

**AFRICAN JOURNAL OF
EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT**

ISSN 0795 – 0063 Volume 23, No. 1 June, 2022

**A JOURNAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT,
UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN**

**DIFFERENT DEANS, DIFFERENT STROKES: THE EXPERIENCE OF A
FACULTY OFFICER**

Ogunjuyigbe, Eunice Adeola

Human Resource & Development Division, Academic Staff

University of Ibadan

Email: eaogunjuyiqbe@gmail.com

Ayeni, Abiodun Olumide

Department of Educational Management

University of Ibadan, Ibadan

Email: biodunmide@gmail.com

Abstract

The academic and administrative cultures are vastly different and are just like two alternative philosophical splits that are irreconcilable: negotiation of contested terrain or turf strained environment and a real potential for friction between faculty and administrator. This is evident in the kind of treatment given to the Faculty Officer, who is the representative in the Faculty. These poor treatments can be in different forms of resentment or suspicion of administrators and find them to be overbearing and overpowering, placating by either party as a way of indulging the other's whims, denying administrator the benefits of office, withholding or misusing of information or displaying defensive reactions, divisiveness, display of resistance of administrative control, inattentiveness to institutional issues, resist acknowledgement of administrative authority, react defensively to administrator's suggestions, cede ground grudgingly, anger and frustration about perceived lack of consultation to mention but a few. In building a solid relationship, perceptions are important because they offer a starting point for collaboration and joint effort. The role of the Faculty Officer was investigated in the course of the work. The experiences of working with four tenure Deans as a way of proffering solutions to these negative perceptions that can foster an attitude that permeates through decision making in institutions of higher learning.

Introduction

The University is a complex administrative and academic organization made up of teaching and non-teaching staff. These two professional groups are expected to interact and work in harmony to have a smooth and effective University administration, for it to achieve its mandate. It is, therefore, necessary that systems and policies are put in place to guide its activities, some of which are controlled, directed and coordinated at the faculty level by the Faculty Officer (Agyei-Bieni and Abedi-Boafo, 2015).

The relationship between the faculty and the administrator has been described as two sides of the same coin by Campbell and Bray (2017), while the harmonious relationship of these two groups within the University system is central to the effectiveness of shared governance (Guskin, 1996 and Westmerger, (1990). This condition of shared governance serves to balance interests and power toward situational goals. Breslin (2000) added that the faculty and administrator should recognized themselves as partners of progress. "This existing relationship" is based on the bonafide partnership between the two factions, the outcome of which is an effective decision-making process, which is executed by established governance. In the early universities, institutions usually start with a small administrative unit. As the organization grows resulting from the increasing population, and a number of courses, it becomes necessary that roles are reviewed for content load and effectiveness coupled with the provision of the Acts for the establishment of universities. Some bureaucracies became necessary and certain structures emerged to ease the burden of the academics for them to focus on the core objective of the University enterprise which is teaching and learning. The faculty autonomy became threatened as the number of administrators increased and structures of authority continue to expand. These actions were viewed as a diversion of resources from academic purposes. This is one of the obstacles to effective Faculty – Administrator relationship. Etzioni (2000) and Clark (1991) asserted that the unique professional orientation stemming from vastly different cultures present a significant obstacle to decision-making in the common interest.

The role of a Dean is that of an academic leader with the authority to verify the adequacy of instructions, monitor academic integrity and ensure that the University policies are implemented in the faculty.

This orientation is in both a narrower and a broader context than that of an administrator. Broader in the sense that their primary connections in their discipline goes beyond the boundaries of their institutions that employ them with respect to research and community development and narrower for the same reasons stated above because their interest and knowledge are centred on their specific field of professionalism. While the academic focus on the academic and programmatic aspect of the institution, the administrator is tailored and programmed to uphold the tenets of an institution, interprets its regulations and ensure that all due processes are followed.

Academia in some faculties view administrators as inconsequential, this is evident in their interaction with some Faculty Officers. They fail to acknowledge the fact that as birds with two wings, the University will be at its best in flying when both wings flap properly.

