008), the goals of university education shall be to:

- (a) Contribute to national development through high level manpower training;
- (b) Provide accessible and affordable quality learning opportunities in formal and informal education in response to the needs and interests of all Nigerians;
- (c) Provide high quality career counselling and life- long learning programmes that prepare students with the knowledge and skills for self-reliance and the world of work;
- (d) Reduce skill shortage through the production of skilled manpower relevant to the needs of the labour market;
- (e) Promote and encourage scholarship, entrepreneurship and community service;
- (f) Forge and cement national unity; and
- (g) Promote national and international understanding and intervention.

To achieve the goals of university education in Nigeria, there is the need to ensure proper management of the personnel, finances, properties and expenditure of the universities. In the core of the university enterprise are the academic staff who are employed to research, teach and carry out community service through knowledge application. The complexity associated with

increase in population of the members of the university community, students and the teachers, as well as the increase in the curriculum, made the function of the masters (teachers) relative to their students difficult and cumbersome (Ogunraku, 2012). That necessitated the need for more non-academic workers to facilitate the academic processes and assist the academic to focus attention on their core responsibilities (teaching and research). Part of these non-academic workers constitute the administrators. Adegbite (1994) identified five categories of administrators who are involved in the day to day administration and governance of the university. These are the policy group, the career administrators, the professionals in administration, the academic administrators, and academics in administration. The policy groups are the members of the governing council, senate, principal officers as stipulated by Statute (Vice Chancellor, Deputy Vice Chancellor(s), Registrar, Bursar and University Librarian) (Adegbite, 1994).

Of all the groups of administrators, the governing council is at the apex of the organogram of a typical university in Nigeria. The governing council is the governing body of the university with powers over the general management of the university.

The university governing council operates under the fundamental legal authority over the university (Saint, 2009). In particular, it is charged with the overall responsibility for the personnel, finances and expenditure, and property of the university. Governing council is tasked with defining a strategic vision for the institution, setting institutional policies, monitoring institutional performance, and ensuring good stewardship of the institution's assets.

As part of the measures to strengthen university governance and administration, the Federal Government on 10th July 2003 signed into law the Universities (Miscellaneous Provisions) (Amendment) Act 2003, otherwise called the University Autonomy Act. The Act among other issues provided a detailed guide for the structure, tenure, functions and operations of governing councils in universities in Nigeria. The law provided that the governing council is the governing authority of each university and has the custody, control and disposition of all property and finances of the university. Other functions are:

- To participate in the making, amendment or revocation of statutes;

- To govern, manage and regulate the finances, accounts, investments, property, business, and so on, of the university and for that purpose appoint bankers, solicitors to audit the accounts of the university;
- To borrow money on behalf of the university and to invest any money belonging to the university;
- To sell, buy, exchange, lease or accept or dispose of real or personal property on behalf of the university;
- To enter into, vary, perform and cancel contracts;
- To determine in consultation with the senate all university fees;
- To establish after considering the recommendations of senate, faculties, institutes, departments, and prescribe their organizations, constitution and functions;
- To authorize after considering the recommendations of senate the establishment for both academic and administrative staff and with the approval of senate suspend, or abolish any academic post;
- To regulate the salaries and to determine the conditions of service of staff;

- To exercise powers of removal from office and other disciplinary control on staff;
- To institute in consultation with senate, fellowship, scholarship, prizes and other endowments;
- To promote and to make provision for research;
- To award Honorary Degrees and other distinctions in consultation with senate;
- To supervise and control the residence and discipline of students and to make arrangements for their health and general welfare;
- To provide for the welfare of all staff and their spouses, children and dependents including payment of pensions and retirement benefits (Micaiah, 2013).

For the purpose of this study, the functions of the governing councils outlined above will be broadly grouped as follows:

- 1) Personnel functions.
- 2) Maintenance of university culture.
- 3) Financial functions.
- 4) Monitoring and review of programmes and awards.
- 5) External relations functions.
- 6) Internal relationships.

7) Development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure.

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Act, Nigeria universities are facing a lot of challenges. The challenges include inadequacies in the use of technology for teaching and learning, deficiencies in using modern methods of teaching, inadequacies in the up-to-date of content taught, and reduced commitment to meeting teaching and evaluation responsibilities to students. Others are staff with skills in modern methods of conducting research are few and infrastructure for ground-breaking research is weak (Okebukola, 2010). The Web Ranking of Nigeria universities 2014, ranked the best university in Nigeria (Obafemi Awolowo University) as the 25th in Africa and the 1700th in the world. In the South East the best university based on the 2014 web ranking (University of Nigeria Nsukka) was ranked 75th in Africa. Considering the numerous challenges facing universities and poor ranking of universities in Nigeria, one begins to wonder whether or not the governing councils of universities are performing their stipulated functions satisfactorily. It is against this background that this study is set out to assess the university council performance in the South East Nigeria.

Statement of the Problem

Universities in Nigeria are facing a lot of challenges. Omolewa (2010) identified some of the challenges to include the form of the quality and quantity of local and international patronage and support, staff and students funding, the development of infrastructure, improving the learning environment in the form of libraries, laboratories and now the internet, reliable electricity and water supply, security of staff and students and academic freedom. Okebukola (2010) buttressed this assertion when he observed that a gap exists between status of Nigerian universities and world class standards in the following areas, inadequacies in the use of technology for teaching and learning, deficiencies in using modern methods of teaching, inadequacies in the up-to-date of content taught, and reduced commitment to meeting teaching and evaluation responsibilities to students, skills in modern methods of conducting research are few, infrastructure for ground breaking research is weak and there is also the limitation of funds for research. Others are inadequacies of extension services to industries and agriculture and in providing viable solutions to

local problems demanding government patronage of services outside the university, severe delays in the release of students results and transcripts; social vices, poor quality of graduates, low potential for internally generated revenue, instability of academic calendar and Nigeria universities tend to over-man non-academic units while not adequately manning academic units.

The above challenges have affected the quality of graduates produced from Nigerian universities. NUC (2004) assessment study on the labour market expectations of graduates from Nigerian universities revealed that there were scores of unemployed graduates roaming the streets and more embarrassingly, those who were lucky to secure employment had to undergo remedial training in order to bridge the huge knowledge and skill gaps leftover from university training. Furthermore, the decline in the quality of Nigeria university education can be deduced from the 2014 web ranking of the best university in Nigeria (Obafemi Awolowo University) as the twenty fifth (25th) in Africa and one thousand seven hundred (1700th) in the world. In the South East, there is no university in the zone listed among the first forty six in the 2014 African ranking of

universities. The poor quality of products of universities and the low ranking of universities in Nigeria in the web ranking of universities in Africa and the world could be attributed to poor performance of the various categories of administrators in the university system. As the governing councils are at the apex of the universities organigram in Nigeria, they are expected to play a leading role in ensuring that universities live up to their expectations. It is against this background therefore that it is necessary to assess the university council performance.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to assess the university council performance in South East Nigeria. Specifically, it seeks to determine the extent to which governing councils:

- 1 Perform personnel functions.
- 2 Maintain university culture.
- 3 Carry out financial functions.
- 4 Monitor and review programmes and awards.
- 5 Carry out external relations functions.
- 6 Maintain internal relationships.

7 Carry out development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure.

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study will be of immense benefit to policy makers, members of the governing council, university administrators, universities' regulating agencies, academic and non-academic staff, students, university community and the general public.

Policy makers will find the outcome of this study useful in assessing the achievements and performance of governing councils of universities under their control and supervision. The study will provide the policy makers quantitative and qualitative indicators on the extent of performance of governing council functions. This will facilitate the process of decision making by the policy makers.

The findings of this study will provide governing councils information they may need for self-evaluation of the extent of performance in their functions. It will provide them indicators of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievements of their set goals. It

will also equip governing council members with information they need for timely decision making, to ensure that they are meeting the university community expectations and expectations of the supervising agencies such as the National Universities Commission, the Joint Admission and Matriculation Board and the Federal and States Ministries of Education. Furthermore, the findings will help governing council members to keep on track and know when they are deviating from their statutory functions.

On the part of the other university administrators (Principal Officers, Deans of Faculty, Heads of Department etc.) the findings of this study will be a guide in the implementation of decisions and policies made by the governing councils. The findings will help the administrators to identify and clarify the scope, purpose and the limits of governing council activities in the universities. The findings will also abreast administrators of the kind of information they may be required to provide to governing council members to enable them carry out their functions effectively and adequately.

The academic and non-academic staff of the universities are major stakeholders in university education. The findings of this study and the recommendations thereof will help enhance the

realization of the welfare and improved working conditions of the staff. The findings will in addition provide a guide for future research undertaking by the academic staff.

The findings of this study will be of benefit to university regulating agencies such as the National University Commission (NUC), Federal and State Ministries of Education, the Visitors (President for Federal Universities, State Governors for State Universities). The extent of performances of governing councils in their functions will go a long way in determining whether or not to widen the caliber of people to be appointed into governing councils, the spread of membership to different professions and trades and inclusion of international membership in governing councils as obtainable in some other countries. The regulatory agencies will also find the outcomes of this study of immense help in the formulation and implementation of policies towards enhancing quality assurance in university education in Nigeria.

The findings and recommendations of this study will be of benefit to students in that they will be guided in channeling their demands and protests when need arises to the university governing councils. The findings will highlight the shortcomings of the governing councils thus students will be able to

disaggregate their challenges in schools in terms of problems arising from poor performance of governing councils and limitations of other categories of administrators. This will enable the students to channel their demands appropriately.

Finally, the university community will benefit from the findings of this study. The university community as a major stakeholder in university education will find the findings of this study helpful in assessing the governing councils' performance of their functions. The findings will provide the members of the university community valuable information that will assist them in monitoring and evaluating of the quality of the products of the universities and the extent governing councils provide enabling environment for teaching and learning in universities in Nigeria.

Scope of the Study

The study was delimited to all the federal and state universities in South East Nigeria. Content wise, the study was delimited to the seven broad groups of the functions of governing councils namely personnel functions; maintenance of university

culture; financial functions; monitoring and review of programmes and awards; external relations; internal relationships; development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. To what extent do the governing councils perform personnel functions in federal and state universities?
2. To what extent do the governing councils maintain university culture in federal and state universities?
3. To what extent do the governing councils carry out financial functions in federal and state universities?
4. To what extent do the governing councils monitor and review programmes and awards in federal and state universities?
5. To what extent do the governing councils carry out external relations in federal and state universities?
6. To what extent do the governing councils maintain internal relationships in federal and state universities?

7. To what extent do the governing councils develop and maintain facilities and infrastructure in federal and state universities?

Null Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance:

1. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of governing councils of federal and state universities in their performance of personnel functions.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of governing councils of federal and state universities in their maintenance of university culture
3. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of governing councils of federal and state universities in their performance of financial functions.
4. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of governing councils of federal and state universities in their

performance of monitoring and review of programmes and awards functions.

5. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of governing councils of federal and state universities in their performance of external relations functions.
6. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of governing councils of federal and state universities in their performance of internal relationship functions.
7. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of governing councils of federal and state universities in their performance of development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure functions.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, existing concepts, theories and empirical studies that are related to the study were reviewed. The review was done under the following subheadings: conceptual framework, theoretical framework, theoretical studies, empirical studies and summary of review of related literature.

Conceptual Framework

Concept of University

Concept of University Governing Council

Concept of Public University

Concept of Structure and Composition of University Governing Council

Theoretical Framework

Systems Theory

Mega Planning Theory

Theoretical Studies

Personnel Functions

Maintenance of University Culture

Financial Functions

Monitoring and Review of Programmes and Awards

External Relations Functions

Internal Relationships

Development and Maintenance of Facilities and Infrastructure

Empirical Studies

Studies Related to Governing Council Functions

Summary of Review of Related Literature

Concept of University

Universities, according to Encarta dictionary, are “Educational Institutions for higher learning that typically include undergraduate college and graduate schools in various disciplines, as well as medical and law schools and sometimes other professional schools. The dictionary.com defines Universities as “Institutions of learning of the highest level, having a College of liberal arts and a programme of graduate studies together with several professional schools, as of theology, law, medicine and engineering, and authorized to confer both undergraduate and graduate degrees. Thus university is an establishment where a seat of higher learning is housed, including administrative and living quarters. It is the body of faculty and students of a university; a large and diverse institution of higher learning created to educate for life and for a profession and to grant degree. Ogunraku (2012) summarized a University as;

- An institution – “an establishment consisting of a building or complex of buildings where an organization for the promotion of some cause is situated; a custom that for a long time has been an important feature of some group or

society; an organization founded and united for specific purpose'

- An institution that is committed to higher education and the advancement of knowledge in various disciplines and professional programmes.
- An institution with administrative and living quarters and which award degrees in undergraduate and graduate programmes.

By its very nature, a university is an institution that is guided and guarded by democratic norms. It is structured in a hierarchical mode that allows for centrifugal operations. Universities are universal academic communities where students from across the world have placement. Such universities are generally referred to as studies generalia. Some other universities draw their students from their localities such universities are referred to as stadium particulare.

To all, university is first and foremost a community of scholars and students committed to the search for knowledge in specific areas. They are institutions that are committed to knowledge generation through research, knowledge dissemination through teaching and knowledge application through community

service. Subsequently, however, the search for knowledge became important for solving societal needs, hence the interest of society in the institution not as secluded ivory towers but special interest for advancing the course of the society, the economy and its politics. Consequently, the contending power of the state, the church and interested individuals became interested in becoming proprietors of tapping knowledge from the enclave to solve societal problems (Ogunraku, 2012)

Universities are multi-purpose organizations undertaking research and public services. Generally, the functions of each university are to establish campuses, colleges, faculties/schools, extra-moral departments and other teaching and research unit; institute Professorships, Readerships and Lectureships and other offices for the pursuit of their objectives; institute fellowships and scholarships, bursaries and prizes; determine the conditions for admission of candidates to various programmes; grants and confer honorary degrees, fellowships and other academic distinctions; provide for the welfare and discipline of members of the university; deprive, for good cause, any person so determined the degree, diploma, certificate, fellowship, studentship, bursary, medal prize or other distinctions earlier conferred; to demand,

receive from persons attending the university such fees for the purpose of instruction; accept and give gifts, legacies and donations; enter into contracts, establish trusts and act as trustee; erect, provide, equip and maintain libraries, laboratories, lecture halls, halls of residence, refectories, sports grounds, playing fields and other buildings or other things necessary, suitable or convenient for any of the objects of the university (Ogunruku, 2012).

Concept of University Governing Council

The constituent organs in a university are those established by the laws and the statutes of the university. There are the council, the senate, the congregation, the convocation and the faculty boards/boards of studies. Of all the organs, the governing council is at the apex of the university organigram in Nigeria. The governing council is the governing body (authority) of the university with powers over the general management of the university (Ogunruku, 2012).

The council is headed by the Pro-Chancellor who is the chairman. The council is constituted to comprise representatives

of the various stakeholders: Government, the university community, the alumni and the Ministry of Education.

The council exercises its functions through committees.

Generally, the committees of the council include;

- The Finance and General purpose committee
- The Tenders Board
- Building, Works and Estate Committee
- Administrative Staff Committee
- Honorary Degree Committee
- Legal Review Committee
- Board of Advancement
- Copyright and Patents Committee
- Advisory Committee on Students Affairs
- Appointments and Promotion committee for Academic Staff
- Appointments and Promotion committees for Senior Administrative and Technical Staff (SATS)
- Disciplinary Committee etc.

The committees meet in between council meetings as clearing houses for council and report their operations to council for approval as appropriate.

