

**Governorship at the Middle East University**

**“A Model”**

**Prepared by**

**Dr. Yacoub Adel Abed Munem Nasereddin**

**Head of Trustee – Council at the Middle East University**

**Amman / Jordan**

**e-mail: [yacoub@meuco.jo](mailto:yacoub@meuco.jo)**

**The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan**

**Amman**

**Telephone (+ 96264790222) Fax (+96264129613)**

**Code No. (11831) P.O. Box (383)**

## **Introduction**

The governorship of universities is considered from the modern conceptions that obtained big concerns in the late years at universities through using it in achieving the comprehensive quality and distinction in performance, and it is the source, or the reference up on which is depended in governing the university, and governorship is known as a “group of laws, systems and instructions, aiming at achieving the comprehensive quality and the distinction in performance by selecting the effective and suitable strategies to achieve destinations of the university and its strategic objectives”, it is so means the disciplines that govern the relations among the basic parties which affect in the performance, and cover the fundamentals of strengthening the university at the long run and specify the responsible and the responsibility.

Universities share in most of the world states in development of its different sides; the social, economic, administrative, political and the health, and else, and it is an important and lively part of their local community. The leaders of universities do their best in formulating the vision of the university and its message which lately specifies the highest objectives of the university. The more different were the visions of universities and their messages, but they meet altogether in a form or the other on two main basic objectives, the first: a distinguished education represented in pushing the congregations of qualified graduates to fill the vacancies in the different associations of state and the community with what fits their needs. And the second: expresses serving the community, or what is called the university undertakes its communal responsibilities (Nasereddin, a: 2012).

Advancement with the university education demands an integrated organization of the university governorship, covers all decision – makers, leaders and its sources. Therefore, the universities governorship is considered the reaching key of the higher education to the highest levels in value and content. Advancement of university posts (teaching, scientific research, community service) demands development of governorship and institutional performance in it, including what guarantees transparency, enquiry, and institutional participation of all parties, in accordance with the legislative reference, regulator of work, where the university academic decisions more in accordance with scientific fundamentals in the university governorship councils, and also what some universities suffer from weakness in governorship, because of numerousness of control and interference parties, and the personal relations lead to unrespect the recommendations of governorship councils in them and their decisions, and so, these universities are lost between temperament and haste of changes, institutional work and the academic fundamentals do not exist in them (Nasereddin, a: 2012).

Therefore, the Arab universities should understand the significance of their adopting the standards of governorship, and the purpose for which they were established, and their role in the operation of development and sharing in transformation into the cognitive economy and world of informatics, and the Arab Ministries of Higher Education and Scientific Research have lay a document in the form of obligatory, or seeking guidance from which universities inspire their responsibilities related to governorship. Such a document will form the road – map for universities, and universities have to perform the operation of reform to their administrative order, and to adopt organizational structures more efficient and more modern.

Stabilization of governorship bases in conducting universities affairs needs to conduct the change more than the change itself, because plenty of the requirements do not need modification of the legal legislations, but to motivate what is available and implement them transparently within the policy of glorifying the achievement, enlarging topics of enquiry and observing the performance in the factual reform of the university education and developing it by a method of prudent administration, reality is the basis of its components, and the future vision is one of the most significant necessities (Khorsheed & Yousef, 2007), and adoption of governorship system at universities demands availability of dear numerousness and comprehensiveness in patterns of governorship, in addition to large participation of the owners of interests at the level of strategic decisions and specification of resources, and existence of controlling machineries among them enable them deal with the executive administration and direct their behavior this is from one side, and from other side existence of internal control is a must, consisted of the governorship councils and submit their report about the extent of sticking to regulations and instructions, and the extent of efficiency and competence of the internal system of the university control.

Governorship implementation and its principles at the universities assist them to reach their strategic destinations, for its implementation leads to bending the relationship between the university and its governorship councils and owners of interest, workers in it, and its students on clear scientific bases (Mungiu – Pippidi & Dusu, 2011), in addition to specifying responsibilities entrusted on the back of each of them and following executing them, and it also assists to uproot states of corruption and carelessness, and un-responsible loss which occur at universities through

implementing policies characterized with clarity and transparency, and enabling all followers of the university and its students to practice their role at complete form and high degree of accuracy (Khorsheed & Yousef, 2010). And also specifies each of the governorship councils, owners of interests in it leaders, and all followers of it in a frame of control and observation through implementing the principles of governorship.

And the governorship saves a healthy environment to work through the principle of enquiry and respecting rules, regulations, and instructions and evaluating the performance of all in a correct scientific form (Nasereddin, 2012), and it also works to increase trust and defend the culture of discussion among the different followers of the university, its leaders and students, and finding forms of cooperation, interaction, coalition at work, improvement of performance, and developing it (Corcoran, 2004).

Many studies indicate to that the political dimension is one of the governorship dimensions (Nasereddin, a: 2012), and it distinguishes between the governorship of the state and the university governorship when the matter concerns the general policy at the level of the state (Al – Taii' & Hamad, 2010). And there is the administrative dimension, which concentrates on the university leaders, the governorship councils in it, and the machinery of transference from the prevailing administration to the governorship (Irtwang & Orsaah, 200). But the economic dimension, is that specifies the relationship between the governorship and the size of investment in the university from one part, and annihilation of forms of carelessness and corruption from other part and achieve continuous progress and development, and correcting the track from a third part (Saleh, 2010).

Meanwhile, the social dimension treats the extent of the university adopting a behavior code specified to each of the teaching staff members,

administrator, and students in it, depending on a list of a group of specified principles (Nasereddin, b: 2012) for contents of governorship directly connect with adopted behavior patterns by governorship principles represented in participation, transparency and enquiry, concentrated on adopting and achieving the collective objective and not the individual and its trend (Izzat, 2010). But the financial dimension works on organizing the relationship and specifying it among the affecting and affected parties by the university policies, decisions and financial results from interest owners in it. By that the university can execute its private strategy through measuring, control and motivation (Tarabeyah, 2010).

Nasereddin had indicated (b: 2012) that implementation of governorship at the university has a distinct significance in the modern world, for its implementation works on glorifying the value of the university and its competitive ability, especially in the field of its output and its regional and worldly situation, and so it works on specifying the strategic trend of the university by correct strategic decision – making to reserve resources, materialistic, and immaterialistic earnings of the university. And Halawah & Taha (2011) assured that implementation of governorship generates a good climate for collective work, the seeks to attain specified destinations, and they are directed to best employment of the university resources, and defending the enquiry, and also good distribution of duties and services, their running and implementation lighten forms of difference at the university, and increase states of coalition and interaction among owners of interests, that is through increasing the effectively of clarity enquiry, control and motivation (Bzawiyah & Salmi, 2011). And the significance of governorship conceals in that it is a comprehensive organization, if invested at universities in accordance with an organized scientific method, capacity to

adapt with variables of both environments, the internal and external, decreasing the different points of view, increasing the coalition with owners of interests with what shares in achieving the competitive trait in the quality of its materialistic and immaterialistic outputs, and in its academic and scientific reputation the local, regional and international, and the extent of its obtaining the worldly accreditation (Wang, 2010).