The Faculty Officer is the Registrar's representative in the faculty. The Registrar is a principal officer of the University and the head of non-teaching staff (Registry). The Registrar is the secretary to the council. He/she collates, analyses and reviews for viability, options for consideration in a committee-run system. Daniel (2014) posited that the Registrar is assisted by colleagues with expertise in finance, human resources, public relations and other professions.

The Faculty Officer is appointed and charged with the responsibility of being the Senior Administrator in the faculty, controls, coordinates and supervises the work of all non-teaching staff of the faculty. The Faculty Officer also functions as an adviser to the Dean, who is the head of the faculty.

The Faculty Officers' Challenges

The faculty administrators are confronted daily with several challenges. The success of this officer is in his/her ability to professionally control and lead the faculty with the required administrative skills. Otherwise, challenges may arise which can disrupt the administrative setting of the faculty and the entire University at large.

To borrow the biblical point of view, can two walk together except they agree? as found in Amos 3:3. Parker (1998) posited that the

absence of a common cause derived from a shared knowledge base necessarily frustrates collaboration and cooperation. Leslie (2003) cited class size, access to resources to support their work, and routes to publication as sources of faculty interest. Class size establishes in many cases the amount of effort involved in the teaching role. Where institutional type (e.g. research universities) dictates the extent to which teaching and research involvement must be prioritized, large classes often require that more time be spent on teaching. Resources and publication concerns are directly related to the research role, and represent for many faculty the primary criteria for productivity and associated rewards. These values are held close by faculty, many of whom would cite them as their reason for choosing the academic profession. The administrator on the other hand, sees their role as serving a collective interest (e.g: fair distribution of resources, advancing institutional visibility and public image, and generally improving institutional performance). Among their highly prized values is the efficiency of institutional operation (Birnbaum 1988, 2003, and Etzioni, 2000). According to Birnbaum, (2003) administrators are also bound to consider and respond to pressure from the external environment (e.g rapidly changing technology, public demand for new programmes, and most importantly, diminishing state and federal support that makes the need for fundraising a critical one. The institution's public image is also an important concern of the administrator (Leslie, 2003) since it dictates the kind and amount of support the public will provide.

Birnbaum (2003) encapsulates the divergent priorities of the parties to higher education decision-making. The faculty culture values creativity, critical discourse and the unfettered pursuit of knowledge. Administrators, on the other hand, seek compromise as a way of reaching decisions where the differing perspectives of decision-makers must be bridged. Basham and Cambell (2010), Thompson, Hawkes and Avery (1969) believed that the different "truth strategies" subscribed to by the two groups are a source of latent hostility between both.

Another issue can be characterized by lack of harmony and mistrust. Delfavero and Bray (2005) posited that the partnership between faculty and administrators is essential to shared governance, it is also a fragile one, characterized by lack of harmony and mistrust.

A common or frequent challenge the administrator encounters regularly can be attributed to genuine differences of opinion over academic matters and the simple desire of a Dean for more direct involvement in administrative activities or processes. Differing perceptions of Dean's roles may also account for a good deal of conflict with administrators. Administrators may view it as the Dean stepping over boundaries and this can lead to tension in the faculty.

The challenges of the Faculty Officer hinge on the fact that academic leadership is complex. Most of the academic staff are observed to be high-handed and believes that they are better or more intelligent. However, everyone is a professional in his/her discipline and Blake (1981) said that individuals who are capable of advancing knowledge are clearly of an unusual calibre.

An academic institution is goal-oriented and growth or market-oriented, of intellectual excellence, not increased productivity in economic terms, and increased intensity of thinking (Giamatti,1998), cited in William Agyei-Bieni and Ekua Abedi-Boafo, (2015). In an instance where the attitude of "know it all" is being displayed there cannot be any fruitful interaction between the faculty and the administrator.

It is therefore essential that the administrator is kept abreast of the University rules, regulations, policies, conventions and statutes since the administrator is the Dean immediate advisor on administrative and Registry matters in the faculty and the University in general. Relevant decisions, policies and conventions taken at both Executive and Management levels should of necessity be communicated to the Faculty Officers who in turn will use these decisions and policies to advise the Dean accordingly.