The governing council generally undertakes roles which ensure that the university operates in conformity with the peoples interests. The council is the policy making organ of university and is constituted to reflect good representativeness of the Nigerian public having the ultimate purpose of rendering service to the nation rather than a section of the society (Mohammed, 1988). In this regard therefore, a university governing council is empowered by law to do anything which in its opinion is calculated to facilitate the carrying on of the activities of the university.

Mohammed (1988) adds that a university governing council wields tremendous powers and authority. University governing council are tasked with defining a strategic vision for the institution, setting institutional policies, monitoring institutional performance and ensuring good stewardship of the institutions assets (Saint, 2009). It is charged with approving the university's budget, takes responsibility for quality assurance and the equivalence of academic awards, defines salary structures, terms of employment for academic staff, and or recruitment of the principal officers of the university. It is also empowered to set students fees.

Larsen (2001) listed the functions of governing boards to include;

- Responsibility for maintaining a high standard of academic quality
- Draw up a strategy for the institutions educational programmes, research and other academic activity.
- Responsibility for the disposition of the institutions economic resource.
- Responsibility for making the internal organization of activities appropriate and cost effective
- Responsibility for the budget accounts and reporting of results.

These functions are carried out in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, rules, limits and targets laid down by the authorities.

Concept of Public University

Public university is a university that awards degrees and awards that receive a share of funding from the federal or state government and serve as a critical component of the overall higher education landscape. These universities enroll a large

number of undergraduate and graduate levels and maintain relatively low tuition when compared with private universities. Public universities provide a number of services to their states and the nation, such as improving access to cutting-edge medical care and contributing to protection of natural resources at the national, state and local level.

Concept of Structure and Composition of University Governing

Council

In any organization, the management structure is the hierarchy of the authorities involved in the management process and the devolution of powers and responsibilities at those levels. In other words, the management structure of an organization is the chain of authorities and the functions of each level of authorities (Oloyede, 2010). Management structure of universities in Nigeria comprises the Chancellor of the university who is the ceremonial head of the institution. He is next only to the titular head of the institution who is the Visitor- the Proprietor and President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria or the Governor of a state. Next is the Pro-Chancellor and Chairman of Council, who presides at every statutory meeting of the

institution. The Vice Chancellor is the field Officer who sees to the daily administration of the university. He presides at every Senate meeting and at such other meetings of some of the Council Committees, as well as the Congregation.

The composition of council of federal universities is provided for in the Universities (Miscellaneous Provisions) (Amendment) Act, 2003. Under the Act, the Governing Council of Federal Universities consist of:

- (a) The Pro- Chancellor
- (b) The Vice Chancellor
- (c) The Deputy Vice Chancellor
- (d) One person from the Federal Ministry of Education
- (e) Four persons representing a variety of interest and broadly representatives of the whole federation to be appointed by the National Council of Ministers.
- (f) Four persons appointed by the Senate from among its members
- (g) Two persons appointed by the Congregation from among its members; and
- (h) One person appointed by Convocation from among its members.

The composition of Governing Council of State Universities is similar to the above with minor variations to suit the peculiar needs of the states.

The council so constituted shall have tenure of four years from the date of its inauguration provided that where a council is found to be incompetent and corrupt it shall be dissolved by the Visitor and a new council immediately constituted for the effective functioning of the university.

Theoretical Framework

Systems Theory

Von Bertalanffy was the founder and chief proponent of the system theory and it was propounded in the year 1950. The systems theory considers the school as a set of distinguishable but interrelated and interdependent parts operating in a logical manner or sequence in order to achieve a goal. The theory argues that a system must be viewed as a whole where changes in one part of the system affect the other parts and the entire system. The whole is not just a sum total of the subsystems, but a holistic representation of the characteristics, what the whole can do, the sub-system cannot.

The systems theory considers the school as a set of distinguishable but interrelated and interdependent parts operating in a logical manner or sequence in order to achieve a goal. On a wider scope, this theory considers educational institutions as sub systems operating within an environment and tries to apply the system approach to problems (Onele, 2014). Knowledge of system theory gives the educational managers (including governing council members) an insight into the importance of involving the community, being receptive to external forces in order to regulate and maintain itself in a desired "steady state". Related to this is the importance of gaining purposive and evaluative feedback channels. Thus, there is need for critical feedback which rather than positive or re-entering, is necessary for an open system like the educational system (Onele, 2014). In universities, internal feedback is needed between governing council members and principal officers, staff and students as well as external feedback between the university and the community. Thus the governing council members should maximize the university relationship with regulating agencies such as federal and state ministries of education, National Universities Commission, Joint Admission and Matriculation

Board etc. Governing council does not exist in isolation rather than it is functionally related and necessarily contributes to a larger system. That is, it is actually a sub-system of a larger organization. Being an open system, it draws on its environment, and, its outputs affect the environment.

Mega Planning Theory

Mega planning theory was founded by Roger Kaufman in 1972 in his book; Educational System Planning and further developed in Kaufman & English 1979. Mega thinking and planning is about defining a shared success, achieving it, and being able to prove it. Mega thinking and planning is a focus not on one's organization alone but upon society now and in the future. It is about adding measurable value to all stakeholders.

Mega planning is a critical aspect of successfully defining, prioritizing, and achieving useful educational results (i.e., societal and community results, payoffs, and consequences). It is characterized by planning where the primary client and beneficiary is society, now and in the future. Mega planning views individuals and organizations as means to societal ends,

and begins by identifying the Outcomes that an institution commits to contribute to society. Mega planning includes these levels of planning (Macro and Micro) as well as by aligning them with positive societal contributions.

Mega planning begins from the belief and assumption that the primary purpose of every person and every organization is to create a better world for the child of Tomorrow. The applicable principles of mega planning include; (1) Needs exist at mega (societal), macro (organizational), and micro (individual/team) levels. (2) Needs are gaps in results. Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach, he set the Agenda for what is known as stakeholder theory. Thus an educational institution benefits from the application of Mega planning when it creates and assures the linkages between the mega, macro, micro, process, and inputs levels of the Organizational Elements Model (Kaufman, Herman, and Water 1996).

In the light of the mega planning theory, the governing councils of universities have to create value for students, employers, financiers, communities and all who intervene in the activities of the university in one form or the other.

Theoretical Studies

Personnel Functions

The human resource is the most important resource of any organization and any effort spared in motivating the workforce will pay off. In this era of globalization, organizations are not only paying for their inefficiencies they are also paying for the global inefficiency, and environmental degradation (Orga & Ogbo, 2012). Organizations that do not put their emphasis on attracting and retaining talents may find themselves in dire consequences, as their competitors may be outplaying them in the strategic employment of their human resource. With the increase in competition, locally and globally, organizations must achieve a competitive advantage. Bohlander, Snell and Sherman (2001) argued that why people have always been central to organizations, they have now taken on an even more central role in building a firm's competitive advantage. Research in human resource management (HRM) has established that the success of any organization is highly influenced by the caliber of its human resource (HR), which in turn, is affected by the organization's human resource management practices (Okoh, 2005).

Armstrong (2006) observed that the assumptions underpinning the practice of human resource management is that people are the organization's key resource and organizational performance largely depends on them. Therefore, if, an appropriate range of human resource policies and processes are developed and implemented effectively, then human resource will make a sustainable impact on organizations performance.

Boohene and Asuinura, (2011) argued that the case for an association between human resource management and organization performance is based on two arguments: The first one being that the effective deployment of human resources offers one of the most powerful bases of competitive advantage. The second argument is that effective deployment of human resources depends on the application of a distinctive combination of practices or the use of consistent set of human resource practices. Again, according to Collins and Druten (2003) researchers have produced compelling evidence for the causal link between how people are managed and organizations performance. They argue that the effectiveness of human resource practices, particularly employee selection procedures, performance appraisal, compensation management, and

employee training and development often have a direct bearing on organizational productivity and performance. Also Boohene and Asuinura (2011) presented that, the result of effectively managed human resources is an enhanced ability to attract and retain qualified employees who are motivated to perform. To them, the benefits of having the right employees motivated to perform include greater profitability, low employee turnover, high product quality, lower production costs, and more rapid acceptance and implementation of corporate strategy.

Training and development is an important area for appropriate range of policies and processes. Human resource is the most dynamic of all resources of any organization; therefore, considerable attention must be given to human development in the organization (Osemeke, 2012). Employee development is a necessary effort of a company to improve quality and to meet the challenges of global competition and social change (Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart & Wright, 2004). Huselid (1995), Oshionebo (2007) noted that providing formal and informal training experiences, such as basic skills training, on-the-job experience, coaching, mentoring and management development can further influence employees development and hence, their

performance. Employee compensation management is another important area. Compensation management is concerned with the formulation and implementation of strategies and policies, the purpose of which is to reward people fairly, equitably and consistently in accordance with their value to the organization and thus help the organization to achieve its strategic goals. Armstrong (2006) presented that the philosophy of reward management recognized that if resource management is about investing human capital from which a reasonable return is required, then it is proper to compensate people differently, according to their contributions.

Another important policy issue is staff performance appraisal. The process of performance management, according to Campbell and Adebayo (2007), involved a continuous judgment on the behavior and performance of staff. It is important that employees know exactly what is expected of them, and the yardstick by which their performance and results will be measured. Most importantly, an effective appraisal scheme can improve the future performance of staff (Osemeke, 2012). According to Campbell et al (2007), there is a clear and strong

relationship between organizational performance and the attention given to performance management and employee appraisal.

Employee recruitment and selection is another critical personnel policy issue. Ezali and Esiagu (2010) stated the success of any organization or efficiency in service delivery depends on the quality of its workforce who was recruited into the organization through recruitment and selection exercises. Recruitment and selection involve getting the best applicants for a job. Recruitment is the process of attracting a sufficient number of individuals with right profile in terms of qualifications, experience, skills and other relevant attributes to indicate their interest in working for the organization (Obikeze & Obi, 2004). Mullins (1999) pointed out that the important thing is for some suitable plans to be used; and that the plan is appropriate to the essential or desired characteristic of the candidate. It is also necessary to comply with all legal requirements relating to employment and equal opportunities, to follow recommended codes of practice and to ensure justice and fair treatment for all applicants. When the best people are selected for the job, productivity increases (Osemeke, 2012). Trustees (governing

council) are expected to assure policy and fiduciary responsibilities, hire and fire the chief executive officer, and in most cases, approve the appointment of senior officers (Laner, 1997). Williams (2011) stated that boards (governing councils) must have the vision and ability to stay on course, to effectively and efficiently manage and utilize fiscal and human resources, and handle a myriad of issues that affect the operations of the institutions. Also the Association of Governing Boards, (n.d.) affirmed that fulfilling the mission of hiring a CEO, assessing the president and engaging in their fiduciary responsibility are responsibilities that boards are charged with.

Maintenance of University Culture

Organizational culture is conceptualized as shared beliefs and values within the organization that helps to shape the behavior patterns of employees (Kotter & Heskett, 1992). Gordon and Cummins (1989) defined organization culture as the drive that recognizes the efforts and contributions of the organizational members and provides holistic understanding of what and how to be achieved, how employee could attain goals. Hofstede (1980) summarized organizational culture as collective process of the mind that differentiates the members of one group from the other

one. The organizational culture is outlined in Schein (1990) as overall phenomenon of the organization such as natural settings, the rite and rituals, climate, values and programmes of the company e.g. performances management, training and development, recruitment and selection, etc.

This cluster includes the following factors- transparency of the board, openness in discussion, level of involvement of directors, atmosphere at board meetings, sharing of common vision by directors and level of team spirit on the board. Culture in this case is a set of informal unwritten rules which regulate board and directors behavior. A vibrant board that works towards adding value to the organization should have a culture of open debate and freedom of thought. It should also have a high level of director involvement in board meeting and activities.

The general atmosphere at the board will determine to some extent the way the board operates, a friendlier and open atmosphere will lead to frank and useful discussions and debates. Boards need to pursue a common vision if all directors are going to 'sing from the same song sheet' (Ogbechie & Koufopoulos, 2010).

"Board culture refers to the norms and values that guide board work. To be effective, boards must adopt professional culture where civil interactions are the norm. In addition, many individuals who are appointed or elected to public boards do not have experience with board work and must be socialized to its values. Board culture affects overall board performance in several ways, 'by shaping the decision process, by leading toward or away from consensus, by using data to understand or argue, or by not using at all, by building or not building constructive relationships among members, and by influencing which matters get on to the board's agenda "(Kezar, 2006:987).

When a board has established a professional culture rather than political culture; decisions will be more rational, debates will focus on ideas rather than power, and agenda items will reflect collegiality rather than the individual desires of powerful members. Kezar (2006) stressed that the Chief Executive Officer and Board Chair can and should nurture/model the desired qualities of board members and should create a culture where certain behavior is accepted. Board members need to be civil, appreciate working in diverse groups, have patience for consensus, be open to multiple views, subsume his or her judgments to the collective, be politically astute, be big picture thinkers, honest, wise, and have a capacity to understand complexity. Although these represent certain skill, they also

represent the values of the board and the approach that needs to be taken to effectively do our work. Board chairs are the most visible symbol of the values. If they do not live them, it is unlikely that the board will have them (Kezar, 2006).

A troubling aspect of most public boards is that people come to the work with a particular ideology based on their political party, yet the work of the board needs to be carried out in a nonpartisan way. The board chair and CEO play a role in working with new board members to make them aware that decisions are based on what is good for the overall institution and to re-enforce that the board values civility (Kezar 2006). Another strategy is that all groups should be treated similarly. No one should receive more information and there should be equal communication. There needs to be a high degree of transparency with all work and communication among all board members. This also deputizes the board.

Writing on boards in the banking industry, Ogbechie and Koufopoulos (2012) stated that behavioural characteristics of directors will have a bearing on the effectiveness of the board. Directors with domineering and over bearing personality are

likely to cause disharmony on the board. Integrity of directors, their ethical standard and attitude will likely influence their expectation and behaviour on the board. Board culture includes; transparency of the board, openness in discussion, level of involvement of directors, atmosphere of board meeting, sharing of common vision by directors and level of team spirit on the board (Ogbechie & Koufopoulos 2012). Culture in this case is a set of informal unwritten rules which regulate board and directors' behaviour. A vibrant board that works towards adding value to the bank should have a culture of open debate and freedom of thought. It should also have a high level of director's involvement in board meeting and activities. The general atmosphere at the board will determine to some extent the way the board operates, a friendlier and open atmosphere will lead to frank and useful discussions and debates (Ogbeche & Koufopoulos 2012). In the words of Welsh (2010) ensuring the ethics of institutional and board actions is a vital responsibility for the governing board. Due to external pressure, boards must pay attention to issues of ethics: Many states have established strong standard for behaviour, requiring board trustees and professionals' interests (Leslie & MacTaggart, 2008).

A challenge faced by public governing boards like community colleges in fulfilling their governing role is the need to deliberate in full public view. All states have established open records or "sunshine laws" that require meetings and records be open to public review (Leslie & MacTaggart, 2008; Mclendon & Hearn, 2006). In an examination of the impact of sunshine laws on boards of trustees in six states, Mclendon and Hearn (2006) found that most respondents felt that the benefits of openness outweighed the costs.

Financial Functions

Nowadays financial resources are inadequate and not always available to sustain university projects, hence university Bursars should ensure greater accountability and eliminate waste. (Mohammed, 1988). Yusuf, et al (2010) observed that in comparison with other African nations, Nigeria funding on education is less than ten percent. This has created some problems and a disabling environment that hamper goal-realization for the Nigerian universities. Among such problems according to Adesina (2005), are lack of focus; failure to relate enrolment to available human and material resources, excessive

trade unionism, decaying and obsolete learning and teaching facilities unbecoming of centres of excellence, inadequate research and frustrated staff and students and poor remuneration packages for teaching and non-teaching staff. These pose great challenges to university governing councils.