The governorship of the universities and their administration at good form demands more enquiry, transparency and the large participation in its leadership with what guarantees the rights of owners of interests in the university education, headed by students (Khorsheed & Yousef, 2009), that is governorship of universities becomes, in general, the clear method, through which university activities, its administration, and its control are directed in order to be able to do its basic occupations in developing the community, defending the values of science, and spread the culture of scientific research, and it is the occupation, which is scientifically achieved through developing occupational human cadres and through developing occupational human cadres and defending its research and technological capacities aiming at interacting with facts of science and cognition age (Gasman, 2010), educating and training the coming generations in the field of modern sciences, and planting the culture of research and development and its values in their minds, and rebuild their political culture with what defends the values of communal participation and communal responsibility (Shibly & Manhal, 2008), and simultaneously developing scientific researchers in the field of basic and applied sciences and employing them in supporting efforts of the comprehensive development (Nasereddin, b: 2012).

The Arab and foreign literatures cleared that governorship of universities is considered an integrated mass makes balance to happen inside

the work, that its loss causes a great defect at the university and its operations and so its outputs. And shares in the governorship, the council of governorship consisted of: the Trustee Council, Deans Council, the University Council and the Scientific Departments, in addition to directors, professors, students, members from the local community and the graduates. And through the review of the previous studies, which discussed in universities governorship, rarity of Arab studies was shown, for just one study was available for the researcher, but the foreign studies, which the researcher reviewed, all of them assured implementation of governorship at universities, some of them:

The study prepared by (Corcoran, 2004) about governorship of universities and legal commitments of the university councils, which deduced that universities governorship leads to distribution of decision-making operation inside the university among the different structures of governorship (faculties, academic councils and the trustee council) and the administrative structures (departments, sections and vice-presidents and their assistants). In addition to distributing responsibility, calling to account and transparency for the sake of practicing the power of decision-making.

The unique Arab study that discussed in governorship of one of the Arab universities that study which Halawah & Taha (2011) had done aiming at making sure of the reality of implementing governorship at the University of Jerusalem. And its results showed that governorship at the University of Jerusalem is available, but not at the required level, in accordance with the worldly standards of governorship, for it tends to deal with solving the problems, values and trends, more than implementing the requirements of governorship and its standards. In addition to that most of decisions are extemporaneous, in spite of existing a letter issued by personnel affairs



concerned with the university rules and regulations (they are governorship), and the results showed that most of employees at the university do not refer to the book, concerned with rules and regulations, or misunderstand what included of texts, or they are unaware of its availability. And also there are some ambiguous items in the book or explained in away cannot be understood. And the results also showed that the weakness of financial resources had the greatest effect in un-ability to implement rules and regulations.

And (Geunda & Muscio, 2009) did a study entitled Governorship of Transferring Cognition by University: “A Critical Review of Literature”. Its results indicated to universities, that implement governorship participate in the activities of transferring cognition, witnessed great changes in governorship of relationships between university and other parties, for transferring cognition became a strategic issue as a source of financing the university researches, and as an instrument of the general policy of economic development. And universities greatly differ in the extent of their ability to rise and succeed in marketing the academic researches. And Geuna and Muscio study discussed the samples of transferring university cognition in a critical form, reviewing the modern developments in literature, rights of the thinking property, methods of transferring academic cognition, and bear the institutional attribute. And the results showed the role that universities do to transfer university cognition, and in marketing results of researches, and indicated that the governorship has its effective effect in the operation of transferring cognition and openness on other universities.

The study prepared by Lindblad and Lindblad (2009) entitled: “Governorship of Higher Education Through States” deduced that Worldly

Classification of universities is the party who led to judge on the extent of implementing governorship at universities.

Meanwhile (Irtwange & Orsaah, 2010) laid a study aimed at evaluating the effect of groups on the pattern of administration related to governorship of universities of the universities, and that the vice-president himself, or as an individual of the group is responsible for the followed pattern of administration, and about the different problems which may spoil the university work, and the principles of transparency, enquiry and participation were effective in quality of the university outputs.

But (Deboer, Huissman and Meister-Scheytt, 2010) had discussed a study entitled: “Supervision in Modern Governorship of Universities: Under Microscope”, the study discussed situations of governorship field at universities of three states; Holland, Austria and the United Kingdom, and compared among constitutions of their supervising councils in what concerns its inclusion of enquiry, independence and transparency. The study had deduced that from the modern elements in attempting reform in higher education sector in Europe is forming new structure of universities governorship, and that the supervising councils in them are part of reform operations, and in spite of the significance of these councils, but few of their members know their true work. And it indicated that the possible fields of improving and developing in present structures of councils and practicing their works do not occur except through implementing governorship and its principles accurately, and motivate the role of internal and external control in it.

And to specify the fields of Taiwani Universities learning from the American Universities in the field of governorship, (Lee & Land, 2010) wrote a study entitled: “What can the Taiwani Universities learn from the

American Universities in the field of Governorship?” The study aimed at showing the trends and issues of the Taiwani Universities governorship compared to the governorship of universities of the United States, and deducing the implementations, Taiwani Universities can benefit from the United States universities. The study deduced that governorship of the Taiwani Universities is ready inefficiency and democratic heading, though most universities in Taiwan depend both councils’ pattern in governorship as it is widespread in America, and the systems of governorship of universities in Taiwan should be responsible for the financial and administrative affairs at the university, and the university Council is responsible for academic matters with educational attribute. For the sake of that , the Taiwani Universities governorship needs more of legislative changes and communication means.

Meanwhile (Luescher – Mamashela, 2010) exerted to lay a study entitled: From Democratic Universities to un-administrative Universities: changing the University Legislative Governorship and Role of Students in it”. This study discussed in the implementations resulted in the increase of administrative participations of students at universities which implement governorship, and these implementations were theoretically discovered through a suggestion matrix from the ideal type of students’ governorship, and that was clarified through a state study of the of “Cape Town University”, which adopt the governorship at its leadership. The study deduced that after a period of the university transferring into democracy, it faced an administrative and academic advancement, its effect was positively reflected on the relationship between the student and the university, especially after implementing governorship in it, and these changes were noticed at different levels such as: student activities appearance

contradicting to politics, and appearance of students' political speeches, for they became more participating in activities in general and more transparent and their response to the enquiry with a high spirit of democracy.

But the study of (Mok, 2010) about universities in Singapore and Malaysia and the extent of its implementing the governorship, it had clarified how the academicians evaluated the implementation of governorship and its effect in the changes that emerged on the university life, for a group of reports and analyses, which came as a result of visiting the Campus and meetings during the period (2007 – 2009), were submitted, and pin – pointed that higher administration of these universities were given a sum of freedom of how to conduct their universities, most of academicians who were met, did not feel with great differences in the reforms after implementing the governorship at their universities. And most of the academicians are still exposed to pressures more than the administrations of the university instead of feeling with “muting”, or “power”. And in spite of this truth the government of Singapore and Malaysia attempted to adopt concepts and the liberal practices to finance the universities governorship, because the academicians view that the state is unable to control university and the higher education.