Staff Motivation

The motivation of staff has been identified as one of the challenges of the Faculty Officer. There is a need for the faculty to respect the portfolio of the Faculty Officer to prevent him from being administratively handicapped. Another challenge of the faculty officer is the non-provision of needful personnel and facilities as well as inadequate resources/malfunctioning equipment .This hinders productivity and good results during the period.

As a Faculty Officer that worked in an uncondusive environment, for almost two years with the magnitude of the above-stated problems should be applauded. Results and successes were recorded, work done, however, was at a huge price and sacrifice for the Faculty Officer.

In conclusion, some faculties do not willingly welcome the immense contribution of the Faculty officer his/her shared governance of administrative involvement in the faculty. Faculty autonomy, a core value held by members of the academic profession (Austin, (1990), Bess (1988), Bowen and Schuster (1986), Clark (1991) by its nature frustrates acceptance of authority. This usually makes administrators uncomfortable in the faculty. Barber (1993) takes faculty to task for what he characterized as an unrealistic attitude toward authority, but Etzioni (2000) contended that faculty unwillingness to grant authority to administrators is a dilemma of organizational structure.

Objectives

1. The objectives of this paper was to examine the roles of the Faculty Officer in the administration and management of the University.
 - i. To investigate the roles of the Faculty Officer.
 - ii. To examine the administration of four tenured Deans to foster improvement in the performance of their duties.
 - iii. To recommend to the management of the institution of higher learning the possibility of making amendments in the governance structure, especially as the faculty officer is highly affected..

Literature Review

The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, define faculty as a group of related departments, sections, centres and units in a college or university with a common goal or aim. The Columbia University handbook on faculties states that "The Faculties are responsible for organizing and conducting the programmes of study leading to the degrees and certificates conferred by the University".

The primary duties of faculty include: effective classroom teaching, academic advising and counselling of students, participation in Departmental committee work, continuous development of the curriculum through assessment applied research or scholarly activity. Faculties set the academic/standard for admission, determine the

requirements for graduation from those programme and approve the courses that fulfil those requirements.

Faculties are responsible for the formulation and implementation of academic policies such as teaching and/or research, curriculum development, International collaborations, resource allocation and community development (Agyei-Bieni and Abedi-Boafo, 2015). Faculties are usually headed by the Dean who serves as its Chief Executive Officer.

The Dean

The Dean leads a specific academic unit including Departments within Universities. A Dean is primarily a University Officer who is the head of a particular Faculty. He represents and presents his/her faculty's particular policies and standpoints, usually reports to the Vice-Chancellor and is responsible for its academic programme, including maintaining a faculty of academic excellence, overseeing its admissions, curriculum and enforcing its rules and regulations. The administrative responsibilities in carrying out these functions which are performed at the faculty are usually carried out by the Faculty Officer, the Registrar's representative in consultation with the Dean, who is the head of the faculty.

The Faculty Officer

Faculty Officer is one of the non-teaching staff employed by the University Council and posted to a faculty as representative of the Registrar to perform administrative functions under the supervision of the Dean. The Faculty Officer coordinates daily administrative duties in the faculty. The Faculty Officer is a specialized professional with a background in either Business Administration, Educational Administration and Management, Human Resources Management, History, English and International Relations, and so on. Agyei-Bieni and Abedu-Boafo (2015) said that the idea for establishing separately administered faculty offices manned by Career Administrators (Faculty Officers) other than Academic Administrators (Deans) came to the fore following the work of Fielden and Lockwood (1973) titled, *Planning and Management in Universities: A study of British Universities*.

Agyei-Bieni and Abedi-Boafo (2015) reported that Fielden and Lockwood (1973) further stated that the Faculty Officer should work

directly with the Dean of the faculty in the discharge of the administrative work including acting as the advisor to the Dean but professionally responsible to the Registrar, who is the Chief Administrator and the head of the administration in the University. This emphasis that the Faculty Officer is representing the Registrar in the faculty, since the Registrar cannot practically be at every Department and Faculty at all times, by virtue of his/her schedules. The Faculty Officer is the Registrar's representative in the faculty and he/she perform the role of the Registrar at the faculty level.