Neville (1988) stated that a university is a several hundred million naira operation. The council should lay down general policy but the Vice Chancellor is the manager (Neville). Kezar (2006) listed specific areas to be considered for governing boards effectiveness in financial management to include involvement in preparation, approval, and monitoring of the budget; whether board members have expertise in long range fiscal planning and analysis of financial reports; and whether board members receive financial reports, and if these are useful.

In a study McDonagh (2006) stated that findings indicated that expenses decreased and profitability increased as board's performance increased. Okojie, J. A. the National Universities Commission Executive Secretary observed that many Nigerian universities such as the University of Lagos, University of Maiduguri, University of Benin, Bayero University Kano and

Nnamdi Azikiwe University (NAU) have developed creative fund generation strategies which are assisting the running of the universities. He explained some varieties of creative strategies which universities may utilize such as: Alumni tracking, database of alumni, periodic contact with alumnus to maintain sense of belonging, Alumni Consultancy/Services; Linkages/partner ships with philanthropists/donor agencies, collaborative research and development; Small and Medium Scale enterprises like built-up shops for rent, operation of cyber cafes, fee for-services parking lots, launderettes, transportation services, renting of halls in idle time and other ventures that create avenues for student-work programmes.

Monitoring and Review of Programmes and Awards

Monitoring is the internal project activity of providing feedback to project management on the progress of the project, the problems it is facing, and the efficiency with which it is being implemented (Bamberger & Hewith, 1986). Kiesler and Sproutt, cited in Richards (1988) defined monitoring as a system of activities with three critical components: It requires the regular

collection of information, it requires that the evaluation results in an institutional (project) action. Bartle (2007) stated that monitoring provides information that will be useful in:

- Analyzing the situation in the community and its projects.
- Determining whether the inputs in the project are well utilized;
- Identifying problems facing the community or project and finding solutions;
- Ensuring all activities are carried out properly by the right people and in time;
- Using lessons from one project experience on to another; and
- Determining whether the way the project was planned is the most appropriate way of solving the problem at hand.

Monitoring can be directed to project inputs, processes and outputs (Kieslar & Sproull, 1982). The assessment in a project, and whether they are expanded as planned, is called input monitoring. It is to ensure that a project is operating at some predetermined standard, or in other words, that a project is operating as stated in its plan of operation. Input monitoring is mostly directed to the input of a project in the educational system. Process monitoring is directed to the process in which a

project is involved in order to assure that these processes are indeed contributing to the expected output. Assessment of whether the project achieves the planned change in the education system is called performance monitoring. Schools as institutions should be engaged with the monitoring and evaluation process, not only to provide answers to authorities but also to improve their own practices (Kieslar & Sproull 1982).

Monitoring and review of programmes would include publishing a brief annual report summarizing activities and progress against established objectives. The review should also advise on further policy interventions and actions that could be put in place to ensure a continuous commitment to efficiency.

Nwangwu (2014) cautioned that quantities growth must provide for the maintenance of standards and quality: In addition to these efforts, higher education must help solve national development problems, of eradication of poverty, reduction of unemployment and ultimately the achievement of improvement in the conditions and quality of life for all citizens (Nwagwu, 2014). Finally for tertiary education to successfully serve as instrument for national development, it must be properly

planned and regulated to avoid unnecessary duplication, wastages and overlaps (Nwagwu). Areas of priority, for example, science and technology should be identified and financed appropriately. Writing on school self- evaluation, Okoro (2014) stated that the need for school self- evaluation follows, on one hand, from the conviction that schools need to take responsibility for their improvement, for such improvement to be sustainable, and on the other hand, from a desire to democratic school management. Also Esu and Emah (2014) opined that globally and recently, the school curriculum has been a subject of much debates especially its content and the approach of developing it.

External Relations

Public boards are distinctive in that they are part of a system of governance, not independent decision- making units. The areas to which public boards need to pay particular attention in order to ensure effectiveness include: Co-ordinate governor's and legislature strategic plans with the board agenda; joint goal setting between the layers of governance is needed; sophisticated communication systems need to be developed; board members need to have access to the governor; and the

board should stay committed to an agenda even as governors turn over (Kezar, 2006).

"Ongoing communication is needed among boards, Governor/President and Legislatures of their collective plan for higher education, particularly if they are to evaluate efforts to fulfill their agenda. Too often boards frustrate governors and Legislatures by failing to see an alignment between the goals of the state and those of the institution. Certainly, the board and governor's visions will not always be aligned, but at least examining linkages was noted as crucial to performance" (Kezar, 2006:991).

Effective state systems/boards have joint goal setting between the governor, Legislature, stake holders, boards, and Presidents. One way to ensure that the state and institutional goals are more aligned is to conduct joint planning processes for developing priorities. High-performing boards have sophisticated communication vehicles such as annual forums for groups to convene to discuss the agenda for higher education, quarterly updates from stakeholders, and annual evaluations of the level of communication between and among groups (Kezar, 2006). "If none of the board members has a relationship with or speaks with the governor, the board is seen as being much more limited ineffectiveness. Board leadership and decisive action requires support from the governor, and boards are limited in forms of the

leadership they can exercise without interaction with the governor" (Kezar, 2006:992).

Internal Relationships

This cluster includes interpersonal relationships between the directors, cohesiveness of the board, and informal contacts between directors, teamwork, trust, and respect. The level of interpersonal relationships between the board members is the right chemistry. Relationships also include quality of management, informal contacts between directors and management, trust, respect, and proper understanding of functions. The board should not act as a rubber stamping body to avoid putting the long term performance of the organization at risk (Ogbeche 85 Koufopoulos, 2010). Board effectiveness is linked to developing and maintaining certain relationships. The most important are those between the CEO and board chair, between the board and campus stake holders and between board members. Relationships need to be intentionally fostered through board meetings, retreats, campus events and ceremonies and communication vehicle (Kezar, 2006).

"The CEO/President and board chair relationship is a key to board effectiveness" (Kezar, 2006:993). This relationship affects how board recommendations are received by the institution as well as the quality of information given to boards to make policy. The CEO/President should establish strong relationships and communicates regularly with every board member, and trust is facilitated by knowing what is going on within the institution and receiving communication in person, by phone and in writing. Strong boards have weekly short updates about pertinent issues sent via emails; the executive committee has phone calls each week or biweekly and the President visits board members outside of meeting, preferably on their turf. Also the President spends time with board members outside the official board business. Trust and communication are essential for board learning, as members will be more open to the information and ultimately assist the board in making better decisions.

Effective board members spend time engaging university constituents outside of their responsibilities. Public boards are responsible to various stake holders, including institutional groups such as faculty, community members and students. In order to enact their role effectively board members need to be

involved in more than a perfunctory way with the institution that they serve "Board meetings include social events and provide opportunities to develop camaraderie. Although the board needs to keep focused on the board agenda, meetings that provide opportunities for board members to build relationships help break down the political/ideological orientation, assist individual board members to learn about their role informally, and enable members to learn through casual conversations (Kezar, 2006). Relationship between board members includes interpersonal relationship between directors, cohesiveness of the board, and informal contacts between directors, teamwork, trust and respect (Ogbechie & Koufopoulos, 2010). Similarly, board-management relationship includes quality of management, informal contacts between directors and management, trust, respect, and proper understanding of functions (Ogbechie & Koufopoulos, 2010).

Development and Maintenance of Facilities and Infrastructure

Bello (n.d) stated that part of the problem attributed to setback of public universities in Nigeria include: poor funding; lack of infrastructure; lack of frequent curriculum review; inadequate staff training and welfare; students over-population;

frequent strikes by both the academic and supporting staff etc. He added that it is very unfortunate that necessary facilities such as sufficient power supply, enough and decent lecture halls, basic chemicals and equipment in laboratories and properly equipped libraries are lacking. He submitted that obviously, public universities in Nigeria need to improve a lot in order to parallel the global standard in imparting knowledge, conducting applicable research, and the be responsive to the needs of our socio economic development. Bello suggested that university administrators should widen their horizon, develop a creative ability and legitimate initiative to generate funds to supplement their grants in order to cater for their many and diverse needs. This could be through efforts to access research funds from donor and, project management finance agencies, collaboration with the industries, parent's contributions, endowments, alumni support and other forms of private sector support. Apart from poor funding, another serious problem facing our universities is lack of good maintenance culture for the few facilities available. It is apparent that in most of our universities the facilities put in place when they were first established could not even be maintained not to talk of providing modern ones. That is to say

that there are no facilities maintenance centers in our universities but hardly do they function properly.

In 1986, the National Universities Commission in collaboration with the then Overseas Development Agency and European Economic Community set up five pilot Equipment Maintenance and Development Centers (EMDCs) in five Nigerian Federal Universities at Zaria, Ile-Ife, Nsukka, Calabar and Bauchi. The aim of the project was to establish maintenance culture in our universities. The pilot centers were supposed to serve as models for other universities to draw experience and expertise for establishing their own Equipment Maintenance Centers (EMCs). Bello observed that the common problem to virtually all the EMDCs/EMCs is poor funding, lack of staff training and inadequate support by the university management.

The Executive Secretary of the National Universities Commission recently in a press conference said "Over one million candidates scramble for just over 200,000 spaces available annually for admission into the universities. In the face of inadequate and obsolete infrastructure and equipment, poor library facilities, inadequate academic staff in number and

quality, lack of relevance of academic programmes, low level of funding, cultism, unstable university calendar, particularly in unionized federal and state universities, most universities still go beyond the carrying capacity allotted to them. He also said there are more than 331 un-approved programmes in the Nigerian University system out of 2605, in 13 disciplines

According to Punch Newspaper Editorial (2015), many universities in Nigeria lack basic infrastructure like regular water supply, sufficient accommodation, well-equipped libraries or functional rest rooms in the halls of residence or in lecture arenas. In university of Lagos for an example, between four and six students occupy a room meant for two. The one meant for four now houses eight or more; while the ones meant for between six and eight students generally house twice the official figure. The recent tragic incident that occurred at the Edo State owned Ambrose Ali University, Ekpoma, leading to the death of two female students while five others sustained serious bodily injuries are a sad reminder of the dilapidated state of social infrastructure in tertiary institutes across the country.

As Awosika (1982) observed, the availability, adequacy and maintenance of facilities and equipment are necessary conditions for running a good and meaningful programme in sports and related fields. A detailed investigation into the existing sports and recreational facilities in some selected Nigeria Universities indicates a low level of availability of the needed sports infrastructure such as stadium pitches, court and indoor sports hall, swimming pool, gymnastic to cater for the yearning of ever growing population of sportsmen and women (Awosika, 1982).

Empirical Studies

Some studies that are related to governing council (boards) are presented in this section.

Kezar (2006) conducted a study on rethinking public higher education governing board performance in the United States. The study conducted elite interview with 132 different experts on board performance. The snowball sampling technique was used as those interviewed provided additional names of people whom they knew were particularly insightful and had significant

expertise with higher education boards. Two research questions were formulated for the study. The study found out among others that there are a set of unique elements necessary to facilitate high performance among public higher education boards. One of the factors that appear to differentiate public from private board performance is the political nature of public boards, leadership in public boards takes the form of a formal agenda and involves stake holder input.

English (2008) conducted a study on board competencies and peer mentoring in East Carolina, United States. A cross-sectional quantitative non-experimental study was implemented using an internet-based survey to gather data from mentors, mentees and professional board staff at participating institutions. The main body data was gathered from closed-ended Likert-scale survey questions. Nine hundred and twenty-seven (927) board professionals, each representing one post-secondary governing board from the association of governing boards of colleges and universities board professional membership list, were invited to participate. Three research questions and six hypotheses were formulated for the study. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze survey data beginning with sample demographics

through a review of perceptual differences associated with each hypothesis.

The study found out that there may be a mismatch between the perceptions of board professionals, mentors and mentees regarding the presence of training related to the mentoring program's purpose. There is also a discrepancy between mentor and mentee perception of the content of mentoring discussions, mentors perceived discussion of each of the board competency dimension to a greater extent than did mentees among others. The mismatch between the perceptions of board professionals (governing council members and principal officers of universities) will create discrepancies in formulation and implementation of personnel policies with respect to training and development of staff.

Williams (2011) conducted a study on assessing the impact of governing boards for Louisiana Public Institutions of higher learning regarding policy and governance in Louisiana, United States. The research was conducted utilizing the grounded theory approach of qualitative research. Five research questions were formulated for the study. The researcher used a research technique called axial coding to interpret the collected data. Axial

coding is utilized when the categories and themes that have emerged from the interviews are compared, cross-referenced, and analyzed across data. All chairs of Louisiana public higher education governing boards and one member were interviewed.

The findings of the study were that Louisiana governing boards have made significant impacts on their respective systems regarding policy and governance; however, there is room for improvement to enhance their performance, and establishing effective policies and governance will make public higher education institutions more effective and efficient with their resources. Thus the findings indicate that there are rooms for improvements in the performances of governing councils in their functions in higher education institutions including universities.

Myers (1997) conducted a study on maintaining the public trust: core competencies associated with effective governing boards of state multi-campus systems of higher education in Maryland, United States. The inductive approach was adopted in the study. The inductive route was taken by talking directly to board members about their experiences - both good and bad - to gain insight into what makes for good system governance. Four research questions and two hypothesis were formulated for the

study. A sample of twenty seven board members was selected from proposed list of six study sites. ANOVA was adopted in the analysis of the data.

The study found that effective governing boards of multi-campus systems demonstrate identifiable behaviours that can be categorized and those behaviours are characteristic of all the competency dimensions - to greater or lesser degrees - in the Chait, Holland and Taylor model. However, the behaviours that really appear to define those exemplary boards are those characteristic of the political, analytical and strategic dimensions. The results also show that the behaviours of exemplary boards in the study vary from those of the less than exemplary study sites. There, behaviours in the political, analytical and strategic dimensions played less a role in predicting board effectiveness; behaviours in the contextual and interpersonal dimensions played a greater role in contributing to board effectiveness and, equally important, behaviours in the educational and strategic dimensions appeared to diminish board effectiveness. These behaviours to a large extent influence the maintenance of internal and external relationships by governing council members in the universities.

Bikmoradi (2009) carried out a study on exploring academic leadership in medical schools and universities in Iran. The study adopted methodological triangulation. The results of two qualitative and two quantitative studies were combined to achieve the research objectives. The qualitative methodologies included use of an expert panel to explore requirements of effective academic leadership. The quantitative technique used included a nationwide survey to explore the preferences and perception of faculties with regard to organizational culture, values and routines. A semi-structured consultation guide was used to conduct discussion in the investigation. Factor analysis was used to assess consistency and reliability. A sample of 40 participants was used in the study.

The study found that the requirements of effective academic leadership in Iranian medical schools and universities could be grouped with six themes: 1) shared vision, goals and strategies; 2) teaching and research leadership; 3) transformational and collaborative leadership; 4) development and recognition performance; 5) fair and efficient management; 6) climate of mutual trust and respect. There are some barriers to effective academic leadership, for example politicization, instability,

paradoxical management, lack of meritocracy, centralization, bureaucracy, and belief in misconceptions. These barriers no doubt will affect the performances of governing council functions in universities.