And (Gasman, 2010) at a study of hers deduced five lessons to leaders of the campus represented in adopting: transparency, enquiry and participation in all affairs of the university, and respecting the award of service termination, respecting the obliged procedures, respecting the mutual governorship, and defending the culture of discussion and debates between students and leaders of the university and its administrators.

And (Wang, 2010) laid a study about “Governorship of Higher Education and Independence of the University in China”, aimed at studying

the self-governing system of the university (its independence) and the extent of the government governance in higher education through drawing the policy of complicating non centralness of the higher education. And the study investigated the independence of the university through studying the rules, organizational departments and views of responses of the questionnaire and its relationship with the state, and discussed the machineries of the government domination and the Chinese Communist Party on the higher education. And the transformation of the university identity and its effect on the independence of the university was discussed. And the study deduced that implementing governorship with its principles (transparency, participation, enquiry) and coexistence of control machineries and new liberal practices showed innovation, invention and ability of advancement with them at the university and the state, and that was positively reflected on the quality of the university outputs.

But (Bzaweyah & Salmi, 2011) they both indicated in their study that there exists in Britain what approximate (III) universities and colleges, and all of them have clear and announced governorship system both universities Oxford and Cambridge for example are governed by a legislative council (the governing council) and consists of a great number of members of the university and affiliate, from graduates, employees, or registered researchers within what is called the university register, their number amounts to about (3000) members. These councils either in Britain or in the United States, they elect members of the executive councils in the university, from which the trustee council, the president and deans of the faculties. These executive councils have to include non-executive members from the university professors (being elected) and other members from the trustee council (elected by the trustee council) and students (elected by students' council).

And in some British universities there exists what is called the court, over the university council, discusses the annual report of the university, and views in the different issues, and issues the appointment decision of the president and his vice-chair-person and members of other councils, and usually the court council consists of (50-400) members at some universities.

The study deduced the following (Bzaweyah & Salmi, 2011):

- Governorship is considered one of the basic systems that aim at achieving quality, and the higher education represents the suitable floor to implement its principles.
- The experiment of the United Kingdom in universities governorship proved to be considered from the most significant present experiments, for she has an announced system to implement the principles of university governorship, and that had shared clearly in reaching of the higher education institutions advanced centers from the worldly classification of universities.
- The study specified axes of quality of the higher education, and also machineries of the institutions governorship system, and also pin-pointed how it implement machineries of governorship on the higher education for the sake of achieving quality.
- The study was terminated with characteristics of experiment of the United Kingdom in governorship of the universities.

And (Mungiu – pippidi & Dusu, 2011) had exerted an evaluation of the Roman Public Universities, (43) public universities were evaluated on the basis of original methodology from part of administrative fairness, or academic fairness, democratic government, academic governorship and the correct financing of one academic year. And the results of evaluation uncovered about existence of disciplinary problems in organizing the

university life, and performing work in it, ascribed to failure in building systems of enquiry and calling for accounting at the university level after implementing the un-centrality in the university education for competing and to improve the general form of the university, and so to reform its practice.

In light of the precedent narration, the governorship in its theoretical and applied frameworks is considered a translation of reality, for if the governorship was governed in its theoretical frame, so the correct practice is implementation that governs that this governorship is rational or it is in need of accuracy and more acute control. And through analyzing the theoretical literature and previous studies and due to the rarity of Arabic and foreign studies, aiming at showing the experiment of the Middle East University in the field of implementing governorship as a “model” other university can follow its example.

**Problem of Study:**

Many Arab and foreign conferences, that discussed the subject of governorship at universities deduced the significance of implementing governorships at universities aiming at improving their performance and guaranteeing quality of their outputs and reaching the first positions in the worldly classification of universities (Bzaweyah & Salmi, 2011).

The subject of governorship of universities starts from using transparency concepts, fairness, participation, clarity, implementing systems, regulations, and instructions, enquiry to develop communities and building them, making positive changes to occur in the states that established these universities, preparing generations able to favour the cognitive and technical explosion, and fulfilling the needs of communities with what favours the age (Khorsheed & Yousef, 2009), and due to the Middle East University implementing the governorship, this study came to clear how the Middle

East University implements the governorship, through answering its questions.

**Questions of Study:**

The first question: what is meant by governorship? The second question: What is the reality of implementing governorship at the Middle East University?

**Significance of Study:**

The significance of study starts from the significance of universities governorship concept that expresses the how of running the university, and it is controlled by all parties concerned at the university, so it is considered the instrument, that guarantees the efficiency of the university administration at benefitting from its abilities and resources to guarantee the quality of its output therefore, the researcher views that the significance of study springs from the significance of building a suggested theoretical framework of how to implement the university governorship, that is, through showing the experiment of the Middle East University in this field, so the significance is personified in the following:

- This study is considered one of the rare studies of its type – at limit of researcher’s cognition – it is considered the second among the Arabic studies after (Halawah & Taha, 2011) study which talks about the reality of implementing of universities governorship, at both Arab and foreign levels.
- It is hoped that results of this study benefit the administrative leaders at the universities through their recognizing governorship and machinery of implementing it at universities, especially the experiment of the Middle East University in this field.



- It is hoped that the results of this study are to be described as the compass that directs the governorship councils at universities and their administrative leaders and haste in the operation of implementing governorship at the university, and building a distinguished system for it.
- It is hoped that this study enriches the Arab library in the field of universities governorship.

### **Objective of Study:**

Because governorship is one of the legally, economically, administratively and politically interwoven sciences, and seeks to fight corruption with all its forms and guarantees the quality of outputs, that is, through implementing its principles (enquiry, transparency, participation) in the university administration, so the objective of this study is to clarify what is meant by universities governorship, and stages of implementing it at universities, and showing the experiment of the Middle East University in this field.

### **Methodology of Study:**

The study followed the descriptive analytical and inductive style of literature and previous studies, aiming at answering the questions of study, and achieving its objectives.

### **Answering Questions of Study:**

The answer of the first question: What is meant by governorship?

Utterance of (“Al – Hakemiyah” “Al – Hawkamah”) governorship is considered modernized in the Arabic Dictionary, it is what is called carving in language (Naht). It is an utterance taken from (Al – Hokoomah) the government, and it is what means discipline and domination, and judging with all what this word means of meanings. Therefore, the utterance of (Al – Hawkamah” includes numerous sides of it (Nasereddin, a: 2012):

- “Al-Hikmah” (wisdom): and what it demands of directing and guidance.
- “Al-Hukom” (governing): what it demands of dominating matters by laying disciplines and the chains that govern behavior.
- “Al-Ihtikam” (appealing): what demands of referring to ethical and cultural references and experience obtained through previous experiments.
- “Al-Tahakom” (suing one another): demanding justice, especially at deviation of the domination of administration and its playing with interests of sharers.