Roles and Responsibilities of the Faculty Officer in the University

The responsibility of an administrator is to manage activities or groups of activities sequential and coordinate their operations, ensure work is properly performed, correct errors and resolve conflicts (Westmeyer, 1990).

Mayer, Recordati, & Hohmeir (1995) posited that the management of the educational institution is a collective effort aimed at providing an environment in which teaching and learning can flourish, resulting in student satisfaction, high performance, retention and a wide range of career opportunities. Effective teaching and learning to enhance performance cannot take place in a toxic environment. Afful-Broni (2004) emphasized that administration is an activity that requires getting the work of an organization done by utilizing and coordinating the effort of others, the Faculty Officer, therefore, as the Chief Administrator of the faculty has the responsibility to coordinate and direct the affairs at the faculty in getting things done within the University. The Faculty Officer is the coordinator of all activities of the faculty, the Departments and also ensures that policies and decisions are implemented in the latter most cost-effective manner. Nyatuame (2008) stated that the Faculty Officer serves as a liaison between the faculty and the central administration, the faculty and Departments, and the faculty and other faculties of the University.

- The Faculty Officer should see himself/herself as a training and staff development officer of the faculty. In consultation with the Dean, the Faculty Officer should be able to arrange training programmes for the young and newly appointed lecturers and non-teaching staff appointed into the faculty on teaching and

administration respectively. In the sense that most young people who are employed into the University profession in most cases have little or no experience and skills (Nyatuame, 2008 and Agyei-Bieni and Abedi-Boafo, 2015).

It is important to note that the Faculty Officer who is not competent should employ “self-development skill” but he/she will arrange for experts to provide comprehensive training. Therefore, it is not out of place if the Faculty Officer himself/herself organize in-service training for such young people.

Fielden and Lockwood (1973) believed that in a University where there is devolution of responsibility within a unified framework, the Faculty Officer serves the faculty and Departments as well as provide common faculty-based services, which included that the Faculty Officer becomes the focal point for directing work from the faculty to other sections/units of the administration of the University. Furthermore, Fielden and Lockwood (1973) suggested that the Faculty Officer should be the baseline of the University administration. This is the reason why the faculty is considered as the largest academic and administrative section of the University’s structure of governance. Thus, the role of the Faculty Officer as emphasized involves working in many areas of the University management. The Faculty Officer acts as a channel through which efforts are directed to meet the faculty’s needs. To this effect, the Faculty Officer in the University occupies a central place and plays a central role in the realization of the faculty and the University goals. The Faculty Officer is responsible for the day-to-day administration and management of the faculty. The Faculty Officer is the representative of the Registrar in the faculty, he/she is the custodian of the University’s statutes, policies and rules, and the implementation of the statutes, policies and the rules while ensuring their compliance or enforcement at the faculty or Departmental levels.

The Faculty Officer is the Chief Supervisor of all staff of the faculty. He/she supervises both the junior and senior staff of the faculty, monitors duties of other senior members of the faculty and Departments and so on. He/she also keeps records of the faculty, equipment, buildings and other assets such as vehicles, furniture, and so on.

The Faculty Officer is a multi-faceted individual whose concerns are for both the institution and the human resources. He/she is also responsible for:

- Servicing the Faculty Appointments and Promotion Panel
- Students services: admission, registration, matriculation and graduation
- Maintenance of students' records for examinations
- Preparation of annual budget and administration of expenditure from funds available to the faculty
- Supervision of staff of the faculty (non-teaching staff)
- Advising the Dean and Heads of Departments on the administration of faculty and Departments
- Planning and organization of all meetings, public lectures/seminars/conferences of the faculty
- Monitoring and implementation of the statutes, rules, policies and regulations of the University at the faculty and Departments.

From the above-stated responsibilities of a Faculty Officer, it is clear that the duties of the Faculty Officer are very important to the administration of the University and as such may be difficult for the University to do without him/her as a working partner of the Registrars, in the administration of the University.