Welsh (2010) carried out a study on increasing a community college governing board's engagement in accountability for students' success: what are the principal influence in Texas, United States. The study employed qualitative research using a grounded theory approach with a single-case design. A combination of interviews and observation was adopted. Purposive sample approach was used in selecting the college that was studied. Purposive sampling was also used to select individuals who were interviewed. Two research questions were formulated for the study. A grounded theory of data coding was used for the study identified eight factors or affinities that influenced the governing board's interest in students success. These include board characteristics (values, skills, knowledge, expertise, life experience and personalities that influence board behaviour), achieving the dream, changing external context, students success, board roles and responsibilities (policy making, setting direction, leadership, establishing high

expectations, fiscal responsibility and evaluation and compensating employees), board culture, college roles and purpose and changing internal context.

Akpakwu and Okwo (2014) carried out a study on politics and the appointment of council members, vice chancellors and other principal officers in federal and state universities in the north central states of Nigeria. The study examined the influence of political factors of partisan politics, ethnic and sectional considerations, religious affiliations, favouritism, the quota system and catchment area policy on the appointment of members of governing councils, vice chancellors and other principal officers in federal and state universities. Two research questions and hypotheses respectively guided the study. The population of the study was 11,582 made up of staff of five federal universities and staff of five state universities. A 14-item structured questionnaire titled 'Influence of Politics on Appointment Questionnaire (IPAQ)' was used to collect data for the study. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions while t-test analysis was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

The study found out that partisan politics, ethnic and sectional considerations, religious affiliations, favouritism, the quota system and catchment area policy significantly influenced appointment of members of governing councils, vice chancellors, and other principal officers in federal and state universities in the north central states of Nigeria. This study relates to the present study in the area of consideration for appointment of university governing councils' members. The study identified various biases in the appointment of university governing councils' members. When the wrong people are appointed due to partisan and mundane considerations, the performance of the functions of the university governing councils is hampered.

Tsav (2015) conducted a study on governing councils' activities on staff and students personnel management in federal and state universities in the north central states, Nigeria. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. The population of the study was 1827 made up of governing council members, senate members, ASUU executive members, SSANU executive members, NASU executive members, and SUG executive members. A sample of 374 was drawn for the study and a ten item structured

questionnaire and interview schedule were used to collect data for the study. Data collected were presented using descriptive statistics while t-test was used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

The study found out that there was no significant difference in the mean rating of senate members and staff union executive of federal and state universities on the extent the governing council activities influenced staff personnel administration while the council and senate members in federal and state universities significantly differed in their mean responses on the extent that the governing council activities affected the student personnel administration. The study focused on the activities of the university governing councils in such areas as personnel functions and relationships in the university system. These activities translate to aspects of the functions of university governing councils which is the concern of this present study.

Summary of Review of Related Literature

The review of related literature in this section covered definitions and explanations of the key concepts and variables under study. The review started with the definitions and descriptions of the major concepts of the study, thus; the concept

of personnel, the concept of finance, the concept of monitoring and the concept of relationship. From the studies of scholars the functions of governing councils were identified. Ogbechie and Koufopoulos for example stated that relationship between board members (council members) includes interpersonal relationship between directors, cohesiveness of the board, and informal contacts between directors (council members), teamwork, trust and respect.

Some theories that are related to university management and performance of governing council functions were also reviewed. The theories reviewed were systems and stake holder theories. The review of these theories broadened the spectrum of governing council functions and governing council activities. Thus the two theories provided an anchor for the study. The system theory for example provided an anchor for the study because it maintained that the functions of a governing council as a sub-system will invariably affect the other sub-systems and the entire university system as a whole as they are interrelated and interdependent of each other.

Empirical studies on university management and administration were also reviewed. The researcher found out from

the literature review that studies available were not directly in the area of performance of university governing council functions particularly in Nigeria. There is therefore a gap in literature in the area of assessment of the performance of governing council functions in universities in Nigeria. The researcher therefore sought to fill this gap in literature and empirically carried out an assessment of university council in South East Nigeria.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

This chapter presented the method used to carry out the investigation. Included here are the following: Research Design; Area of the Study; Sample and Sampling Technique; Instrument for Data Collection and Validation of the Instrument; Reliability of the Instrument; Method of Data Collection and Method of Data Analysis.

Research Design

The research design used in carrying out this study was the descriptive survey research design. This research design was used because the researcher sought to find out the conditions or relationships that existed, opinions that were held, processes that were ongoing, effects that were evident or trends that were developing (Akuezulo & Agu, 2003). The descriptive survey design helped the researcher to collect data on the views of internal governing council members and principal officers, and staff whose duties related to governing council activities (Deputy Registrars in charge of governing council matters and Public Relations Officers)

Area of the Study

The area of study is South East geopolitical zone of Nigeria made up of five states as follows, Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, and Imo states. Geographically, the zone is bounded in the West and South by South South Zone, in the East and North by North Central Zone. Generally, the people of the zone speak Ibo, and are mostly traders as well as industrialists, public and civil servants. A pertinent feature of the zone is the high quest for university education. At present there are five state universities and five federal universities in the area.

Population of the Study

All the ten universities (five federal and five state universities) in the area were used for the study. The population of this study consisted of 165 persons made up of 115 internal members of governing councils and 50 persons whose duties relate to activities of governing council (Registrars, Bursars, University Librarians, Deputy Registrars in-charge of governing council matters and Public Relations Officers).

Sample and Sampling Techniques

Due to the small size of the population, all the members were used in the study.

Instrument for Data Collection

The instrument used for data collection was an assessment of university council performance questionnaire (AUCPQ) constructed by the researcher. The questionnaire consisted of two parts; part one contained information on the university, and part two was made up of structured items to which the respondents expressed opinion on. Part two was divided into seven sections ABCDEFG containing eleven items on personnel functions, ten items on maintenance of university culture, seven items on financial functions, seven items on monitoring and review of programmes and awards, five items on external relations, four items on internal relationships, and four items on development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure respectively. The respondents supplied information on their universities and then reacted to the structured items on the questionnaire using a four point scale. The response format was as follows: Very High (VH) = 4; High(H) =3; Low (L) = 2; and Very Low (VL) = 1.

Validation of Instrument

The draft copies of the instrument for data collection were subjected to expert review to ensure its face and content validity. In ensuring this, the researcher consulted three experts, two from Educational Policy and Management Department and one from Measurement and Evaluation Department. The experts were given copies of the research topic, purpose of the study, research questions and hypotheses together with draft instrument for the validation exercise. They were requested to vet the instrument in terms of their clarity, coverage and relevance to the problem under study. They also reviewed the appropriateness of the language and expressions. The vetting by the experts helped the researcher to re-structure and modify the instrument. This ensured that the instrument measured what it was designed to measure. Copies of the validators' comments are attached as appendix 5.

Reliability of the Instrument

The Cronbach alpha method of reliability was carried out to determine the internal consistency or average correlation of

items in the survey instrument to gauge its reliability. The designed questionnaire was pilot-tested on twenty principal officers and staff of University of Benin and Ambrose Ali University Ekpoma (ten per university) whose duties relate to governing council activities. The mean rating of the items in each of the seven clusters were coded in the statistical package of the Social Sciences using Norris (2005) guidelines. The scores were analyzed using Cronbach alpha reliability analysis scale. Coefficients of 0.71, 0.71, 0.79, 0.86, 0.89, 0.91, 0.92, were obtained for the seven clusters respectively. Overall coefficient of the instrument was 0.96. These coefficient values were considered adequate for the study as the least coefficient is greater than 0.7.

Method of Data Collection

The questionnaire was administered in all federal and state universities in the five states that make up the geopolitical zone. The questionnaire was administered and collected through direct visit by the researcher and other research assistants (one research assistant per university). The Research Assistants were personnel officers in the employment of universities. They were

trained by the researcher to ensure that they effectively do the work. Two weeks were used for the administration and collection of the questionnaire. The direct approach used in the distribution of the questionnaire availed the researcher and the research assistants the opportunity to appeal to the respondents and solicit for their co-operation. It ensured a high percent (79.39%) return of the distributed questionnaire.

Method of Data Analysis

The research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation while z-test was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of the responses to each item on the questionnaire was calculated. The mean of means of all items in a cluster was also calculated. The decision rule for interpreting the mean scores of the data was, a mean score of 2.5 and above was regarded as a high level performance of governing council functions while a mean score of less than 2.5 was regarded as a low level performance of governing council functions. The hypotheses were tested using z-test at 0.05 level of significance. The null hypothesis was rejected if the calculated value was less than the table value while the null hypothesis was

upheld if the calculated value was greater or equal to the table value.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this chapter, the data collected from the field for this study were analyzed and the summaries were presented in tables to highlight the findings. The presentation was sequential starting with answering of the research questions and then testing of hypotheses.

Research Question One

To what extent do the governing councils perform personnel functions in federal and state universities?

Table 1

Mean Scores on the Extent Governing Councils Perform Personnel Functions

S/N	Items	Federal (N=61)			State (N=70)		
		Mean	SD	Decision	Mean	SD	Decision
1.	Clarification of the mission of the university	2.967	.948	High	2.64	.963	High
2.	Attracting qualified staff for recruitment	2.721	.968	High	2.542	.828	High
3.	Retaining qualified staff	2.082	.737	Low	2.885	.893	High
4.	Planning succession for filling positions of principal officers (vice chancellor, registrar,	2.623	.778	High	2.785	.849	High

bursar, university librarian)							
5.	Control and discipline of staff	2.245	1.010	Low	2.928	.889	High
6.	Conflict resolution among staff	2.967	.965	High	2.400	.923	Low
7.	Development of human resources management policies	2.852	.872	High	1.785	.930	Low
8.	Staff compensation management	2.950	.973	High	2.342	.866	Low
9.	Staff performance appraisal	3.016	.991	High	2.942	.946	High
10.	Staff recruitment and selection	2.213	.685	Low	2.742	.973	High
11.	Acting as court of the last appeal to aggrieved staff	2.901	.888	High	1.814	.921	Low
	Mean of means	2.685	.386	High	2.528	.424	High

The result in table 1 shows that federal and state universities were rated high extent in classification of the mission of the university, attracting qualified staff for recruitment, planning succession for filling positions of principal officers (vice chancellor, registrar, bursar, university librarian) and staff performance appraisal. The table also shows that federal universities were rated high extent in conflict resolution among staff, development of human resources management policies, staff compensation management and acting as court of the last appeal to aggrieved staff, and rated low extent in retaining qualified staff, control and discipline of staff, and staff recruitment and selection. State

universities were also rated high extent in retaining qualified staff, control and discipline of staff and staff recruitment and selection, but rated low extent in conflict resolution among staff, development of human resources management policies, staff compensation management and acting as court of the last appeal to aggrieved staff.

The overall result in the table 1 shows that federal and state universities had a mean of means rating of 2.685 and 2.528 respectively. This indicates that they perform personnel functions to a high extent.

Research Question Two

To what extent do the governing councils maintain university culture in federal and state universities?

Table 2

Mean Scores on the Extent Governing Councils Maintain University culture

S/N	Items	Federal (N=61)			State (N=70)		
		Mean	SD	Decision	Mean	SD	Decision
1.	Maintenance of transparency in activities of the university	2.934	0.928	High	1.728	0.797	Low
2.	Maintenance of good atmosphere in the university	2.885	0.858	High	1.871	0.899	Low

3.	Sharing of common vision by council members	2.704	0.989	High	2.100	0.764	Low
4.	Maintenance of team spirit in decision making process	3.098	0.850	High	2.885	0.808	High
5.	Maintenance of openness in discussion	3.098	0.850	High	1.814	0.921	Low
6.	Building constructive relationship among council members	2.639	0.876	High	2.657	0.866	High
7.	Establishment of professional culture	2.278	0.985	Low	1.814	0.921	Low
8.	Nurturing of desired qualities and values	2.114	1.034	Low	1.785	0.535	Low
9.	Building a professional non-partisan culture	2.623	1.051	High	1.628	0.870	Low
10.	Subjecting meetings and records to public review	1.868	0.957	Low	2.714	0.704	High
	Mean of means	2.624	0.415	High	2.100	0.494	High

The result in table 2 indicates that governing councils of federal universities were rated high extent in all the items except in establishment of professional culture, nurturing of desired qualities and values, and subjecting meeting and records to public review, while governing councils of state universities were rated low extent in all items except in maintenance of team spirit in decision making process, building constructive relationship among council members, and subjecting meetings and records to public review. Also the result in table 2

shows that the mean of means rating of governing councils of federal universities was 2.624 while that of governing councils of state universities was 2.100. This indicates that governing councils of federal universities perform the functions of maintenance of university culture to a high extent, while the governing councils of state universities perform the functions of maintenance of university culture to a low extent.

Research Question Three

To what extent do the governing councils carry out financial functions in federal and state universities?

Table 3

Mean Scores on the Extent Governing Councils Carry Out Financial Functions

S/N	Items	Federal (N=61)			State (N=70)		
		Mean	SD	Decision	Mean	SD	Decision
1.	Approval of university budget	2.754	.809	High	2.671	.846	High
2.	Monitoring budget implementation	3.065	.793	High	2.014	.648	Low
3.	Implementation of long range fiscal planning	1.803	.653	Low	1.942	.507	Low

4.	Analysis of financial reports	1.786	.412	Low	2.842	.972	High
5.	Regulation of university business/undertakings	1.918	.936	Low	2.085	.811	Low
6.	Appointment of university auditors to audit university account	2.966	.862	High	3.085	.775	High
7.	Borrowing money on behalf of the university	1.800	.879	Low	2.842	.926	High
8.	Investment of money belonging to the university	1.716	.884	Low	1.857	.905-	Low
9.	Purchase of property on behalf of the university	1.883	.845	Low	1.957	.858	Low
10.	Sell of property of the university	1.967	.729	Low	2.014	.496	Low
11.	Leasing of property of the university	1.688	.466	Low	1.842	.911	Low
	Mean of means	2.121	.406	Low	2.287	.455	Low

In table 3, it was observed that federal and state universities were rated low extent in implementation of long range fiscal planning, regulation of university business/undertakings, investment of money belonging to the university, purchase of property on behalf of the university, sell of property of the university and leasing of the property of the university. Federal universities were also rated low extent in analysis of financial reports and borrowing money on behalf of the university, while state universities were rated low extent in

monitoring budget implementation. Table 3 also shows that federal and state universities were rated high extent in approval of university budget and appointment of university auditors to audit university account. Federal universities were also rated high extent in monitoring budget implementation, and state universities were rated high extent in analysis of financial reports and borrowing money on behalf of the universities. In overall, table 3 shows that the mean of means scores of governing councils of federal universities (2.121) and state universities (2.287) are below the benchmark of 2.50 indicating that governing councils perform financial functions to a low extent.

Research Question Four

To what extent do the governing councils monitor and review programmes and awards in federal and state universities?

Table 4

Mean Scores on the Extent Governing Councils Monitor and Review Programmes and Awards

S/N	Item	Federal (N=61)			State (N=70)		
		Mean	SD	Decision	Mean	SD	Decision
1.	Development of intended learning outcomes	2.229	.955	Low	2.557	.911	High
2.	Publication of learning outcomes	2.442	.827	Low	2.642	.799	High

3.	Careful attention to curriculum design and contents	2.180	.885	Low	2.942	.866	High
4.	Careful attention to different modes of delivery (full time, part-time, distance learning, e-learning)	2.032	.706	Low	1.871	.720	Low
5.	Provision of appropriate learning resources	2.688	.764	High	1.985	.670	Low
6.	Monitoring of the progress and achievement of student	1.606	.556	Low	1.942	.634	Low
7.	Regular review of programmes	1.836	.453	Low	1.971	.537	Low
8.	Soliciting feedback from employers of labour	1.967	.604	Low	1.828	.563	Low
	Mean of means	2.123	.347	Low	2.217	.405	Low

Table 4 shows that federal and state universities were rated low extent in all the items except in provision of appropriate learning resources for federal universities and development of intended learning outcomes, publication of learning outcomes and careful attention to curriculum design and contents for state universities. In addition, table 4 indicates that the mean of means scores of governing councils of federal universities (2.123) and state universities (2.217) are below the benchmark of 2.50. This indicates that governing councils perform the functions of monitoring and reviewing of programmes and awards to a low extent.