Definitions submitted to this term were abundant, for each term guides to the point of view adopted by presenter of this definition. For example the International Financing Corporation “IFC” defines this term, that it is “the system through which running companies and governing their works are done”, (Alamgir, 2007). Meanwhile, the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development “DECD” defined it as “a group of relations in between persons responsible for running the company, board of administration, and shareholders and else from sharers” (Jan, 2008).

And by analyzing the incoming definitions in studies, which discussed universities governorship (Ridh & Abdullah, 2011; Urgi & Abdel Samad, 2011; Jan, 2008) can deduce the following meanings of the universities governorship concept:

- A group of systems concerned with control on the performance of the university.
- Organizing relationships among university councils governorship (trustee council, university council, deans council).
- A group of rules by which university running and control on it due to a certain structure including distribution of rights and duties in between

the university administration and councils of the university governorship with what guarantees quality of the university outputs.

There-upon, the governorship is not a pure comprehensive administration of the university, but it is a larger sphere and a more general concept, it is an integrated organization represented in the group of legislations, aiming at achieving the quality of operations and outputs, and both administrations; academic and administrative and its distinction (Bzaweyah & Salmi, 2011), that is through selecting suitable strategies to achieve destinations of the university, and it is too an integrated group of human elements and interactive and integrated materialism, that makes harmony and balance inside the university to exist, for its loss causes a great defect in operations of the university, and then in its outputs, and in general governorship is built on three principles:

- Transparency, it means designing systems, machineries, policies, legislations, and their implementation, and it is considered of the important worldly standards in classifying states and conducting them and universities (Bzaweyah & Salmi, 2011), for it is a machinery to measure the extent of implementing governorship in the community, and it allows individuals to obtain cognition and information concerned with governorship so that they can make decisions with mutual effect (Al-Tai'I & Hamad, 2010). And it means transparency and clearance of what is going on inside the university, with the accessibility of objective and accurate information flowing and easiness of using and implementing them actually by employees in the university. This clarity means that university students can easily proclaim to the university leadership about what is going on inside themselves, and about their problems and needs, the matter that generates fruitful discussions between the university

leaders and the students. And the open meetings form a challenge to students thinking and motivate them to participate and share in covering the values of debates and constructive communication between the university leaders and its students (Nasereddin, a: 2012).

- Participation, it is the councils of governorship allowing both staffs the academic and administrative, students and the community to participate in drawing policies, and laying rules of work at different fields of university life (Lee & Land, 2010), and give the opportunity to university students to have a role in the operation of decision-making (Khorsheed & Yousef, 2009), and the good governorship has to contain all contents of participation to support the university leadership and councils of governorship in it as a model in implementing the university policies.
- Enquiry, means enabling the concerned individuals inside and outside the university to control work without leading to breakdown the system or offending others (Khorsheed & Yousef, 2008), in addition to implement systems and instructions with all transparency on all employees in the university and on its students (Corcoran, 2004), and enquiry is considered the other face of the leadership, and without it the leadership will be a dictatorship (Nasereddin, b: 2012), and it is a commitment forces others for calling for accounting, or answering about responsibility which depends on them (Al-Aabbas, 2010).

But (Graham & Plumptre, 2003) had added to these principles other principles, they are:

- Trend: means the concern of community leaders at large sphere and long run with the good government and human development.

- Performance: it is the response of the universities at an attempt to serve all owners of interest within the framework of the effectiveness, efficiency, and operations, aiming at achieving results, that fulfill the public needs and obtain the highest level of benefit from the available resources.
- Equity: by the meaning of achieving justice for all and advancement with them, and fulfilling their needs, and guaranteeing sovereignty of the law. And it is obliged for the legal frames to be just and executed fairly, especially the rules concerning human rights.

Answering the second question: what is the reality of implementing governorship in the Middle East University?

Studies that discussed in implementing governorship at universities assure that there is a group of standards reflect and clarify values, which prevail and affect governorship of universities are: (Nasereddin, b: 2012, Khorsheed & Yousef, 2009; Saleh, 2010; Halawah & Taha, 2011; Izzat, 2010):

- Existence of rules systems and instructions clarifies the best styles of practicing the power of governorship councils at the university (trustee council, university council, deans council, faculties councils, and sections councils) and its administrative leadership.
- The extent of proportional participation of the employees, and the local community from non-members of governorship councils and the directors in decision-making, and in directing the track of work at the university.
- The extent of the governorship councils and employees endurance of their roles at the university.

- Extent of existence of primary committees following the governorship councils discussing works that need research and detailed study.
- Extent of announcing salaries of the governorship councils members and employees and their rewards, and what connects them of achievements and works done.
- Degree of implementing standards of guaranteeing local, Arab and regional quality.

Many studies assured that the fields of governorship are various and different at universities (Corcoran, 2009), but they are connected with episodes of one series, gathers between each of them to affect the other and be affected by him, and works to achieve its objectives all, they are (Al-Tii & Hamad, 2010):

**Field One: establishing the concept of commitment and its culture:**

For the philosophy of governorship is performed on enriching the concept of commitment and fertilizing its culture, and it is an advancement structural thinking, performed on establishing the educational and ethical content with large sphere (Al-Taii & Hamad, 2010; Mok, 2010).

**Field Two: achieving credibility and increasing the elements of trust:**

Achieving credibility and increase of trust in data and information, issued about the university, and what it includes of reports and clarifying what occurs and done in it is considered one of the most important fields of governorship and is positively reflected on the university operations and its outputs (Gasman, 2010; Al-Taii & Hamad, 2010).

**Field Three: improving transparency and achieving clearance:**

Governorship is used as an instrument of enlightenment, getting light and shedding light on the different sides acting at the university, and so belittling of mistiness and un-clearance, ambiguity and darkness. The

stronger governorship is, the most effective it was, because it improves the degree of transparency and clearance (Naser Al-Deen, b: 2012; Al-Taii & Hamad, 2010).

**Field Four: saving elements of local and international investing attraction:**

Governorship is not a destination in itself, but it is a means to reach achieving numerous objectives related to the university and its strategy (Lee & Land, 2010).

**Field Five: achieving justice and implementing the principle of (at the foot of leveling):**

Governorship in this field is performed on preparing available opportunity for all, and on implementing this principle, the thing that increases feeling with justice and fairness, and so with security, and with what defaces states of un-ability, greed, and corruption (Al-Taii & Hamad, 2010; Nasereddin, b: 2012).

**Field Six: good running of the university:**

Governorship concentrates on running the university, especially what relates to operations of planning, or organizing, or directing or following up with efficiency and effectively, and then it increases by the university administrative ability through specifying the objectives concerning each activity, specifying the executive programs, and congregating resources and capacities guaranteeing to execute these objectives (Geuna & Muscio, 2009).