Qualities of Faculty Officer

The Faculty Officer must possess the following desirable qualities for effective and efficient delivery of their duties:

- I. Should be knowledgeable of the University's vision, mission and all other rules and regulations, and also work towards making it a reality at the faculty level.
- II. Must have good skills in respect to storing and retrieving records and information
- III. Must be good effective communication skill
- IV. Must possess a high level of monitoring, supervisory and appraising skills
- V. Must be very confident in decision-making
- VI. Should be available and accessible to all faculty members

- VII. Must be very tolerant, patient and pushful with members of the faculty.

Memoirs of Working with Four Tenured Deans

For our institutions to be innovative, the Deans and administrators must effectively work together. It is worthy of note that lack of joint effort, mutual respect and trust among the group can frustrate collaboration and cooperation. It is of essence that some of these anomalies in the operations of Deans were addressed by the University Management and by extension the tenures of any aspiring Deans so that certain things can be straightened/corrected out for the effectiveness of shared governance and for the University to get to that desired height. Each of the tenures will be studied under the following themes.

Tenure A

(1) Acceptance of Authority/Administrator

This tenure embraced and accepted the joint participation of the faculty and administrator within the faculty and this was evident in the warm reception given to the faculty administrator on the first day in office. "You are welcome to the faculty and I will make sure that resources are made available to you to excel in this place". The tenure saw the different professionals working within the faculty as a team irrespective of the different positions of each, as long as each worked under the confines of the University rules and regulations.

(2) Good Interwork Relationship

The working relationship during this tenure was cordial. All worked together as a team, closed all gaps disregarding all barriers/boundaries to ensure that the faculty successfully compete with other Universities in Nigeria and globally.

(3) Communication

Communication was a bit challenging because the Dean sometimes would have resolved issues by himself before he realized that he should have set up a committee for a collaborative agreement to subsist or consult with the administrator.

(4) Finance

The faculty administrator only worked with the tenured Dean for four months. There was no finance committee meeting all through this period, resources were available in abundance in the faculty. Servicing of meetings during this tenure was between the Dean and staff in the Dean's office. The Faculty Officer was not carried along in the area of finance during this tenure. whereas, the Faculty Officer should be in the know of the finance of the faculty as a statutory member of the finance committee

(5) Involvement of Administrator in the Planning and management of Resources

Despite the acceptance of the administrative arm, the Faculty Officer was not allowed to actively participate in Planning and Management in some day to day activities in the faculty. These areas are under the supervision of the Faculty Officer who yet was sidelined.

In the light of the above, the University management should look into the two gray areas of finance, planning and resources management to incorporate this during the training of newly elected officers.

Tenure B

The Faculty Officer was on the ground to witness the commencement of this tenure and coordinated the election that instituted this tenure. There were some unhealthy traditions passed down to the incoming Dean that discouraged partnership in the faculty. The faculty was divided during this tenure.

(i) Acceptance of Authority/Administrator to Function

Just like tenure A, this tenure also embraced and indicated his willingness to work as a team with the Faculty Officer. This was manifested in the manner of operation. Right from the very first day of his tenure, the Faculty Officer was invited for discussion on and realizing the vision of the tenured Dean with the Faculty Officer.

(ii) Cooperative/Good Working Relationship

The working relationship during this tenure was excellent. There was a harmonious relationship during this tenure. This tenure promised to present a financial account of his stewardship to the board on his last

day of operation in office. Tenure B worked with all the other professionals in the faculty most especially the Faculty Officer. The agenda of the meeting was the input of both the tenure and the faculty administrator.

(3) Communication

The communication during this tenure was good. The tenure carried the Faculty Officer along in decision making. The tenure understood the hierarchy and observed all due processes and protocols. Information was disseminated through the Faculty Officer.

(4) Finance

The tenure was very transparent in the sense that the tenure worked through the finance committee. The only challenge was how to immediately raise funds urgently to attend to pressing needs before the University bursary process and the release of the funds.

(5) Involvement of Administrator in the Planning and Management of Resources .