Research Question Five

To what extent do the governing councils carry out external relations in federal and state universities?

Table 5

Mean Scores on the Extent of Governing Councils Carry out External Relations

S/N	Item	Federal (N=61)			State (N=70)		
		Mean	SD	Decision	Mean	SD	Decision
1.	Co-ordination of president's or governor's strategic plan with the university agenda	2.623	.734	High	1.771	.515	Low
2.	Joint goal setting between the governing council and layers of governance	1.770	.559	Low	1.885	.602	Low
3.	Governing council members access to the president or governor	1.704	.527	Low	1.942	.634	Low
4.	Maintaining high level of communication vehicle across layers of governors	1.901	.650	Low	2.628	.640	High
5.	Staying on the agenda even as presidents or governance turnover	2.737	.793	High	1.800	.579	Low
	Mean of means	2.147	.417	Low	2.005	.304	Low

Table 5 shows that federal and state universities were rated low extent in joint goal setting between the governing council and layers of governance and governing council members' access to the president or governor. The table in addition, shows that federal universities were also rated low extent in maintaining high level of communication vehicle across layers of governance (item 4 with a mean of 1.901) while state universities were also rated low extent in coordinating of president's or governor's strategic plan with the university agenda and staying on the agenda even as presidents or governors turnover (items 1 and 5 with means of 1.771 and 1.800 respectively).

Federal universities were rated high extent in coordination of president's or governor's strategic plan with the university agenda and staying on the agenda even as presidents or governors turnover (items 1 and 5 with means of 2.623 and 2.737 respectively) while state universities were rated high extent on maintaining high level of communication vehicle across layers of governance (item 4 with mean of 2.628).

Table 5 indicates that the mean of means scores of governing councils of federal universities (2.147) and state universities (2.005) are below the benchmark of 2.50. This indicates that governing councils perform the functions of carrying out external relations to a low extent.

Research Question Six

To what extent do the governing councils maintain internal relationship in federal and state universities?

Table 6

Mean Scores on the Extent Governing Councils Maintain Internal Relationships

S/N	Item	Federal (N=61)			State (N=70)		
		Mean	SD	Decision	Mean	SD	Decision
1.	Maintenance of internal contacts between governing council members	2.426	.884	Low	2.714	.744	High
2.	Maintenance of cordial relationship between the Vice Chancellor and governing council members	2.754	.745	High	2.671	.756	High
3.	Maintenance of cordial relationship between the Vice Chancellor and chairman of governing council	2.426	.845	Low	1.771	.515	Low
4.	Maintenance of cordial relationship among staff	1.934	.679	Low	2.128	.946	Low
	Mean of means	2.385	.499	Low	2.321	.474	Low

In table 6 it was observed that federal universities were rated low extent in all items except in maintenance of cordial relationship between the Vice Chancellor and governing councils (item 2 with mean of 2.754). The table also

shows that state universities were rated high extent in maintenance of internal contacts between governing council members and maintenance of cordial relationship between the Vice Chancellor and governing council members (items 1 and 2 with means of 2.714 and 2.671 respectively) while maintenance of cordial relationship between the Vice Chancellor and chairman of the governing council and maintenance of cordial relationship among staff (items 3 and 4 with means of 1.771 and 2.128 respectively) were rated low extent. From table 6, it was also observed that the mean of means scores of governing councils of federal universities (2.385) and state universities (2.321) are below the benchmark of 2.50. This indicates that governing councils perform the functions of maintaining internal relationships to a low extent.

Research Question Seven

To what extent do the governing councils develop and maintain facilities and infrastructure in federal and state universities?

Table 7***Mean Scores on the Extent of Governing Councils Develop and Maintain Facilities and Infrastructure***

S/N	Item	Federal (N=61)			State (N=70)		
		Mean	SD	Decision	Mean	SD	Decision
1.	Successful negotiation and entering into contracts for projects in the university	2.016	.618	Low	1.771	.593	Low
2.	Cancellation of non-performing contracts	2.065	.573	Low	1.985	.601	Low
3.	Provision of adequate teaching facilities in the university	2.032	.604	Low	2.157	.500	Low
4.	Provision of information and communication technology in the university	2.786	.732	Low	2.357	.834	Low
5.	Establishment of maintenance culture in the university	2.032	.546	Low	2.757	.731	High
	Mean of means	2.186	.468	Low	2.205	.324	Low

The result in table 7 indicates that federal and state universities were rated low extent in all the items with the exception of establishment of maintenance culture in the university which was rated high extent in state universities (item 5 with mean of 2,757). Table 7 also shows that the mean of means scores of governing councils of federal universities (2.186) and state universities (2.205) are below benchmark of 2.50. This indicates that governing councils perform

the functions of development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure to a low extent.

Testing of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

There is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in performance of personnel functions.

Table 8

z-test on Federal and State Universities Mean Rating of Governing Councils Performance of Personnel Functions (N = 131, df = 129)

Source of Variation	N	Mean	SD	z-cal	Sig.	Decision
Federal	61	2.685	.386	2.201	.030	S
State	70	2.528	.424			

S-Significant @ $z\text{-cal} > 1.96$

Table 8 indicates that there is significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in performance of personnel functions ($z_{(2,129)} = 2.20$, $p\text{-value} = 0.03$). The null hypothesis was thus rejected. Then, it was concluded that there is significant difference in the mean rating of governing council of federal and state universities in performance of personnel functions.

Hypothesis Two

There is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in maintenance of university culture.

Table 9

z-test on Federal and State Universities Mean Rating of Governing Councils in Maintenance of University Culture (N = 131, df = 129)

Source of Variation	N	Mean	SD	z-cal	Sig.	Decision
Federal	61	2.624	.415	6.521	.000	S
State	70	2.100	.494			

S-Significant @ $z\text{-cal} > 1.96$

In the table 9 it was observed that there is significant difference in the mean rating of governing council of federal and state universities in maintenance of university culture ($z_{(2,129)} = 6.52$, $p\text{-value} = 0.00$). The null hypothesis was thus rejected. Then, it was concluded that there is significant difference in the mean rating of governing council of federal and state universities in maintenance of university culture.

Hypothesis Three

There is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing council of federal and state universities in performance of financial functions.

Table 10

z-test on Federal and State Universities Mean Rating of Governing Councils in Performance of Financial Functions(N = 131, df = 129).

Source of Variation	N	Mean	SD	z-cal	Sig.	Decision
Federal	61	2.121	.406	-2.173	.032	S
State	70	2.287	.455			

S-Significant @ z-cal> 1.96

Table 10 indicates that there is significant difference in the mean rating of governing council of federal and state universities in performance of financial functions ($z_{(2,129)} = -2.17$, $p\text{-value} = 0.03$). The null hypothesis was thus rejected. Then, it was concluded that there is significant difference in the mean rating of governing council of federal and state universities in performance of financial functions.

Hypothesis Four

There is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of monitoring and review of programmes and awards function.

Table 11

z-test on Federal and State Universities Mean Rating of Governing Councils in Performance of Monitoring and Reviewing of Programmes and Awards Functions (N = 131, df = 129)

Source of Variation	N	Mean	SD	z-cal	Sig.	Decision
Federal	61	2.123	.347	-1.427	.156	NS
State	70	2.217	.405			

NS-Not Significant @ $z\text{-cal} < 1.96$

In the table 11 it was observed that there is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of monitoring and review of programmes and awards functions ($z_{(2,129)} = -1.43$, $p\text{-value} = 0.17$). The null hypothesis was thus not rejected. Then, it was concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing council of federal and state universities in the performance of monitoring and review of programmes and awards functions.

Hypothesis Five

There is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of external relations functions.

Table 12

z-test on Federal and State universities Mean Rating of Governing Councils in Performance of External Relations Functions (N = 131, df = 129)

Source of Variation	N	Mean	SD	z-cal	Sig.	Decision
---------------------	---	------	----	-------	------	----------

Federal	61	2.147	.417	2.239	.027	S
State	70	2.005	.304			

S-Significant @ $z\text{-cal} > 1.96$

Table 12 indicates that there is significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of external relations functions ($z_{(2,129)} = 2.24$, $p\text{-value} = 0.03$). The null hypothesis was thus rejected. Then, it was concluded that there is significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of external relations functions.

Hypothesis Six

There is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of the federal and state universities in the performance of internal relationship functions

Table 13

z-test on Federal and State Universities Mean Rating of Governing Councils in Performance of Internal Relationship Functions (N = 131, df = 129)

Source of Variation	N	Mean	SD	z-cal	Sig.	Decision
Federal	61	2.385	.499	.750	0.455	NS
State	70	2.321	.474			

NS-Not Significant @ $z\text{-cal} < 1.96$

Table 13 shows that there is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of the federal and state universities in the performance of internal relationship functions ($z_{(2,129)} = 0.75$, $p\text{-value} = 0.46$). The null hypothesis was thus not rejected. Then, it was concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of the federal and state universities in the performance of internal relationship functions.

Hypothesis Seven

There is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure functions.

Table 14

z-test on Federal and State Universities Mean Rating of Governing Councils in Performance of Development and Maintenance of Facilities and Infrastructure Functions (N = 131, df = 129)

Source of Variation	N	Mean	SD	z-cal	Sig.	Decision
Federal	61	2.186	.468	-0.270	.788	NS
State	70	2.205	.324			

NS-Not Significant @ $z\text{-cal} < 1.96$

In Table 14 it was observed that there is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance

of development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure functions ($z(2,129) = -0.27$, $p\text{-value} = 0.79$). The null hypothesis was thus not rejected. Then, it was concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure functions.

Summary of Major Findings

Below are the summary of the findings of the study:

1. The extent of performance of personnel functions by governing councils in federal and state universities was high.
2. The extent of performance of maintenance of university culture functions by governing council was high in federal universities but low in state universities.
3. The extent of performance of financial functions by governing councils was low in federal and state universities.
4. The extent of performance of monitoring and reviewing of programmes and awards functions by governing councils was low in federal and state universities.
5. The extent of performance of external relation functions by governing council was low in federal and state universities.
6. The extent of performance of internal relationship functions by governing councils was low in federal and state universities.

7. The extent of performance of development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructural functions by governing councils was low in federal and state universities.
8. There was a significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of personnel functions.
9. There was a significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the maintenance of university culture.
10. There was a significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of financial functions.
11. There was no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in performance of monitoring and review of programmes and awards functions.
12. There was a significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of external relations functions.
13. There was no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of internal relationship functions.
14. There was no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure functions.

CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter discussed the findings of this study by making inferences from the results obtained and the literature. The chapter also identified the various educational implications of the study. In addition, recommendations were made for improvement of educational practices in the concerned and related institutions. Finally the limitations of the study were indicated while suggestions for further research were also made.

Discussion of Findings

The discussion of the findings was done in relation to the research questions posed under the following headings:

1. The extent of performance of personnel functions by governing councils of federal and state universities
2. The extent of maintenance of university culture by governing councils of federal and state universities.
3. The extent governing councils of federal and state universities carry out financial functions.
4. The extent governing councils of federal and state universities monitor and review programmes and awards.
5. The extent governing councils of federal and state universities carry out external relation functions
6. The extent governing councils of federal and state universities develop and maintain internal relationships.
7. The extent governing councils of federal and state universities develop and maintain facilities and infrastructure.

Extent of Performance of Personnel Functions by Governing Councils

The study disclosed that the extent of performance of personnel functions by governing councils in federal and state

universities was high. This finding indicated that the governing council members appreciated the observation of Armstrong (2006) that the assumptions underpinning the practice of human resource management is that people are the organizations key resources and organizational performance largely depends on them. Therefore, if an appropriate range of human resource policies and processes are developed and implemented effectively, then human resource will make a sustainable impact on organizational performance. Okoh (2005) also stated that research in human resource management has established that the success of any organization is highly influenced by the caliber of its human resource, which in turn, is affected by the organizations human resource management practices.

The study revealed that the governing councils of federal and state universities took issues such as attracting qualified staff for recruitment into the universities, planning succession for filling positions of principal officers (Vice Chancellor, Registrar, Bursar, University Librarian) and staff performance appraisal very seriously. In federal universities, issues such as conflict resolution among staff, development of human resource management policies, staff compensation management and

acting as court of the last appeal to aggrieved staff were given due attention. On the part of state universities, retaining qualified staff, control and discipline of staff were given high attention. This position agrees with the view of Orga and Ogbo (2012) who stated that organizations that do not emphasis on attracting and retaining talents may find themselves in dire consequences, as their competitors may be outplaying them in the strategic employment of their human resource.

The study further revealed from the hypothesis testing that there is significant difference in the mean rating of federal and state universities in the performance of personnel functions. Governing councils of federal universities perform personnel functions to a higher extent, and this according to the researcher could be as a result of membership of governing councils of federal universities being more broad based and consisting of professionals of various backgrounds. As illustrated by Saint (2009) in some cases (e.g., Denmark, Singapore, Spain, and United States) nearly all the board members are drawn from beyond the university and outside the government. In other cases, specific constituencies are earmarked for membership, such as alumni (e.g., Austraria, Columbia, and. Philipines),

women (e.g., Tanzania), donor representatives (e.g., University of Cape Town) or the region/locality in which the university is located (e.g., Chile, Malaysia, Spain). In Nigeria, the governing councils of federal and state universities are composed of the principal officers of the universities (the Vice Chancellor, Deputy Vice Chancellors, Registrar, representatives of senate, representatives of congregation, government representatives (drawn from different backgrounds) and representatives of the federal or state ministries of education. Notwithstanding this provision, the membership of governing councils of federal universities are more diversified, particularly in regional spread. This wider spread no doubt could make room for attracting professionals in different areas including personnel administration.

Extent of Maintenance of University Culture by Governing Councils

The study revealed that the maintenance of university culture functions by governing councils was to a high extent in federal universities but to a low extent in state universities. The study further revealed that there was a significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state

universities in the maintenance of university culture in the South-East zone. Issues such as maintenance of transparency in activities of the university, sharing common vision by council members, maintenance of openness in discussions, and maintenance of team spirit were rated high in federal universities. As pointed out above, the membership of the governing councils of federal universities are wider spread. Some of the members are drawn from different universities in other regions of the country and other works of life. As they assemble in the governing council of a university, each person brings in his ideas and experiences on best practices from his university or background thus building up a pool of best practices. Whereas in state universities, the membership of governing councils are mainly restricted to indigenes of the state. This creates a narrow experience and idea pool for state universities. Thus the higher ranking of governing councils of federal universities in the maintenance of university culture than state universities in the opinion of the researcher could be attributed to establishment of professional culture rather than a political culture. This assertion is in line with the view of Kezar (2006) when he stated that if a board (governing council) has established a professional culture

rather than a political culture, decisions will be more rational, debates will be focused on ideas rather than power, and agenda items will reflect collegiality rather than the individual desires of powerful members. Similarly, Ogbechie and Koufopoulos (2012), also shared this view while writing on the banking industry and stated that behavioural characteristics of directors will have a bearing on the effectiveness of the board. Directors with domineering and overbearing personality are likely to cause disharmony on the board integrity of directors (governing council members), their ethical standard and attitude will likely influence their expectations and behaviour.