**Field Seven: increasing effectiveness and concern:**

Governorship does a very important role in increasing effectiveness at the university, and makes its present and future promising through numerous means, of them: quality of outputs and advancement with their type, and

acquire competitive traits by its graduates (Al-Taii & Hamad, 2010; Nasereddin, b: 2012).

And in addition to different councils, the university controls through numerous committees, the most important of which the financial committee, which is entrusted to submit its reports to the general council about the activities and financial behavior that took place at the university, and the committee of revision which consists of two non executive members and three executive members, from its duties reviewing systems of internal control at the university, risks administration, reviewing the effectiveness of the financial system efficiency at the university, report about the university accounts review, and recommendation of appointing the external reference (Lee & Land, 2010).

And from the primary duties at the university administration is the internal review, which is entrusted, through the committee of review to submit its report to the general council, and to the executive director of the university about the efficiency of risks administration and its appropriateness, the internal control and governorship arrangements at the university, there upon the internal reviewers have to submit reasonable assurance about these things.

And some modern studies, such as (Basheekh, 2009; Al-Bareedi, 2009; Al-Jurf & Abu Mousa, 2009; Khattab, 2009; Khalil, 2009; Sami, 2009; Al-Khateeb & Gareet, 2010; Tarabeyeh, 2010; Abu Gheit, 2010; Halawah & Taha, 2011; Ridah & Abdullah, 2011) assured that there is a group of indicators, by which measuring the extent of governorship effectiveness is done at the universities, they are a group of standards, clarified by the following point:



- Existence of communique including regulations, systems and instructions containing the best styles of practicing the power of the higher governorship councils at the universities and their administrative leaderships.
- Extent of proportional participation of non members of governorship councils and directors at decision making and directing the track of work at the university.
- Extent of separation and dividing the work and roles of governorship councils and employees at the university.
- Extent of availability of primary committees following the governorship councils discussing deeds need research and detailed study.
- Degree of announcing salaries and rewards of governorship councils members and employees and what connect them of achievements and deeds done, and extent of what each achieved of results and their harmony with what is contracted upon.

The previous standards are considered basic supports for stages of implementing governorship at the universities, and assured that each of: (Tarabeyeh, 2010; Al-Aabbas, 2010; Halawah & Taha, 2011; Khorsheed & Yousef, 2009; Shibli & Manhal, 2008; Ii'zzat, 2009).

The Middle East University implemented the governorship in it through five stages, they are:

**The First stage:**

Definition of governorship (spreading culture of governorship) and consisting a general point of view supporting it.

It is the most important and dangerous stage at all, in it the governorship milestones and sides are already clarified, and dimensions and concepts concerning it are clarified. And also its methods, instruments,

messages, and differentiation between the governorship as a culture, behavior and commitment, and the governorship as the basis of fair treatments.

### **The Second stage:**

Building the basic structure of the governorship on strong bases able to absorb its movement, able to interact with variables and new occurrences, and it is a compound structure, interwoven and extended, for the basic structure is considered perfectly necessary to found the governorship and implement it, and achieve understanding and effective coexistence among the different parties.

The basic structure is an important and obligatory element for founding the governorship, which is divided into two parts; they are:

Upper basic structure of the governorship, covering the institutional organizational entity (governorship councils) and the supervising parties on their implementation, at the level of the university.

Lower basic structure of the governorship, covering the basic and ethical evaluation.

### **The Third stage:**

Laying a standardizing program of the governorship and specifying its measuring durations:

A schedule had been laid, specified for deeds, duties, and obligations for all those belonging to the university, for achieving all expected and searched for objectives.

### **The Fourth stage:**

Executing governorship and implementing it:

In this stage implementing the truthful experiments were done, that measure the extent of readiness and wish of all parties in implementing

governorship. The governorship, as it has freedoms also governing restrictions and adjustments are practiced in it too.

**The Fifth stage:**

Governorship following up and developing it:

Governorship following its implementation up and guaranteeing good execution and developing it is considered one of the most important previous stages, for control and follow up are considered the main instrument the university uses for the good executing of the governorship, and it is a control with integrated derivative nature. It has two main occupations, they are:

- Operational therapy to deal with any error, or shortage occurs.
- Precautionary inventive occupation performed on the tools and means that increase effectiveness of governorship and so, an organizational administrative unit inside the administrative structure and the organizational construction of the university, to follow up the good performance of all the university belongings, with what guarantees the execution of governorship values at an effective and accurate form.

And from the obligatory to be mentioned that each stage of the previous stages subdued to continuous evaluation (constituent), for it forms in its group interactive and interpenetrated rings, seeking to attain a specified destination, it is the guarantee of quality of outputs and good performance of all individuals of personnel.

The implementation of governorship at the Middle East University enabled it to attain its strategic destinations, for implementing it led to framing the relationship between the university and the councils of its governorship and owners of interests and employees in it and students on clear scientific bases, in addition to specifying the responsibilities entrusted on each of them and to follow up executing them, and its implementation

enabled to uproot states of carelessness at employees and students, and the un-responsible loss that may occur at the university through implementing policies characterized with clearance and transparency, and this led to enable all those who belong to the university and students to practice their role at a complete form and a high degree of accuracy. And governorship had saved a healthy environment for work through the principle of enquiry and respecting regulations, systems and instructions, and exerted effort to increase trust and defending the culture of discussion among the different persons belonging to the university and its leadership and students, and founded formulations of cooperation, interaction and integration at work, and improving performance and developing it.

The administrative dimension, which is considered one of the most important dimensions of governorship, concentrated on the university leadership and governorship councils in it, and the machinery of transition from the prevailing administration to the governorship had the most effective effect in implementing the governorship at the university and achieving its objectives. But the economic dimension had achieved the distinguished relationship between the governorship and size of investment at the university from a part, and annihilation of corruption shapes from the second part and achieving the continuous development and correcting the track from a third part.

Meanwhile the social dimension treated the extent of adopting a behavior code for both the teaching and administrative staffs and students in it. For contents of governorship values connected directly with adopted behavior patterns, specified by governorship principles. But the financial dimension was conspicuously appeared through the governorship implementation, which worked on organizing the relationship and specifying

it among the effecting and affected parties by the university policies, decisions, and its financial results.

And in general, implementing the governorship at the Middle East University has a distinguished importance in our contemporary world and in the coming wisdom age, for its implementation worked on glorifying the value of the university and its competitive ability, especially in the field of its outputs and its regional and worldly situation, and so it works on specifying the strategic trend of the university, by correct strategic decision making to keep resources and materialistic and immaterialistic gains of the university, and by that the governorship implementation at the university created a good climate for collective work, which sought to attain specified destinations directed to the best using of the university resources and defending the enquiry, and the good distribution of duties, services and their running and implementation had decreased the discrepancy shapes at the university and increased states of collision and interaction among owners of interests, by that the university sought to implement governorship in accordance with an organized scientific method, that acquired it the capacity of adaptation with variables of both internal and external environments. And decreased the different points of view, and increased the collision with owners of interests, the thing that may share in achieving the competitive trait in the quality of the university materialistic and immaterialistic outputs and in its academic and scientific form, the local, regional and international, and the extent of obtaining the worldly accreditation.