The tenure partially involved administrator in Planning and Resources Management except for the practical aspect in the faculty, however, the Faculty Officer was duly informed after the completion of the practical task and any ensuing profits.

Tenure C

This tenure saw the Deanship as individual research and the faculty as a platform where all decisions are taken of elevation. The tenure did not believe in the shared governance of the faculty/administrator relationship.

(i) Acceptance of Authority/Administrator to Function

The Faculty Officer held the reigns of the faculty because of his absenteeism but financially had no wherewithal to implement policies and render services.

(ii) Cooperation/Good Working Relationship

The tenured Dean has a very good interpersonal relationship with staff. The administrator endured this period because of her loyalty to the

institution and commitment to duty, assisted in the performance of her duty at a minimal level using influence, wit and skills, to get the job done in the face of resource- challenges.

(iii) Communication

Communication during this period was good and most of the instructions were done via social media. The Faculty Officer only carried out the instructions given to her by the Dean.

(iv) Finance

All through the two-year tenure the faculty only had two finance committee meetings. The Dean single-handedly financed all the faculty projects and later sought reimbursement. The faculty did not follow the usual processing of salary advance. The Dean already earmarked an account through which he transferred money to any projects of his choice. Not a single item was purchased or repaired during this period. The office of the Faculty administrating worked in a lean period.

(5) Involvement of Administrator in the Planning Of Resources Management

This tenure partially involved the administrator in the planning and management of resources. Information was heard while the tenure Dean reported to board members.

Tenure D

(i) Acceptance of Authority/Administrator to Function

This was the most interesting of all the tenure the faculty administrator interacted with. Right from the very beginning of this tenure, it was obvious that the tenure was to be conflict-laden. There was no cordial interaction from the Dean. The tenure was not willing to share information with the Faculty Officer who ought to be a partner in progress. It was obvious through all actions and in words that the faculty had the monopoly of authority to the exclusion of all others and especially the Faculty Officer.

(ii) Cooperation/Good Working Relationship

There was nothing like cooperation during this tenure because the tenure utilized divide and rule of enticement by transferring money to staff to ensure that the office procedures are bridged which was a common tool of use by the Dean.

(3) Communication

Communication was at a zero level during this period. There was no interaction. The tenure ignored the faculty administration, and practically took over the duties of the Faculty officer, organized agenda, service meetings, sent out notice of meeting and communicated directly with department and different units of the faculty.

(4) Finance

The tenure operated through the finance committee and secured the necessary approval, but operated the finance of the faculty by herself. The tenure serviced meetings without the involvement of the Faculty Officer, purchased assets and implemented projects without the knowledge of the Faculty Officer

(5) Involvement of Administrator in Planning & Resources Management

The tenure Dean did not involve the administrator in any planning. The Faculty Officer was ignored. The administration was a one-person show by the Dean. The Faculty Officer was deliberately made redundant.

Summary

The Dean and the Faculty Officer relationship only exist in theory. One sees the other as being superior/intelligent more than the other and not as of progress. When going through the memoirs of the Deans, one can observe that the tenure was elected to satisfy only the interest of those that elected them or represent the academic agenda in the faculty.

In most cases, the Faculty Officers are seen as a spy sent from the central administration to monitor the operations at the faculty level and not as the Registrar's representative in the faculty that needed to be accorded with a certain level of recognition and this is one of the reasons why the two groups from a different culture may not want to work well together. This must be the likely reason why the Faculty

Officer was not carried along when the issues in consideration related to the planning of their scholarship or professionalism in the faculty.

The University puts in a lot of time, money and effort to ensure that the newly elected Deans are educated on how to effectively perform their roles in the ivory tower without the Dean and the Faculty officer at cross-purpose. At the end of the day, the Deans go toward their traditional ways of operation. Administrators are always happy to look forward to this kind of training and conflict may arise in the faculty when the Dean still operates in the old tradition of boss-subordinate. The Dean is the chair of the finance committee always guide the meeting in the area of interest. Faculty Officers who believe that resources should be tailored towards a particular direction would be challenged under such tenure.