Extent of Performance of Financial Functions by Governing Councils

The findings of the study revealed that the extent of performance of financial functions by governing councils were low in federal and state universities and there is a significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of financial functions in federal and state universities. The study found that the

performance of governing councils of federal and state universities was low in implementation of long range fiscal planning, regulation of university business, undertaking investment of money belonging to the universities, sell of the properties on behalf of the universities and leasing of properties of the universities. This low rating of the governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of financial functions could be considered as a contributory factor to low funding of universities in Nigeria. As Yusuf (2011) observed, in comparison with other African nations, Nigeria funding on education is less than ten percent. This has created some problems and a dis enabling environment that hamper goal realization for the Nigerian universities. Adesina (2005) agreed with this and added that such problems lead to decaying and obsolete learning and teaching facilities unbecoming of centres of excellence, inadequate research and frustrated staff and students and poor remuneration packages for teaching and non-teaching staff. Very often many universities are finding it difficult to meet their funding obligations any time there is a delay in release of funds to the universities by the federal or state government. This ought not to be the case where the governing council is carrying

out financial functions effectively. It is also a common knowledge that governing council members focus their attention in award of bogus contracts without ensuring that funds are available for the execution of the projects. This leaves the universities with numerous uncompleted projects.

Extent of Performance of Monitoring and Review of Programmes and Award Functions by Governing Council

The findings of the study revealed that governing councils of federal and state universities were rated low in the extent of performance of monitoring and reviewing of programmes and awards functions. The study also shows that there is no significant difference between the extent of performance of monitoring and review of programmes and awards by governing councils of federal state universities. The function of monitoring and review of programmes is critical in the life a university. It is a function that provides governing councils opportunities to evaluate their activities and the output of the universities. The elements of the monitoring and review programmes and awards that were rated low include attention to different modes of delivery (full-time, part-time, distance learning, e-learning), provision of appropriate learning resources, monitoring the

progress and achievements of students, regular review of programmes and soliciting feedback from employers of labour. A governing council that does not give due attention to these critical indicators of success in a university setting has not laid a good foundation for high level of accomplishment in the university. This is in line with the views of Kieslar and Sproull (1982) who stated that monitoring can be directed to three main components of a project namely, project inputs, processes, and outputs. Reviewing of programmes helps universities keep abreast of the developments in technology and keep in tune with global changes. A university that does not review her programmes from time to time runs the risk of carrying obsolete programmes and producing products that will not fit into the present requirements the world of work. This in the view of the researcher may be a contributory factor to the high graduate unemployment being experienced in Nigeria today. Monitoring and review of programmes and awards also ensures that universities are operating at some predetermined standards. It is on this note that Nwagwu (2014) cautioned that quantities growth must provide for the maintenance of standards and quality.

For universities to help solve national development problems of eradication of poverty, reduction of unemployment and ultimately the achievement of improvement in the conditions and quality of life for all citizens, there is need for constant monitoring and review of programmes and awards. This view was supported by Nwagwu (2014), Okoro (2014), and Esu and Emah (2014).

Extent of Carrying out External Relations Functions by Governing Councils

The findings of the study revealed that governing councils of federal universities coordinated presidents strategic plan with the universities agenda and stay on the agenda even as presidents turn over. Similarly, governing councils of state universities maintained high level of communication vehicles across layers of governance(the executive, legislature etc.)

On overall, the findings of the study further revealed that the extent of performance of external relation functions by governing councils in federal and state universities was low.The findings also revealed that there was a significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the extent of carrying out external relations functions. Governing councils of federal universities maintained

relatively a higher external relations than governing councils of state universities. Generally, governing councils of federal and state universities were rated low in joint goal setting between the governing councils and the layers of governance and governing councils' member access to the president/governor. For effective operations, there is need for ongoing communication among governing council members and president/governors and legislature in their collective plan for university education but the study revealed a gap between the governing members and various layers of governance with the governing council members not having access to the president/governor. This gap leads to a situation where in some instances governing councils frustrate president/governors and legislators by failing to see an alignment between the goals of the state and those of the institutions. This leads to the formulation of policies on university education at cross purposes, creating overlap and duplication of programmes with their associated wastages. Though Kezar (2006) stated that board (governing council) and governor's visions will not always be aligned, but at least examining linkages was noted as crucial to performance.

To facilitate proper linkages Kezar (2006) suggested a joint goal setting between the president/governors, legislature, stakeholders and governing councils. This mechanism will afford all concerned parties to contribute their own quotas to enhancement of university education in the country. It is also important to note that governing council leadership and decisive actions require support from the President/Governors. A good communication between the governing council and the President/Governor helps to smoothen out university challenges including funding issues which always constitute major obstacles to university effectiveness. The governing council members particularly the Chairman should maintain a relationship or speak with the President/Governor to ensure that the council is not limited in effectiveness. The following options suggested by Kezar (2006) could be of immense help. They include annual forum to discuss agenda of university education, quarterly updates from stakeholders, and annual evaluation meetings and activities.

Extent of Maintenance of Internal Relationship by

Governing Councils of Federal and State Universities

The findings of the study showed that the rating of the governing councils of federal and state universities was to a low extent in maintenance of internal relationships. The study also showed that there was no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the maintenance of internal relationships. Maintenance of internal relationships includes interpersonal relationship between governing council members, governing council members and principal officers of the universities (Vice Chancellors, Registrars, Deputy Vice Chancellor, Bursars, University Librarians), and governing council members and staff and students of the universities. Internal relationships also includes quality of management, informal contacts between governing council members and management, trust, respect and proper understanding of functions. Good internal relationship is the right chemistry for success in a university. However, the study indicated low maintenance of cordial relationships between the Vice Chancellors and the Chairmen of governing councils, low cordial relationship between governing council members and staff of the universities. This low level of internal relationships in our

universities as revealed in the study could be one the reasons why there is always constant disputes between governing councils of universities and universities management. In some cases these disputes lead into a situation where one party challenges the other in the law court. Such litigations greatly affect the development of the concerned university.

On the other hand, internal relationship could be fostered through good governing council meetings, retreats, campus events and ceremonies. These provide opportunities for the governing members to interact on one on one basis and exchange ideas and experiences. This helps to breakdown political/ideological orientations and enable members to learn through casual conversations.

Effective internal relationships affect how governing council recommendations are received by university principal officers and other staff of the universities, as well as the quality of information given to governing councils to make policies. Kezar (2006) agreed with this view and added that relationships need to be intentionally fostered. Ogbeche and Konfopoulos (2010) also supported this view.

Extent of Performance of Development and Maintenance of Facilities and Infrastructure Functions by Governing Council

The findings the study revealed that the extent of performance of development and maintenance of facilities functions by governing councils in federal and state universities was low. The study also revealed that there is no significant difference in the mean rating of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure functions. This low level of performance of the functions of development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure by governing councils of federal and state universities could account for the poor state of facilities and infrastructure in universities in Nigeria. Many universities in Nigeria lack basic facilities and infrastructure like regular water supply, sufficient accommodation, well equipped libraries or functional rest rooms in the halls of residence or in lecture arenas, sufficient power supply, basic equipment and chemicals in laboratories. In spite of the gap in facilities and infrastructure, many universities as reported by the Executive Secretary National University Commission Okojie, J.A.(2007) are going beyond the carrying capacity allotted to them.

Related to the above insufficiencies, another problem facing universities in Nigeria is lack of good maintenance culture. Dilapidation of facilities and uncompleted projects are common features in universities in Nigeria. It is in recognition of these challenges that the National Universities Commission in collaboration with the then Overseas Development Agency and Economic Community in 1986, set up five pilot Equipment Maintenance and Development Centres (EMDCs) in five Nigeria federal universities at Zaria, Ile-Ife, Nsukka, Calabar and Bauchi. The primary aim of the project was to establish maintenance culture in universities in Nigeria.

Conclusion

An inference that was drawn from the findings of this study is that the governing councils of federal and state universities in South East Nigeria were not performing their functions at an optimal level, specifically the extent of performance of financial functions, reviewing programmes and awards, carrying out external relations, maintenance of internal relationship and development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure was low. However the study showed that the extent of performance of

personnel functions and maintenance of university culture by governing councils were high in federal universities. Similarly, the extent of performance of personnel functions by governing council in state universities was high but the extent of maintenance of university culture by governing councils was low in state universities. Therefore one can conclude that the low level performance of the functions of governing councils in federal and state universities in South East geopolitical zone in Nigeria to a great extent was responsible for the low quality of university education in the South East zone of Nigeria in particular and Nigeria in general and the consequent low ratings of universities in South East Nigeria among the comity of universities in the world, Africa and in Nigeria in web metric university rankings.

Educational Implications

The findings of this study have far reaching implications to the development of university education in Nigeria.

The high ranking of governing councils of federal and state universities in the performance of personnel functions gives hope that top level administrators in the university system(governing council members) appreciate the indispensable role of the human

element in the university system. As the personnel is the “life wire” of any organization, the need for the governing councils to sustain the attention given to it cannot be over emphasized. Both the skilled and unskilled human resources need to be continuously updated to meet the challenges of a technology driven world. In addition to upgrading the skill and competency of staff, their welfare should also rank top in the priority of all levels of administrators in the university system particularly the governing council.

On the maintenance of university culture, the low rating of governing councils of state universities is not a good development. This has the capacity of making state owned universities to lag behind in the quest by universities to meeting global parameters of quality assurance and international competitiveness. A vibrant governing council should work towards adding value to the university and have a culture of open debate and freedom of thought. This will create opportunities for universities in Nigeria to move away from the parochial approaches to running a university and move to the next level, level of global competitiveness and equipping grandaunts with

quality skills and knowledge for the world of work and better living in the society.

On financial functions, a governing council that meets the needs of the age should aim at implementation of long range fiscal planning, qualitative investments on behalf of the university, leasing, sell and purchase of properties for or on behalf of the university and monitoring budget implementation in the university, and creating alternative sources of funds for the development of the university and so on. But with low level of performance of financial functions by governing councils of federal and state universities, it implies that the challenges facing universities in Nigeria due to lack of funds will linger. With the wide spread of application of information communication technology (ICT) in various spheres of life, universities all over the world are undergoing transformation and rapid changes to meet global challenges and demands of the economy of various countries. Universities in Nigeria should not be left out. It is therefore worrisome that governing councils of federal and state universities were rated low in the performance of monitoring and review of programmes and awards. If nothing is done to change this situation, universities in Nigeria may not meet the demands

of a technology driven era. The products of universities in Nigeria will continue to be deficient in relevant skills, knowledge and exposure. The unemployment arising from lack of marketable skills will continue to be in the increase.

The importance of maintaining a good external and internal relationship by governing councils of federal and state universities cannot be over emphasized. The study revealed a low rating of the governing councils of universities in the South East zone. This presents a great challenge to the universities not only that internal cohesion within the universities is in question, their external reach in terms of relating with their regulatory and supervising agencies such as Joint Admission and Matriculation Board, National Universities Commission, Federal and State Ministries of Education, the legislature and the executive arms of government will not stand on a healthy ground.

Finally, the low rating of governing councils in the functions of maintenance of facilities and infrastructure does not augur well for universities in Nigeria. The governing councils are expected to take a lead in ensuring that requisite facilities and infrastructure are developed in universities. Not only that carrying out these functions effectively will increase the carrying

capacity of Nigerian universities, it will also enhance the quality and standards of products of the Universities. The expectations of employers of labour and the society will be met and universities in Nigeria will attain global competitiveness.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made.

1. Federal and state governments should improve on the welfare packages and training programmes of staff of universities.
2. The state universities maintained university culture to a low extent, state governors should appoint knowledgeable people in university administration into university governing councils.
3. Federal and state governments should give governing councils of universities a wide latitude to create fund generating opportunities for the universities.
4. To ensure that university programmes are meeting the expectations of stakeholders, governing councils of federal and state universities should strengthen internal quality assurance mechanisms.

5. Governing councils of federal and state universities should create quarterly, biannual or annual fora for joint goal setting involving different layers of governance.
6. Governing councils of federal and state universities apart from regular council meetings should engage in other activities (such as retreats, talk shops and so on) that will foster interaction between governing council members, university management, staff and students.
7. Governing councils of federal and state universities should discourage commencement of projects that there are insufficient funds for completion.

Limitations of the Study

The limitation to this study is that it was carried out in only federal and state universities in the South-East zone of Nigeria, and therefore the findings of the study may not be generalized to universities in the other remaining five geopolitical zones in the country and private universities in Nigeria.

Suggestions for Further Studies

Based on the limitation of the study, the researcher suggests that similar research be carried out in other geopolitical zones of Nigeria and in private universities

REFERENCES

- Adegbite, J.G.O. (2007). *Administering and managing universities*. Ibadan: Mosuro.
- Adesina, S. (2005). *Growth without development: The Nigerian educational experience*. Lagos: Yema Investment Ltd.

- Aja-Okorie, U. Personnel Management in School Administration, In G. O. Unackukwu & P. N. Okorji (Eds.), *Educational management. A skill building approach* (pp.366-383).Nimo, Anambra State: Rex Charlse & Patrick Limited.
- Akinsulire, O. (2006). *Financial management* (4th Ed.). Lagos, Nigeria: Ceemol Nigeria Limited.
- Akpakwu, O.S.,& Okwo, F. A. (2014). Politics and the appointment of council members, vice chancellors and other principal officers in federal and state universities in the north central states of Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*5 (33).
- Akuezuilo, E.O.,& Agu, N. (2003). *Research and statistics education & social sciences. Methods and application*.Awka, Nigeria: Nuel Centi and Academic Press Ltd.
- Alder, P.S.,& Kwon, S. (2002). Social capital, prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*. January, 17-40.
- Armstrong, M. (2003). *Ahandbook of human resource management practice*. London: Kogan page.
- Armstrong, M. (2004). *Ahandbook of human resource management practice*(9th ed.). London: Kogan page.
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *Ahandbook of human resource management practice*(10th ed.). London: Kogan page.
- Association of governing boards and colleges (nd) Washington, D.C. Association of Governing Boards and colleges.
- Awosika, B. Y. (1982) International programme in selected Nigerian universities. In Iheanacho, S. B. C., Ikpene, E. E., & Saba, I. A. Assessment on provision of recreational facilities in Nigerian universities in the 21st century. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*. 3 (1)
- Ayeni, A.O. (2014). Human communication and interpersonal relationships in organizations. In G. O. Unachukwu,& P.N.

- Okorji (Eds.), *Educational management: A skill building approach* (213-229). Nimo, Anambra State: Rex Charles & Patrick Limited.
- Bamberger, M., & Hewitt, E. (1986). *Monitoring and Evaluating Urban Development Program: A Handbook for Program Manager and Researchers (Technical Paper No 53)*. World Bank Washington D.C.
- Barney, J.B. (1995). Looking inside for competitive advantage *Academy of Management Executive*, 9, (4).
- Bartle, P. (2007). The Nature of monitoring and evaluation. Definition and Purpose. Workshop Handout.
- Bello, M. (nd). *The State of the Nigeria Public Universities*. Belloonline @ yahoo.com.
- Bertalanffy, L. V. *System theory, foundations, development, application*. Canada: George Braziller.
- Bikmoradi, A. (2009). *Exploring academic leadership in medical schools and universities in Ivan Karolinska Institute*. Sweden: Stockholm.
- Blan, P. (1995). *The dynamics of bureaucracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bohlander, G., Snell, S., & Shennan, A. (2001). *Managing Human Resources*. New York: South-Western College.
- Boohene, R., & Asuinura, E.I. (2011). Effect of human resource management practice on co-operate performance: *International Business Research*, 4, (1), January. Available online @ www.ccnnet.org/jbr. Retrieved on May 5, 2015.
- Campbell, O. A. & Adebayo, T.F. (2007). *Staff performance evaluation in Nigeria Universities*. Ibadan: Nigeria College Press.