Aiming at reconnoitering the reality of implementing governorship at the Middle East University from the point of view of both teaching and administrative staffs and human resources in there, and what if there are differences at the reality of governorship implementation, due to difference

of occupational post at the individuals of sample of study to a number of years experience. Dr. Yacoub Adel Nasereddin, Head of Trustee Council of the Middle East University, had laid a study to investigate that (Nasereddin, 28-32: b, 2012). This study investigated the reality of implementing governorship at the Middle East University from the point of view of both the teaching and administrative staffs working there, and the sample of study consisted of best using of the university resources and defending the enquiry, and the good distribution of duties, services and their running and implementation had decreased the discrepancy shapes at the university and increased states of collision and interaction among owners of interests, by that the university sought to implement governorship in accordance with an organized scientific method, that acquired it the capacity of adaptation with variables of both internal and external environments. And decreased the different points of view, and increased the collision with owners of interests, the thing that may share in achieving the competitive trait in the quality of the university materialistic and immaterialistic out-puts and in its academic and scientific form, the local, regional and international, and the extent of obtaining the worldly accreditation.

Aiming at reconnoitering the reality of implementing governorship at the Middle East University from the point of view of both teaching and administrative staffs and human resources in there, and what if there are differences at the reality of governorship implementation, due to difference of occupational post at the individuals of sample of study to a number of years experience. Dr. Yacoub Adel Nasereddin, Head of Trustee Council of the Middle East University had laid a study to investigate that (Nasereddin, 28-32, b: 2012). This study investigated the reality of implementing governorship at the Middle East University from the point of view of both

the teaching and administrative staffs working there, and the sample of study consisted of (113) members of both the administrative and the teaching staffs at the university, of them (64) members of the teaching staff and (49) administrators were chosen from the simple random community of study. And to collect data a scale prepared by the researcher was used, consisted of (50) paragraphs, was assured of its validity and reliability by using Cronbach Alpha a quotient. And to statistically analyze data arithmetic means and standard deviations were used, and t-test for two independent samples, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Shefee test for dimensional comparisons.

Results of Nasereddin's study (28-30 b: 2012) related to question one: "What is the reality of implementing governorship at the Middle East University from the point of view of both teaching and administrative staffs and personnel individuals?". Showed that implementing governorship at the Middle East University was high from the whole point of view of the administrators and the teaching staff members with an arithmetic mean (4.08). But at the level of administrators was high with an arithmetic mean (3.96), meanwhile it was (4.19) to the teaching staff members, and was high too. And Nasereddin (28-30 b: 2012) ascribed these results to that the Middle East University, represented in the Head of its Trustee Council and Councils of governorship in it is serious in implementing governorship and its principles at all administrative and academic fields of the university. That starts from the university policies and strategic plans, and its conviction that it will reach universality and a distinguished worldly classification through implementing governorship, and this is what (Bzaweyah & Salmi, 2011; Khorsheed & Yousef 2008, 2009; Moka, 2010; Wang, 2010). The height of the arithmetic mean of the teaching staff members higher than the

administrators was ascribed to that the teaching staff members are more concerned and sticking to the governorship and its fields, due to their job, occupation and the nature of duties and responsibilities, and this what (Khorsheed & Yousef, 2009) assured.

Meanwhile the directly connected paragraphs with standards of the university implementing the rule of Jordanian universities, systems and instructions of the corporation of Jordanian Higher Education Associations Accreditation, and the councils of governorship at the university practicing their responsibilities, and existence of systems and special instructions of the university, and dis-interference of the directors staff of the university company in the academic and administrative activities of the university and the financial matters of it, there is a high estimation (Nasereddin, 28-30, b: 2010) ascribed that to the following reasons:

- Conferences, symposiums and meetings concluded by the Trustee Council of the university for all deans, directors of departments, and teaching staff members, in which the governorship standards, principles and its importance were raised to make the face of the university and its fame conspicuous, and attempts to reach the position of worldly classification through implementing the governorship at all its academic and administrative fields, and this may be reflected on the university operations and outputs, and this was assured by (Bzaweyah & Salmi, 2011) and (Halawah & Taha, 2011) and (Corcoran, 2004).
- Wisemen councils follow up and the Head of its Trustee Council of the good implementation of the university to the Rule of Jordanian Universities as a whole and accurate, in addition to the university implementation of systems and instructions of the Jordanian Corporation for Higher Education Association. Accreditation, and reconnoitering



systems of worldly and regional Accreditation Corporations and their instructions and implementation, in what serves the vision and message of the university, positively reflected on the extent of the governorship councils practice of their responsibilities punctually and accurately at the university, the thing that assisted it to build systems and instructions concern the university, covering both administrative and academic sides. This agrees with what (Al-Taii & Hamad, 2010; Halawah & Taha, 2011; Mungiu – Pipidi & Dusu, 2011; and Saleh, 2010).

- Interference of directors staff of the university company, its directors of academic, administrative, or financial affairs of the university, may have their effective effect in implementing governorship at the university, for dis-interference of owner or head of directors staff in the university academic and administrative affairs is considered with effect on standing a barrier against implementing governorship in it.
- The councils of governorship at the university and doing their duties and responsibilities and following them at the university from all fields, may have the effective effect in implementing governorship, and this is what each of: Halawah & Taha (2011); and Bzaweyah & Salmi (2011), in addition to motivating councils of governorship of the internal and external control departments had assured, and motivation of principles of enquiry, transparency and participation in the university work, and this is what each of: Bzaweyah & Salmi (2011); and Khorsheed & Yousef (2009); and Wang (2010); and Lee Land (2010) had assured.

But the paragraphs related to implementing systems and instructions, aiming at decreasing crises, and the employee demanding to obtain his rights supported by systems and just instructions, and un-domination from any of the governorship councils members on individuals, or group, and

implementing a system of enquiry by the university at both levels individual and collective, and participation of representatives from the local community in laying development plans at the university, and participation of representatives of the administration of the university and deanships in laying rules of the budget expender. All of these came an arithmetic mean of high rate, but it needs to be reviewed and supported to reach a very high arithmetic mean or even distinguished, and this demands to build a scale to investigate the extent of employees' consent about those fields mentioned in the paragraphs about their chiefs and their occupational state aiming at advancement with governorship and fields of its implementation at a more effective form. Naser Al-Deen (28-30, b: 2010) ascribed causes of previous results, in addition to what was above mentioned t the following:

- Non-existence of crises at the university, and so the systems and instructions concerning that are not implemented, from the point of view of theirs, or un reconnoitering them on those crises if existed and how to treat them. This is what (Khorsheed & Yousef, 2009).
- All employees enjoyed all their occupational rights, and the possibility of their obtaining them at any time, because of the existence of systems and special organized instructions. That has its effective effect in the success of implementing governorship at the university.
- Existence of media system, known as Rules and Instructions of the University, but it may be unknown to some people, or not motivated at a complete form, or does not show it to all employees, because the nature of their work does not demand that, and may the media system is unmotivated at the required form on which it should be (Mok, 2010) assured that.