Tenure B who strove to do things by following the University laid down process is a good example of a faculty and administration partnership that evolved in progress and actualization of University goals.

Conclusion

The role of the Faculty Officer is germane to a good governance system in the faculty and the entire institution at large.

Administrators must keep themselves abreast of the rules and regulation guiding their operations which should be used appropriately. The full understanding or knowledge of the organization's culture or terrain is equally important. This will enable them to work around /surmount/overcome the constraints imposed on their day to day activities by the organizational structure. By this, the negative perspective bridging the gulf between the two disparate cultures is broken down and possibilities of building a productive and reciprocal relationship are realized.

Recommendations

The following suggestions should be taken into consideration by the management so as to foster effective governance relationship between the faculty and administrator in a University system.

1. The relationship between the Dean and the Faculty Officer should be such that it will acknowledge the powerful and popular notion of networking and other forms of socializing and

influencing as viable approaches to building a trusting relationship that would foster the best way of working together. Mutual respect and trust are promises of a qualitative shared governance system.

2. The faculty-administrator relationship in the interest of a more effective governance system should be free of tension and conflict for better productivity and make governance systems move responsive to fast-changing societal needs.
3. Many of the problems associated with shared governance stems from the lack of a clear definition in faculty-administrator relationships, as well as the perspectives faculty and administrators hold towards governance. If institutions wish to embrace the concept of shared governance, they should clearly articulate participant expectations and seek to understand current perceptions held by faculty and administrators.
4. Most of the traditions in the University system are not documented. Some Deans are ignorant and hide, this may reduce the office of Faculty Officer to the Dean's secretary instead of the faculty secretary. The Faculty Officer needs proper recognition and respect as accorded to any senior management officer. The office of the Faculty Officer has come to stay as such the lecturer, heads of Department or units or sections and the Deans of faculties or directors of centres, upon their engagement should be given the appropriate orientation to recognize the office of the Faculty Officer as to such. Afful-Brom, in 2004 said that "the Faculty Officer serves as a coordinator to direct affairs at the faculty to get things done the right way in moving the faculty forward". so His or Her effort needs to be properly recognized by all faculty members. Similarly, the mindset of all the administrative staff of the faculties should be oriented to recognize and respect the office of the faculty other as a representative of the registrar of the faculty.
5. The choice between the different forms of governance as hard and soft type of institution as academic and market have a significant influence on shared governance. Birnbaum states that "hard governance is hierarchic and is forward-looking and em-passe the system of social connections and

interaction in an organization and is the type of governance often found at academic institutions". Hard governance refers to the structures, regulations, and systems in an organization that defines authority and relationships, set processes for the organization and ensure conformity with policies, the most common type of governance found at most University.

6. Despite the lack of evidence that regulatory, structural, and authoritative changes would be significant, there are continual calls to reform or alter hard governance. The primary argument focuses on changing the structure of governance, especially, the particular aspects that affect faculty participation in decision making. It is widely believed by those who seek this type of change that this will improve institutional performance by limiting who has a voice in decision making, moving decision making to the top of the hierarchical scale (Birnbaum,2004, Blackburn,1998).
7. The need to redesign effective governance structure to avoid "boundary-crossing" which is one of the causes of conflict in an organization. This will require that reformers "reflect upon histories as well as futures to build the new structure. As the environment continues to evolve, institutions will inevitably face, more and more complicated and extreme challenges in the necessity to achieve a shared governance system to respond swiftly in ways beneficial to the institution will increase
8. The Faculty Officer should be considered for allocation of some resources and proper office accommodation. The Faculty Officer needs a befitting office for privacy. This can serve as motivation for taking a lot of personal initiatives in consultation with his/her Dean to move the Faculty forward.
9. A precondition for equitable treatment of conflicting viewpoints is the maintenance and strengthening of information networks between the Faculty and administrator.

References

- Abedi-Boafo, W. A. B. E. (2015). Assessing the Functions of Faculty Administrators in the University of Education. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(24),140-145.
- Afful-Broni, A. (2004). *Theory and practice of educational leadership in Ghana*. Accra: Yamens Press Ltd.

- Agyei-Bieni, W., Abedi-Boafo, E. (2015). Assessing the functions of faculty administrators in the University of Education, Winneba. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(24), 140-145.
- Austin, A. E. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. *New directions for institutional research*, 1-74.
- Barber, B. (1993). *Constructing the Social System*. New Brunswick, Transaction Publishers.
- Basham, M. J., & Campbell, D. F. (2010). A comparative analysis between researchers, innovative practitioner and department chairs of critical issues for turnaround leadership in community college instructional programs and services 2010 and beyond. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 35(1-2), 50-60.
- Bess, J. L. (1988). *Collegiality and Bureaucracy in the Modern University: The Influence of Information and Power on Decision Making Structures*. 1243 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, Teachers College Press, , NY 10027.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: the cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Birnbaum, R. (2003). *The end of shared governance: looking ahead or looking back*. New Directions for Higher Education, n127 p5-22 Fall 2004 (EJ760453) <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.490.5897&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Bowen, H. R. & Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled*. 16-00 Polity Drive, Fair Lawn, NJ 07410, Oxford University Press,
- Breslin, R.D. (2000). Lessons from the presidential trenches. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46, B24.
- Brown, M.C. (Ed.). (2000). *Organization & governance in higher education*. (5th ed). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publisher
- Campbell, E. & Bray, N. (2018). Two sides of the same coin?. Analysis of faculty and administrators' perspectives on governance. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 42(12), 893-907.
- Clark, B. R. (1963). Faculty organization and authority. In T. F. Lunsford (Ed.), *The study of academic administration* (pp. 37-51). Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education.

- Daniel, G. F. (2014). *Higher Education, Governance and Related Matters*. Ghana Journal of Higher Education, 1, 107-119.
- Del Favero, M. & Bray, N. (2005). *The Faculty-Administrator Relationship: Partners in Prospective Governance?*. Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly, 3(1), 53-72.
- Favero, M. D. (2003). Faculty-administrator relationships as integral to high-performing governance systems: New frameworks for study. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(7), 902-922.
- Gabriel, A O., Francis, J A & Elizabeth S(nd): *A Review On The' Role of Officer' in the Administration and Management of Tertiary Institutions in Ghana: The Case of Takoradi Technical University* https://www.academia.edu/32314592/A_REVIEW_ON_THE_ROLE_OF_A_FACULTY_OFFICER_IN_THE_ADMINISTRATION_AND_MANAGEMENT_OF_TERTIARY_INSTITUTIONS_IN_GHANA_THE_CASE_OF_TAKORADI_TECHNICAL_UNIVERSITY. Retrieved on 13 July, 2021 .pg 1-13.
- Guskin, A.E. (1996). *Facing the future: The change process in restructuring universities*. Change: The magazine of higher learning, 28(4), 27-37.
- Hartman, J. B. (1977). *Change and conflict in the University*. The Journal of Educational Thought (JET)/Revue de la Pensée Educative, 11(1), 3-15.
- Leslie, D. W. (2004). *Governance" or" Governing?"*. Metropolitan Universities, 15(1), 17-37
- Igwe ,T.I. , Adeniyi,A J. & Akinmade, D. (2021). *University Administration in the 21st century: A compendium of ANUPA Lecture Series 1*, 31.
- Mayers, P., Recordati, T. & Hohmeier, D. (1995). *System-supported teaching and learning to improve student performance, satisfaction, and retention*. Academic initiatives in total quality for higher education, 181-204.
- Nyatuaume, P.(2008) *"Two- day orientation for newly appointed Deans and Faculty/Faculty Officers of Takoradi Technical University Duties and Responsibilities*.
- Parker, J. E. (1998). *Leading as Scholars & Educators: The Case for Collaboration*. *Liberal Education*, 84(4), 8-15.
- Thompson, Hawkes, & Avery, R. W. (1969). *Truth strategies and university organization*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 5(2), 4-25.
- Westmeyer, P. (1990). *Principles of Governance and Administration in Higher Education*. 2600 South First St., Springfield, Charles C. Thomas Publisher, IL 62794-9265.