- Campbell, O.A., et al (2007). *Staff performance Evaluation in Nigeria Universities*. Ibadan: Nigeria; College Press.
- Collins, R. & Druten, K.V. (2003). *Human resource management practice*. Available online @ [http://www.edu.au/agism/web.agismuf/attachementby Titlcch -Report 2003/&File /C](http://www.edu.au/agism/web.agismuf/attachementbyTitlcch-Report2003/&File/C). Retrieved May 5, 2015.
- Cornett, M.M., & Saunders, A. (2002) *Fundamentals of financial institution management*. United States of America, Irwin: McGraw Hill.
- English Dictionary (2010). Available: www.oed.com.
- English, S.K. (2008). Board competencies and peer mentoring. UMI 3318384 Pro Quest LLC Ann Arbor.
- Esu, A.E.O., & Emah, I.E. (2014). Nature, purpose and process of curriculum development. In N.A. Nwagwu & U.M.O. Ivowi (2014) (Eds.) *Education in Nigeria: Development and Challenges*. Lagos: Foremost Educational Services Ltd.
- Ezeali, B.O., & Esiagu, L.N. (2010). *Public personnel management (human capital strategy in the 21st Century)*. Onitsha: Book Point Limited.
- Freeman, R.E. (1984). *Strategic management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2008) National Policy on Education (10th ed.). Lagos: NERDC Press.
- Gege, D. (1996). Maintenance Strategies for improving productivity in the Nigerian economy: A Paper Presented at the 1996. Symposium of the National Productivity Day. February, 28.
- Goleman, D., Boyarzis, R, & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gordon, G., & Cummins, W. (1989). *Managing management climate*. Poronto, Canada: Lexington Books.

- Hodge, B. (2010). Topography of space, time and disciplinary in early modern English: The case of Andrew Marvel. In P. Kelly & I.E. Sember (Eds.), *Word and Self Enstranged in English Texts 1550-1660* pp. 151 -166. London: Ashgate.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture consequences: International differences in work related issues*. Beverly Hills: C.A. Sage.
- Huselid, M.A. (1995). *The impact of human resource management practice on turnover, productivity and corporate financial performance*. Retrieved May 5, from @<http://www.Mark-huselid.com/articles.html>.
- Kaufman, R.A (1972) *Educational System Planning*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J: Prentice-Hall.
- Kaufman, R., & English, F. W. (1979) *Needs Assessment: Concepts and application*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J: Educational Technology publications.
- Kezar, A. (2006). Rethinking high education governing boards'performance: Result of a national study of governing boards in the United State. *The Journal of Higher Education* 77, (6) 968-1008.
- Kiesler & Sproull (1982). Managerial responses to changing environmental: Perspectives on problem sensing from social cognition. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27, 548-570.
- Kotter, E.H., & Heskett, O.K. (1992). Culture: The missing concept in organizational studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 4(2), 220-240.
- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2004). *Organizational behaviour* (6th ed.). Irvwin, New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Laner, I.M. (2001). The role of the governing board in higher education institutions. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7, (4) 323-340.

- Leslie, D., & Mac Taggart, T. (2008). *The new ethics of trusteeship: How public college and university trustees can meet higher public expectations*. Washington DC: Ingram Center for Public Trusteeship and Governance and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
- Leisyte, I. (2014). Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.
- Leisyte, I., & Westerheijden, D.F. (2014). Stakeholders and quality assurance in education. In Eggins, Heather, *drivers and barriers to achieving quality in higher education*. ISBN 9462094942.
- McDonagh, K.J. (2006). Hospital governing boards: A Study of their effectiveness in relation to organizational performance. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 51, 377-389.
- McLendon, M.K., & Hearn, J.C. (2006). Mandated openness in public higher education: A field of study of state sunshine laws and institutional governance. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(4) 645-683.
- Micaiah, W. (2013). *University governing council: Structure, functions, responsibilities*. Posted on April, 9. Comconlearn @ yahoo.com.
- Mohammed, A.N. (1988). Effective policy formulation and implementation within university system. *Proceedings of the NUC/CVU British Council International Seminar*, Abu Zaria. 1987, November 9-10.
- Morphy, T. (2015). Stakeholder analysis, project management, templates and advice. *Stakeholder Management e-book and Real World Templates*.
- Mullins, J. I. (1999). *Management and organizational behavior*. London: Prentice Hall.

- Myers, R.E. (1997). *Maintaining the public trust: Core competencies associated with effective governing boards of state multi-campus system of higher education*.U.S.A. MI 48106-1346.
- National University Commission Report (2012).*
- National University Commission Report (2014).*
- National University Commission assessment study on labour market expectations of graduates from Nigeria universities. (2004).*
- Neville, A. (1988). Creating a more efficient machinery in resource management in the university. *Proceedings of the NUC/CUV, British Council International Seminar*. A.B.U., Zaria.1987, November 9-10.
- Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2004) *Fundamentals of human resource management*. United States of America, Irwin: McGraw-Hill.
- Nwagwu, N.A. (2014). Development of tertiary education in Nigeria. In N.A. Nwagwu, & U.M.O. Ivow (2014) (Eds.) *Educational in Nigeria: Development and Challenges*. Foremost Educational Services Ltd Lagos.
- Obi, E. (2003). *Educational planning in contemporary Nigeria*. Enugu: Computer Edge.
- Obi, E. (2004). *Issues in educational administration*, Enugu, Nigeria: Empathy International.
- Obikeze, S.O.,& Obi, E.A. (2004). *Public administration in Nigeria. A developmental approach*. Onitsha: Book Point Limited.
- Odikpo, C.K. (1988). Effective structure of university administration. *Proceeding of NUC/CVC/BE British Council International Seminar*. A.B.U., Zaria, 1987, November 9-10 144-156.

- Ofoegbu, E. (1985). Personnel recruitment and management. In H. N. Nwosu (Ed.) *Problems of Nigerian administration*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension.
- Ogbechie, C., & Konfopolus, D.N. (2010). Board effectiveness in the Nigerian banking industry.
- Ogunraku, A. O. (2012). *University administration in the 21st century a new direction*. Ile-Ife Osun: Obafemi Awolowo University Press Ltd.
- Okebukola, P. (2010). World class status for Nigerian universities: Goals, challenges and pathways, In J. Okoyie, I. Oloyede, & P. Obaya (Eds.). *50 years of university education in Nigeria, evolution, achievements and future directions Nigeria*: University of Ilorin and National University Commission, 535-551.
- Okoh, A. O. (2005). *Personal and human resource management in Nigeria* Lagos: Amfitop Books.
- Okojie, J.A. (2007). *Higher education in Nigeria*. Retrieved June 16, 2010 from <http://www.nucnigeria.org>
- Okoro, D.C.U. (2014). Inspection and supervision for quality assurance. In N.A. Nwagwu, & U.M.O. Ivowi (2014) (Eds.). *Education in Nigeria: Development and challenges*. Lagos: Foremost Educational Services Ltd, Lagos.
- Oloyede, I.O. (2010). Phases in the development of a Nigerian University: The University of Ilorin Experience. *In 50 years of University Education in Nigeria*. University of Ilorin and National Universities Commission.
- Omolewa, M. (2010). *Highlights of historical development of university education in Nigeria: Evolution, achievements and future directions* (ed.). University of Ilorin and National University Commission.

- Omopariola, O. (nd) *Business finance in Nigeria*. Ile-Ife, Nigeria: Obafemi Awolowo University Press Ltd.
- Onah, F.O. (2008). *Human resource management*. 2nd Edition Enugu: John Jacobs Classic Ltd.
- Onele, A. A. (2014) Basic theories in educational management. In G. O. Unachukwu & P. N. Okorji (Eds.) *Educational management. A skill building approach*. Nimo, Anambra State: Rex Chrles & Patrick Limited.
- Onyeishi, A.O., Eme, O.I., Emeh, I.E.J. (2012). Problems of personnel management in Nigeria: The Nigeria local government system experience. *Arabia Journal of Business Management Review* (OMAN Chapter) 1, (6) January, 2012.
- Orga, C.C.,& Ogbo, A.I. (2012). Evaluating the challenge of human resource management in Nigeria: *European Journal of Business and Management*,4, (13)
- Osemeke, M. (2012). The impact of human resource management practice on organizational performance: A Study of Guinness Nigeria PLC. *AFRREVIJAH. An International Journal of Arts and Humanities*,1(1) February, 79-94. Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.
- Oshionebe, M.E. (2007). Recruitment selection, placement and induction process of human resource in complex organization. In Bello, I.B; Oshionebo, B.O.,& Ojeifo, S. A. (Eds.) *Fundamental of human resource management in Nigeria*. Ibadan: College Press.
- Pandit & Mohammed (1990). In Obi, E. (2004) *Issues in educational administration*. Enugu: Nigeria Empathy International.
- Punch Newspaper (2015, May 11) *Nigeria Varsities: Saddled with aging infrastructure*.

- Quest, D.E., Michie, J., Conway, N., & Sheenan, M. (2003). Human resource management and corporate performance in the UK. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41,(2) 291-314.
- Roembloom, A.L. (2004). Academic leadership: References in the key of C. *Journal Pediatrics*, 145, 281-282.
- Saint, W. (2009). Guiding university: Governance and management arrangements around the globe, *Human Development Network, World Bank* October, 20.
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*.45 (2), 109-119. Retrieved March 10, 2003 from <http://dxdoi.org/10/03/0003-066x.45.2.109>.
- Sera Y.& Beaudry, S. (2007). Social development. The World Bank Monitoring and Evaluation: Tips for Strengthening Organizational Capacity. www.worldbank.org/smallgrantsprogram.
- Shapiro, J. (2001). *Civicus: World alliance for citizen participation*. Newtown, Johannesburg. Retrieved from <http://www.civicus.org>.
- Tsav, S. A. (2015) Governing councils' activities on staff and students personnel management in federal and state universities in the north central states, Nigeria. *The Journal of Educational Policy and Entrepreneurial Research (JEPER)*2 (4) 85-99.
- Ume, T. (2002). *Fundamentals of educational administration*. Nsukka. Chukwu Education.
- Unachukwu, G.O., & Okorji, P.N. (2014) (Eds.) *Educational management: A skill building approach*. Nimo, Anambra State: Rex Charles & Patrick Limited.
- Welsh, L.S.A. (2010). *Increasing a community college governing boards' engagement in accountability for student success*:

What are the principal influences? UMI 3438, UMI Dissertation Publishing ProQuest LLC Ann Arbor.

Williams, K. A. (2011). *Assessing the impact of governing boards for Louisiana public institutions of higher learning regarding policy and governance* UMI 3453031, UMI Publishing ProQuest LLC. Ann Arbor.

Williams, S. (2009). *Guiding universities: Governance and management arrangements around the globe commissioned by the human development network*. World Bank 2009 October, 20.

Yusuf, A. (2010). An overview of the philosophical, historical political and socio-economic factors that have impacted on the development of universities in Nigeria. *In 50 years of university education in Nigeria: Evolution, achievements and future directions (ed.)*. University of Ilorin and National University Commission.

APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE

Department of Educational
Management and Policy
NnamdiAzikiwe University
Awka
10th February, 2015.

Dear Sir/Madam.

I am a Ph.D. research student in the Department of Educational Management and Policy, NnamdiAzikiwe University Awka. The focus of this study is on Assessment of university council Performance in South East Nigeria.

The attached questionnaire is designed to elicit information from present and past members of governing council and staff of universities whose duties relate to governing council activities. The information derived is hoped to help in reshaping governing council activities in the universities.

I will be grateful if you kindly assist in this study by completing the questionnaire faithfully through your objective and honest response as it affects your institution.

I assure you, information given will be treated as confidential.

Kindly oblige me and God bless you.

Yours Faithfully

Mr. Ofor, Raymond Ozoemena.

**ASSESSMENT OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL PERFORMANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE**

PART ONE

Institutional Data

Please tick (√) in the spaces provided, otherwise complete.

1. Name of University -----

2. Type of ownership.

a) Federal Government University

b) State Government University

PART TWO

Instruction: Please tick (√) on the column that describes your rating of the governing council of your university in the performance of the following functions in sections A-G. Very High (VH), High (H), Low (L), Very Low (VL).

Section A: Personnel Functions

S/N	Items	VH	H	L	VL
1	Clarification of the mission of the university.				
2	Attracting qualified staff for recruitment.				
3	Retaining qualified staff.				
4	Planning succession for filling positions of principal officers (Vice Chancellor, Registrar, Bursar, University Librarian)				
5	Control and discipline of staff.				
6	Conflict resolution among staff.				
7	Development of human resource management policies.				

8	Staff compensation management.				
9	Staff performance appraisal.				
10	Staff recruitment and selection.				
11	Acting as court of the last appeal to aggrieved staff.				

Section B: Maintenance of University Culture

S/N	Items	VH	H	L	VL
12	Maintenance of transparency in activities of the university				
13	Maintenance of good atmosphere in the university.				
14	Sharing of common vision by members.				
15	Maintenance of team spirit in decision making process.				
16	Maintenance of openness in discussion.				
17	Building constructive relationship among members.				
18	Establishment of professional culture.				
19	Nurturing of desired qualities and values.				
20	Building a professional non-partisan culture.				
21	Subjecting meetings and records to public review				

Section C: Financial Functions

S/N	Items	VH	H	L	VL
22	Development of intended learning outcomes.				
23	Publication of learning outcomes.				
24	Careful attention to curriculum design and contents.				
25	Careful attention to different modes of delivery (full time, part				
	time, distance learning, e-learning)				
26	Provision of appropriate learning resources.				
27	Monitoring of the progress and achievements of students.				
28	Regular review of programmes.				

Section D: Monitoring and Review of Programmes and Awards

S/N	Items	VH	H	L	VL
29	Development of intended learning outcomes.				
30	Publication of learning outcomes.				
31	Careful attention to curriculum design and				

	contents.				
32	Careful attention to different modes of delivery (full time, part				
	time, distance learning, e-learning)				
33	Provision of appropriate learning resources.				
34	Monitoring of the progress and achievements of students.				
35	Regular review of programmes.				

Section E: External Relations

S/N	Items	VH	H	L	VL
36	Co-ordination of President's or Governor's strategic plans with the university agenda.				
37	Joint goal setting between the governing council and layers of governance.				
38	Governing council members access to the president or governor.				
39	Maintaining high level of communication vehicles across layers of governance.				
40	Staying on the agenda even as presidents or governors turn over.				

Section F: Internal Relationships

S/N	Items	VH	H	L	VL
41	Maintenance of informal contacts between governing council members.				
42	Maintenance of cordial relationship between the Vice Chancellor and governing council members.				
43	Maintenance of cordial relationship between the Vice chancellor and chairman of governing council.				
44	Maintenance of cordial relationship among staff.				