- Un-conviction of some responses with the principles of enquiry or transparency may be the reason of the low in the arithmetic mean to the height below the very high, either because they are employees, or that they have weak points, and they do not wish any-body to be aware of them. This was what (Bzaweyah & Salmi, 2011) mentioned; (Saleh, 2010); (Wang & Gasman, 2010).
- Un-reconnoitering some academicians, or administrators, or their awareness that the university invites representatives from the local community to participate in councils of its governorship, that is, because of the nature of their work, or they consider such matters do not concern them. This is what corresponds on participation in laying the budget of deanships or departments and centers too. This is to what (Halawah & Taha, 2011) indicated.

And in general, the result of the answer of this question (question one) is assured in particular by (Corcoran, 2004) and (Bzaweyah & Salmi, 2011), for they assured that universities governorship leads to distribute the power of decisions inside the university through the councils of its governorship, and through its administrative structures and in it accountancy, enquiry, tnsparency and participation and its motivation are all defended. And this is what Khorsheed & Yousef studies 2008 and 2009 and Wang's study 2010 assured (Bzaweyah & Salmi, 2011) and (Lindblad & Lindbland, 2009) indicated that the university, that implements governorship will lead the university to be at the first positions at universities worldly classification, as it is at the British universities. And this is what Bzaweyah & Salmi study (2011) assured, in addition to distinction in quality of its outputs, and councils of effective governorship result in implementing distinguished

governorship. And this is what the present study brought and was assured by (Lee & Land, 2010) study and so by Mok (2010) study.

But results related with the second question from Nasereddin (31, b, 2012) study “are there differences with statistical indication at the level of ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) at the reality of implementing governorship at the Middle East University, due to the difference of the occupational position for individuals of the sample of study?”. It had shown the existence of differences with statistical indication at the level of ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) due to the difference of occupational position, for it was for the interest of the teaching members and with an arithmetic mean (4.19) compared with the administrators, who obtained an arithmetic mean (3.96), and at both states was high, and that may refer to (Nasereddin, 31: b, 2012):

- The university implements governorship with faith and potency, because it takes with principles of enquiry, participation and transparency, and this is positively reflected on the fame of the university, its shape and on its outputs quality. This is what was assured by each of: (Lee & Land, 2010), (Corncoran, 2004), (Khorsheed & Yousef, 2008) & (Khorsheed & Yousef, 2009).
- The administrators and the teaching staff members and due to their occupations, their outlook to the extent of implementing governorship differs, because of the nature of their duties and jobs. So, we find them at the teaching staff members higher than the administrators, because they are the most in touch of and fraction with the fields of university governorship, for most of the teaching staff members have awareness of the governorship and its dimensions, especially that from among teaching staff members a great number of persons from the Faculty of Business Administration who have academic awareness with companies

governorship and this is what positively reflects on their knowledge of universities governorship and machineries of its implementation, and this is what Mungiu – pippidi & Dusu, 2011 assured; but the administrators, a great part of them are newly appointed, especially administrative departments directors and chair – persons of administrative sections, and they do not know much about the university and the extent of implementing governorship.

Meanwhile, results of answering question three of Nasereddin (31-32: b, 2012) “are there differences with statistical indication at the level ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the reality of implementing governorship at the Middle East University due to difference of the number of years of service to individuals of the sample of study?”, existence of differences with statistical indication of the reality of implementing the governorship due to the variable of years of experience. It was for the interest of those with more than two years experience then followed that those who have two years experience. Then was lower arithmetic mean to those who have just one year experience, causes of this may be ascribed to the following; (Nasereddin, 31-32: b: 2012):

- Individuals of the sample of study with more than two years experience are more aware of the extent of implementing governorship at the Middle East University, for they co-existed stages of implementing the strategic plan at the university, or following it up, in addition to their participation in conferences and symposiums held by the university for all deans of faculties and directors of departments, in respect of laying policies of the university and putting frames of implementing governorship at the university. But those with two years experience had coexisted a limited number of efficiencies concerning the university

policies, or implementing governorship at the university and were subjected to short courses of that. But those with one year experience, they got acquainted with governorship and fields of its implementation through their chiefs or colleagues, so their experience at that a little bit limited.

### **Recommendations:**

Starting from that universities governorship is considered an integrated organization of a group of integrated human and non-human elements, integrated and interacted, generate harmony and balance inside the university, for their loss causes a great defect in its operations and then in its outputs, and starting from results of this study, we can recommend the following:

- **In the field of studies:**
  - Doing a similar study at the public and private universities to investigate the reality of implementing governorship in them.
  - Preparing studies to investigate the negative effects resulted from dis-implementing governorship at the universities.
- **In other fields:**
  - Review of universities governorship systems, their concepts and the extent of its implementation yearly, for the sake of amending in effective items, and laying systems to be in harmony with the university situation, and requirements of students and employees clearly, and with the worldly trends at governorship of universities.
  - Preparing enlightenment programs for students and both the teaching staff members and administrators, especially new individuals, through symposiums, lectures and workshops about governorship, its principles and fields of implementing them.

### **Firstly: Arabic References:**

- Abul Gheit Huweida (2010). “Role of Governorship in Improving the Performance of Local Administration”. Unpublished Doctorate Dissertation. Assadat Academy for Administrative Sciences – Egypt.
- Al-Aabbas, Mohammad (2010). Governorship of Universities. [maalabbas@kk.edu.sa](mailto:maalabbas@kk.edu.sa).
- Basheekh, Abdel Lateef Bin Mohammad Abdel Rahman (2009). “List of companies governorship and the relationship with quality of accountancy information and the Saudi Share Market”. Conference of companies Governorship. 31/10 – I/II/2009, King Fahed University.
- Al-Breidi, Abdullah (2009). Problematic of the Term in the Arab Administrative Thinking implementing on the term Governance is a methodological description of the problematic and a suggested frame to treat it. Conference of companies Governorship. 31/10 – I/II/2009 King Fahed University.
- Bzaweyah, Abdel Hakim & Salmi, Abdel Jabbar (2011). “Quality of Higher Education in the shadow of achieving principles of Governorship: Experiment of the United Kingdom in Governorship of Universities” the International place of Assembly about Governorship at the University: evaluation of Governorship styles in the Higher Education 3-4/10/2011.
- Al-Jurf, Yaser and Abu Mousa, Ahmad (2009). “A Reconnoitering Study about the extent of the Saudi companies implementation of the machineries and principles of companies governorship”. Conference of companies Governorship. 31/10-I/II/2009 King Fahed University.
- Halawah, Jamal & Taha, Nidaa (2011). “Reality of Governorship at the University of Jerusalem”, University of Jerusalem, Institute of

Sustainable Development, House of Developmental Science, Jerusalem, Palestine.

- Khattab, Mohammad Shihatah (2009). “Factors of the success of accountancy information system programs and their role in motivating companies governorship: a field study on the Saudi companies”. Conference of Companies Governorship. 31/10-I/II/2009 King Fahed University.
- Al-Khateeb, Khaled & Goreit, Ii’sam (2010). Concepts of Governorship and its implementations, Damascus University, Faculty of Economics.
- Khalil, Mohammad Ahmed (2009). “Role of Companies Governorship in Developing the Balanced Scale of performance: A Theoretical Field Study”. Conference of companies Governorship. 31/10/I-II/2009, King Fahed University.
- Khalil, Mohammad & Al-Iishmawi, Ahmed (2008). “Institutional Governorship” Al Hurriyah Bookshop for Publicaiton and Distribution, Cairo, Republic of Arab Egypt.
- Khorsheed, Mu’tz & Yousef, Muhsen (2008). “Challenges of Reality and Visions of the Future: Role of students and Legislative Reform in the Administration of the University. A workshop organized by the Arab Reform Forum at the Library of Alexanria.
- Khorsheed, Mu’taz & Yousef, Muhsen (2009). “Governorship of Universities and Defending abilities of Higher Education system and scientific research in Egypt”. Conference of Governorship of the Higher Education organized by the Arab Reform Forum at the Library of Alexandria.
- Rida, Jawehdu & Abdullah Mayo (2011). Implementing principles and practices of accountancy governorship, the international place of



assembly, the first The accountancy governorship of the institution: a reality, bets and Horizons, bensaidamine. Yolasite.com.

- Sami, Majdi Mohammad (2009). “The External Review is one of the Companies Governorship machineries”. Conference of Companies Governorship. 31/10-I/II/2009, King Fahed University.
- Shibly, Mosallam & Manhal, Mohammad (2008). “Building a Strategic Perspective of the Governorship System and measuring the level of a Reconnoitering Study instrument at Al-Basrah University”, Al-Basrah University, Faculty of Administration and Economics/ Department of Business Administration. [www.nazaha.i9/searchweb/edare/9/doc](http://www.nazaha.i9/searchweb/edare/9/doc).
- Saleh, Mohammad Gharabah (2010). “Extent of Implementing the Principle of Clearance and Transparency from the principles of companies Governorship at the Company of Biirel Modawwar Sharing Limited”. Master Degree Dissertation, Al-Najah National University, Nablus, West Bank.
- Al-Tai’I Ali and Hamad, A’ala’a (2010). “Dimensions of Local Governorship in Iraq: a field study in the Local Council of Al-Mahmoudiyah District” Journal of Baghdad Economic College, No. (25), 41-68.
- Tarabeyah, Khaled (2010). Companies Governorship. [www.nazha.i9/searchweb/edare/g.doc.kh.fturabi@yahoo.com](http://www.nazha.i9/searchweb/edare/g.doc.kh.fturabi@yahoo.com).  
[khaledkai@yahoo.com](mailto:khaledkai@yahoo.com).
- Izzat Ahmed (2009). “Concept of Universities Governorship purpose of it and means of Implementing it”. Amman, Jordan.
- Al-Ghalibi, Taher Muhsen and Al-Aamiri, Saleh Mahdi (2008). “Social Responsibility and Ethics of Business: Business and the Community”, Amman: Dar Wael for Publication.

- Nasereddin, Yacoub Adel (a: 2012). “Suggested Theoretical Framework for universities Governorship and Indications of Implementing it in light of Comprehensive Quality Requirements”, accepted research for publication in the coming numbers of the Journal of Developing University Performance – Al-Mansourah University.
- Naser Al-Deen, Yacoub Adel (b: 2012). “Reality of Implementing Governorship at the Middle East University from the pointf view of both staffs, the Teaching Staff Members and Administrators working there”. Accepted Research for publication in the coming numbers of the Journal of the Arab Universities Union.
- Yurqi, Hussein and Abdel Samad, Omar (2011). “Reality of Governing Institutions in Algeria and means of motivating them”. University of Al-Mudyah. Bensaidamine.yolasite.com.

### **Secondly: Foreign References:**

- Alamgir, M, (2007) «Corporate Governance: A Risk Perspective», paper presented to: Corporate Governance and Reform: Paving the Way to Financial Stability and Development. **A Conference organized by the Egyptian Banking Institute**, May 7 – 8, Cairo, p:03.
- Corcoran ,Suzanne. (2004). Duty, Discretion and Conflict: University Governance and the Legal Obligations of University Boards. **Australian Universities' Review**, 46 (2) p30-37.
- Deboer, Harry,. Huisman, Jeroen & Meister-Scheytt Claudia. (2010). Supervision in "Modern" University Governance: Boards under Scrutiny. **Studies in Higher Education**, 35 (3) p317-333.
- Gasman, Marybeth. (2010). Five Lessons for Campus Leaders: Academic Freedom, Shared Governance, and Tenure at an Historically Black

- University. Change: **The Magazine of Higher Learning**, 42 (6) p54-57.
- Geuna, Aldo & Muscio, Alessandro. (2009). «The Governance of University Knowledge Transfer: A Critical Review of the Literature». Minerva: **A Review of Science, Learning and Policy**, 47 (1) p93-114.
- Graham, jone& Plumptre Tim, (2003). "**principles for Good Governance in the 21st century**" Wheelen Thomas and David Hunger, "Strategic Management " ,9th edition ,Prentice- Hall ,New JERSEY.
- Irtwange, S. V. & Orsaah, S.(2010). “Assessment of Groups Influence on Management Style as Related to University Governance”. **Educational Research and Reviews**, 5 (2) p46-63.
- Jan, Cattrysse, (2008) « Reflections On Corporate Governance And The Role Of The Internal Auditors», Roularta Media Group, [on line], **Available at [www.papers.ssrn.com](http://www.papers.ssrn.com)**, (20/10/2008), P:04.
- Lee, Lung-Sheng & Land, Ming H. (2010). What University Governance Can Taiwan Learn from the United States?. Online Submission, **Paper presented at the International Presidential Forum (Harbin, China). 9 pp.**
- Lindblad, Sverker & Lindblad, Rita Foss. (2009). «Transnational Governance of Higher Education: On Globalization and International University Ranking Lists». **Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education**, 108 (2)2 p180-202.
- Luescher-Mamashela, Thierry, M. (2010). From University «Democratisation to Managerialism: The Changing Legitimation of University Governance and the Place of Students». **Tertiary Education and Management**, 16 (4) p259-283.
- Mok, Ka Ho. (2010). When State Centralism Meets Neo-Liberalism: Managing University Governance Change in Singapore and Malaysia. Higher Education: **The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning**, 60 (4) p419-440.

Mungiu-Pippidi, Alina & Dusu, Andra Elena. (2011). Civil Society and Control of Corruption: Assessing Governance of Romanian Public Universities. **International Journal of Educational Development**, 31 (5) p526-540.

Wang, Li. (2010). Higher Education Governance and University Autonomy in China. **Globalisation, Societies and Education**, 8 (4) p477-495.

AMEU