Section G: Development and Maintenance of Facilities and Infrastructure

S/N	Items	VH	H	L	VL
45	Successful negotiation and entering into contracts for projects in the university.				
46	Cancellation of non-performing contracts.				
47	Provision of adequate teaching facilities in the university.				
48	Provision of information and communication				

	technology				
--	------------	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 2

STATISTICAL TABLES

DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=a1 a2 a3 a4 a5 a6 a7 a8 a9 a10 a11 b1 b2 b3 b4 b5 b6 b7 b8 b9 b10
c1 c2 c3 c4 c5 c6 c7 c8 c9 c10 c11 d1 d2 d3 d4 d5 d6 d7 d8 e1 e2 e3 e4 e5 f1 f2 f3 f4 g1 g2 g3 g4 g5

/STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX.

Descriptives

univastype = Federal

Descriptive Statistics ^a					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
a1	61	1.00	4.00	2.967	.948
a2	61	1.00	4.00	2.721	.968
a3	61	1.00	4.00	2.082	.737
a4	61	1.00	4.00	2.623	.778
a5	61	1.00	4.00	2.245	1.010
a6	61	1.00	4.00	2.967	.965
a7	61	1.00	4.00	2.852	.872
a8	61	1.00	4.00	2.950	.973
a9	61	1.00	4.00	3.016	.991
a10	61	1.00	4.00	2.213	.685
a11	61	1.00	4.00	2.901	.888
b1	61	1.00	4.00	2.934	.928
b2	61	1.00	4.00	2.885	.858
b3	61	1.00	4.00	2.704	.989
b4	61	1.00	4.00	3.098	.850
b5	61	1.00	4.00	3.098	.850
b6	61	1.00	4.00	2.639	.876
b7	61	1.00	4.00	2.278	.985
b8	61	1.00	4.00	2.114	1.034
b9	61	1.00	4.00	2.623	1.051

b10	61	1.00	4.00	1.868	.957
c1	61	2.00	4.00	2.754	.809
c2	61	2.00	4.00	3.065	.793
c3	61	1.00	3.00	1.803	.653
c4	61	1.00	2.00	1.786	.412
c5	61	1.00	4.00	1.918	.936
c6	60	1.00	4.00	2.966	.862
c7	60	1.00	4.00	1.800	.879
c8	60	1.00	4.00	1.716	.884
c9	60	1.00	4.00	1.883	.845
c10	61	1.00	4.00	1.967	.729
c11	61	1.00	2.00	1.688	.466
d1	61	1.00	4.00	2.229	.955
d2	61	1.00	4.00	2.442	.827
d3	61	1.00	4.00	2.180	.885
d4	61	1.00	3.00	2.032	.706
d5	61	2.00	4.00	2.688	.764
d6	61	1.00	3.00	1.606	.556
d7	61	1.00	3.00	1.836	.453
d8	61	1.00	3.00	1.967	.604
e1	61	2.00	4.00	2.623	.734
e2	61	1.00	3.00	1.770	.559
e3	61	1.00	3.00	1.704	.527
e4	61	1.00	3.00	1.901	.650
e5	61	2.00	4.00	2.737	.793
f1	61	1.00	4.00	2.426	.884

f2	61	2.00	4.00	2.754	.745
f3	61	1.00	4.00	2.426	.845
f4	61	1.00	3.00	1.934	.679
g1	61	1.00	3.00	2.016	.618
g2	61	1.00	3.00	2.065	.573
g3	61	1.00	3.00	2.032	.604
g4	61	2.00	4.00	2.786	.732
g5	61	1.00	3.00	2.032	.546
Valid N (listwise)	60				

a. univastype = Federal

univastype = State

Descriptive Statistics ^a					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
a1	70	1.00	4.00	2.642	.963
a2	70	1.00	4.00	2.542	.828
a3	70	1.00	4.00	2.885	.893
a4	70	2.00	4.00	2.785	.849
a5	70	1.00	4.00	2.928	.889
a6	70	1.00	4.00	2.400	.923
a7	70	1.00	4.00	1.785	.930
a8	70	1.00	4.00	2.342	.866
a9	70	1.00	4.00	2.942	.946
a10	70	1.00	4.00	2.742	.973

a11	70	1.00	4.00	1.814	.921
b1	70	1.00	4.00	1.728	.797
b2	70	1.00	4.00	1.871	.899
b3	70	1.00	4.00	2.100	.764
b4	70	1.00	4.00	2.885	.808
b5	70	1.00	4.00	1.814	.921
b6	70	1.00	4.00	2.657	.866
b7	70	1.00	4.00	1.814	.921
b8	70	1.00	3.00	1.785	.535
b9	70	1.00	4.00	1.628	.870
b10	70	1.00	4.00	2.714	.704
c1	70	1.00	4.00	2.671	.846
c2	70	1.00	4.00	2.014	.648
c3	70	1.00	3.00	1.942	.507
c4	70	1.00	4.00	2.842	.972
c5	70	1.00	4.00	2.085	.811
c6	70	2.00	4.00	3.085	.775
c7	70	1.00	4.00	2.842	.926
c8	70	1.00	4.00	1.857	.905
c9	70	1.00	4.00	1.957	.858
c10	70	1.00	3.00	2.014	.496
c11	70	1.00	4.00	1.842	.911
d1	70	1.00	4.00	2.557	.911
d2	70	1.00	4.00	2.642	.799
d3	70	1.00	4.00	2.942	.866
d4	70	1.00	3.00	1.871	.720

d5	70	1.00	3.00	1.985	.670
d6	70	1.00	3.00	1.942	.634
d7	70	1.00	3.00	1.971	.537
d8	70	1.00	3.00	1.828	.563
e1	70	1.00	3.00	1.771	.515
e2	70	1.00	3.00	1.885	.602
e3	70	1.00	3.00	1.942	.634
e4	70	2.00	4.00	2.628	.640
e5	70	1.00	3.00	1.800	.579
f1	70	2.00	4.00	2.714	.744
f2	70	2.00	4.00	2.671	.756
f3	70	1.00	3.00	1.771	.515
f4	70	1.00	4.00	2.128	.946
g1	70	1.00	3.00	1.771	.593
g2	70	1.00	3.00	1.985	.601
g3	70	1.00	3.00	2.157	.500
g4	70	1.00	4.00	2.357	.834
g5	70	2.00	4.00	2.757	.731
Valid N (listwise)	70				

a. univastype = State

Descriptives

univastype = Federal

Descriptive Statistics^a

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Personnal functions	61	1.82	3.36	2.685	.386
Maintenance of culture	61	1.90	3.80	2.624	.415
Financial function	60	1.55	2.82	2.121	.406
Monitorin	61	1.50	2.88	2.123	.347
External relations functions	61	1.40	3.00	2.147	.417
External relations functions	61	1.50	3.50	2.385	.499
Development and maintrenance of facilities andinfrastructure functions	61	1.40	3.20	2.186	.468
Valid N (listwise)	60				

a. univasiptype = Federal

univasiptype = State

Descriptive Statistics^a

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Personnal functions	70	1.73	3.55	2.528	.424

Maintenance of culture	70	1.50	3.40	2.100	.494
Financial function	70	1.45	3.36	2.287	.455
Monitorin	70	1.38	3.00	2.217	.405
External relations functions	70	1.40	2.40	2.005	.304
External relations functions	70	1.50	3.50	2.321	.474
Development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure functions	70	1.60	2.80	2.205	.324
Valid N (listwise)	70				

a. univastype = State

Z-TEST GROUPS=univastype(1 2)

/MISSING=ANALYSIS

/VARIABLES=personnel maintenance financialfuntn monitorin external internal development

/CRITERIA=CI(.95).

Z-test

Group Statistics

	Univastype	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Personnal functions	Federal	61	2.6855	.386	.049
	State	70	2.5286	.424	.050
Maintenance of culture	Federal	61	2.6246	.415	.053
	State	70	2.1000	.494	.059
Financial function	Federal	60	2.1212	.406	.052
	State	70	2.2870	.455	.054
Monitorin	Federal	61	2.1230	.347	.044

	State	70	2.2179	.405	.0484
External relations functions	Federal	61	2.1475	.417	.053
	State	70	2.0057	.304	.036
External relations functions	Federal	61	2.3852	.499	.063
	State	70	2.3214	.474	.056
Development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure functions	Federal	61	2.1869	.468	.060
	State	70	2.2057	.324	.038

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		z-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
Personnal functions	Equal variances assumed	.373	.542	2.20
	Equal variances not assumed			2.21
Maintenance of culture	Equal variances assumed	.103	.749	6.52
	Equal variances not assumed			6.598
Financial function	Equal variances assumed	.020	.889	-2.173
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.192
Monitorin	Equal variances assumed	.203	.653	-1.427
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.442
External relations functions	Equal variances assumed	7.211	.008	2.239
	Equal variances not assumed			2.192
External relations functions	Equal variances assumed	.315	.575	.750
	Equal variances not assumed			.747

Development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure functions	Equal variances assumed	2.779	.098	-.270
	Equal variances not assumed			-.263

Independent Samples Test

		z-test for Equality of Means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Personnel functions	Equal variances assumed	129	.030	.156
	Equal variances not assumed	128.748	.028	.156
Maintenance of culture	Equal variances assumed	129	.000	.524
	Equal variances not assumed	128.855	.000	.524
Financial function	Equal variances assumed	128	.032	-.165
	Equal variances not assumed	127.784	.030	-.165
Monitoring	Equal variances assumed	129	.156	-.094
	Equal variances not assumed	128.976	.152	-.094
External relations functions	Equal variances assumed	129	.027	.141
	Equal variances not assumed	108.240	.031	.141
Internal relations functions	Equal variances assumed	129	.455	.063
	Equal variances not assumed	124.524	.456	.063
Development and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure functions	Equal variances assumed	129	.788	-.018
	Equal variances not assumed	104.741	.793	-.018

Independent Samples Test

	z-test for Equality of Means
--	------------------------------

		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
			Lower	Upper
Personnal functions	Equal variances assumed	.07132	.015	.298
	Equal variances not assumed	.07085	.016	.297
Maintenance of culture	Equal variances assumed	.08045	.365	.683
	Equal variances not assumed	.07950	.367	.681
Financial function	Equal variances assumed	.07629	-.316	-.014
	Equal variances not assumed	.07562	-.315	-.016
Monitorin	Equal variances assumed	.06651	-.226	.036
	Equal variances not assumed	.06582	-.225	.035
External relations functions	Equal variances assumed	.06334	.016	.267
	Equal variances not assumed	.06470	.013	.270
External relations functions	Equal variances assumed	.08512	-.104	.232
	Equal variances not assumed	.08542	-.105	.232
Development and maintrenance of facilities andinfrastructure functions	Equal variances assumed	.06977	-.156	.119
	Equal variances not assumed	.07149	-.160	.122

APPENDIX 3



Categories: Academic Calendar

Top 100 Universities in Nigeria – 2015 [Latest Edition]

Last modified on February 10th, 2015 by Olusegun Fapohunda · Posted in [Nigeria Universities Updates](#)

University		Location
1 University of Lagos	Lagos	
2 Obafemi Awolowo University	Ile-Ife	
3 University of Ibadan	Ibadan	
4 University of Ilorin	Ilorin	
5 Covenant University	Ota	
6 Federal		

17 Lagos State University	Ojo
18 Redeemer's University	Mowe
19 Bayero University Kano	Kano
20 University of Maiduguri	Maiduguri
21 Ladoke Akintola University of Technology	Ogbomoso ...
22 Federal University, Dutsin-	Dutsin-Ma

34 Ebonyi State University	Abakaliki
35 Veritas University	Abuja
36 Madonna University	Okija ...
37 University of Calabar	Calabar
38 Nasarawa State University	Keffi
39 Pan African University	Lagos
40 Ambrose Alli University	Ekpoma

52 Enugu State University of Science and Technology	Enugu
53 Joseph Ayo Babalola University	Ikeji-Arakeji
54 Niger Delta University	Wilberforce Island Yenagoa
55 African University of Science and Technology	Abuja
56 Kaduna State University	Kaduna

68 Olabisi Onabanjo University	Ago Iwoye ...
69 Tai Solarin University of Education	Ijebu-Ode ...
70 Modibbo Adama University of Technology	Yola
71 Ajayi Crowther University	Oyo Town
72 Imo State University	Owerri

85 Oduduwa University	Ile Ife
86 Michael Okpara University of Agriculture	Umuahia
87 Bowen University	Iwo
88 Adamawa State University	Mubi
89 Crescent University	Abeokuta
90 Cross River University of Science & Technology	Calabar ...

102 Samuel Adegboyega University	Ogwa
103 Taraba State University	Jalingo
104 Sokoto State University	Sokoto
105 Kwara State University Wukari	Wukari
106 Tansian University	Umunya ...
107 Akwa Ibom State University	Uyo
108 Godfrey	

APPENDIX 4

Universities in Africa | 2014 University Web Rankings

file:///Server/my documents/Amy/Top Universities in Africa _ 2014



Your Gateway to Universities and Colleges

Home > 2014 University Web Rankings: Africa

Top 100 Colleges and Universities in Africa by University Web Ranking. Link to it

2014 UNIVERSITY WEB RANKINGS | AFRICA

Top 100 Universities and Colleges in Africa

4

Universities in Africa | 2014 University Web Rankings











file:///Server/my documents/Amy/Top Universities in Africa _ 20

15	Assiut University	Egypt
16	Université Mohammed V - Agdal	Morocco
17	University of Nairobi	Kenya
18	Université de Ouagadougou	Burkina Faso
19	University of Johannesburg	South Africa
20	Makerere University	Uganda
21	University of Botswana	Botswana
22	Zagazig University	Egypt
23	University of Ghana	Ghana
24	Universidade Eduardo Mondlane	Mozambique

Universities in Africa | 2014 University Web Rankings

file:///Server/my documents/Amy/Top Universities in Africa _ 2014 ...

42	Université de Batna	Algeria	
43	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	South Africa	
44	University of Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe	
45	University of Zambia	Zambia	
46	Université Abdelhamid Ibn Badis Mostaganem	Algeria	
47	Université Abdelmalek Essadi	Morocco	
48	Université d'Alger	Algeria	
49	Université d'Antananarivo	Madagascar	
50	Moi University	Kenya	
51	Université Mohammed V - Souissi	Morocco	

69	Kafr el-Sheikh University	Egypt	
70	University of Ibadan	Nig	
71	Université Hassan II - Casablanca	Morocco	
72	University of Malawi	Malawi	
73	Université des Sciences et de la Technologie Houari Boumediène	Algeria	
74	Universiteit van die Vrystaat	South Africa	
75	University of Nigeria	Nigeria	
76	Universidade de Cabo Verde	Cape Verde	
77	Polytechnic of Namibia	Namibia	
78	Kenyatta University	Kenya	

Universities in Africa | 2014 University Web Rankings

file:///Server/my documents/Amy/Top Universities in Africa

- 96 Université Mohamed Khider de Biskra
- 97 Madonna University
- 98 The British University in Egypt
- 99 University of Fort Hare
- 100 Sokoine University of Agriculture

Algeria

Nigeria

Egypt

South Africa

Tanzania

5
APPENDIX C

Validation of instrument on the Topic:

Analysis of Governing Council Performance and University Effectiveness in South-East and South-South Nigeria

This is to certify that I

Prof. Romy Okoye

APPENDIX 5

Validation of instrument on the Topic:

Analysis of Governing Council Performance
And University Effectiveness In South
East And South South Nigeria

This is to certify that I Dr Loyce Ojiali

Validated the above mentioned instrument and made corrections/recommendations

APPENDIX 5

Validation of instrument on the Topic:

Analysis of Governing Council Regime and
University Effectiveness in South East and South
South Africa

This is to certify that I Dr. Carol Esuyser

Validated the above mentioned instrument and made corrections/recommendations
on the following areas:

