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Abstract
This study was designed to examine the activities of Governing Councils on staff and students personnel in the Management of federal and state Universities in the North-central States, Nigeria. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. The population of the study was 1827, made up of 163 governing council members, 1292 senate members, 98 ASUU executive members, 90 SSANU executive members, 83 NASU executive members and 101 SUG executive members, from the 11 public funded Universities of federal and states in the north-central states, Nigeria. The sample of the study was 374 consisting of 33 governing Council members, 271 Senate members, 53 Staff union executive members and 17 SUG executive members representing 20.5% of the population, drawn using proportionate stratified random sampling technique from 6 public funded Universities of Federal and States in the North-Central States, Nigeria. The instruments for data collection were a 10 item structured questionnaire titled: Governing Councils’ Activities and University Management Questionnaire (GCAUMQ), Interview Schedule and FGD Guide. The response options for the questionnaire items in clusters A & B were; Very High Extent (VHE), High Extent (HE), Low Extent (LE), and Very Low Extent (VLE) with numerical values of 4,3,2 and 1 points respectively. The instruments were validated by three experts. Cronbach Alpha method was used to determine the internal consistency of the questionnaire items. The reliability indices of the clusters were 0.85 and 0.79 for clusters A &B respectively. The overall reliability coefficient was 0.82. The researcher with the help of 5 research assistants administered copies of the questionnaire and also conducted interview and FGD. Data collected were presented using descriptive statistics while t-test was used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The data from interviews and FGD were qualitatively analyzed. The major findings were; There was no significant difference in the mean ratings of senate members and staff union executives of federal and state universities on the extent, the governing council activities influenced staff personnel administration at (3.05, 2.91); the council and senate members in federal and state universities significantly differed in their mean responses on the extent that the governing councils activities affected the student personnel administration at (3.61, 2.77). It was recommended among others that governing councils of federal and state universities should follow due process in the recruitment, appointment and promotion of staff; governing councils of universities at federal and state should not intimidate or harass SUG leadership on matters affecting student body. Again student should not be discriminated against on admission matters on the basis of ethnic and state of origin considerations.
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Introduction

Universities are unarguably the highest institutions of learning the world over, and therefore, most countries consider these institutions as critical to their overall national development. According to Asimiran and Sufean (2009), “University is a fascinating institution with many faces: academic, scientific, social, cultural, economic, political, religious and commercial. Whatever it is, the noble vision and mission of the University is to generate, expand, and disseminate knowledge in all disciplines for the advancement of human civilization”. Developed countries have made giant scientific, technological, economic and of course, political gains because of the quality of manpower derived from their universities. It is important to note that less developed countries that are interested in fast-tracking their development, place adequate attention and emphasis on the quality of manpower that is turned out of their educational institutions, especially universities (Ukase, 2011).

Mgbekem (2004) holds that University education prepares people through teaching and learning for acquisition of knowledge and skills for job performance in the civil service, business organization, private enterprises and corporations as well as individual enterprises, as a means of producing high level manpower for the country’s economy. In the same vein, Onokerhoraye and Nwoyen (1995), posited that universities are major vehicles for economic and social development in different parts of the world. Despite the immense benefits of University education in nation building, the potentials of higher education and indeed the University system in developing countries to fulfill its responsibilities is frequently thwarted by long standing problems. A number of these problems have inhibited goal attainment and are raising questions, doubts and fears.

In Nigeria however, each University has been established by a law whether by Federal or State Government, (Korgba, 2011). Since the attainment of Independence by Nigeria in 1960, there are currently 37 Federal Universities across the six geo-political zones of the country. Apart from the federal universities, there are 37 state owned universities and 50 privately owned universities. That means, Nigeria presently has a total of 124 universities. (National University Commission (NUC), 2014). In order to achieve the aims and objectives for which these Universities are set-up, each of the Universities has a Governing Council. These Councils are the highest policy making bodies of the universities. The Governing Council is the University’s governing body and has the responsibility for both the general direction and superintendence of its University, (Oshio, 2004). The governing councils also respond to the challenges involved in the governance process by making the decisions for sustainable, ethical, and effective management of public University education, (Korgba, 2011).

The composition of the councils is supposed to reflect the Federal Character, gender representation and locational interest and is never through election by the University communities concerned, (Ekong, 2001). Established by the University (Miscellaneous Provisions Amendment) Act (2003), the powers, functions and general mandate of the Governing Councils run inter-alia: Section 2AA of the Act states that; “The powers of the Council shall be exercised, as in the law and statute of each university and to this extent establishment circulars that are inconsistent with the Laws and statute of the university shall not apply to the university….”

The purpose of these provisions is to liberate the Universities from the bureaucracy of the civil service and to enable the Council exercise its powers and performs its functions without undue external influence, (Oshio, 2004). In the discharge of councils’ mandate however, it appears that, most University Governing Council activities come into conflict with other organized bodies within the Universities over the implementation of such policies. As a result, the relevant stakeholders of University system particularly Academic, Non Academic staff and students, have expressed serious concerns about the activities of Governing Councils in the management of Universities in the North Central States. The researcher’s experience indicated that there are doubts as whether the Governing Councils are really playing the game according to rules. Dominant among these concerns are; Staff personnel administration especially in the areas of recruitment, appointment and promotion; and students personnel administration.
Cases of students’ misconduct, examination malpractices and preferential admissions are said to have been done without investigation by the councils. Alabi, (2002) observed that this sometimes leads to destruction of properties, payment of restitution fees and destruction of academic activities. This study was therefore an attempt to look into the activities of Governing Councils in the management of federal and state Universities in the North Central States, Nigeria, in the areas of staff and students personnel administration. Literature revealed, indicated a preponderance of problems and public agitations arising from activities of the Governing Councils like staff and students personnel administration.

Statement of the Problem
There has been a general outcry by the academic, non-academic and students over poor managerial activities by Governing Councils evident in the Universities which in turn have a concomitant effect on the general growth in the smooth running of the universities. Some writers have said that the decay experienced both in academic performance by students in particular and the backwardness of the Universities in general is due to the fact that activities of the Governing Councils in the management of the Universities are a concern. The crux of the matter lies in the supposition that Governing Councils’ Activities are said to be in doubt on staff personnel administration, especially in the areas of recruitments, appointments and promotions of staff. Governing Council Activities on Students personnel Administration especially in the areas of admission, discipline and welfare of students which in most cases are discriminately done are also a concern. The problem of the study posed in a question form is: what is the extent of Governing Councils activities on University administration in the areas of Staff and students Personnel Administration?

Purpose of the Study
The main purpose of this study was to look into the Governing Councils’ activities in the management of Universities in the North Central States, Nigeria.

Specifically, the study sought to:
1. Establish the extent of Governing Councils’ activities on staff personnel administration
2. Establish the extent of Governing Councils’ activities on student’s personnel administration.

Significance of the Study
In practical terms, the study will be of immense benefit to the governing councils, university managers, students of educational administration and planning, Association of educational administration and planning and future researchers. The findings of the study will expose the governing councils to the laws guiding the staff and student personnel administration.

Research Questions
The study was guided by the following research questions:
1. To what extent do the Governing Councils’ activities in Federal and State Universities influence Staff Personnel Administration?
2. To what extent do the Governing Councils’ activities in Federal and State Universities affect students’ personnel administration?

Hypotheses
The following null hypotheses were formulated to guide the study and were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

Ho1 There is no significant difference in the mean scores of Senate members and University Staff Union Executives of Federal and State Universities on the extent the Councils’ activities influence Staff Personnel administration.

Ho2 The Councils and Senate members in Federal and State Universities do not differ significantly in their mean responses on the extent the Governing Councils' activities affect the Students’ Personnel administration.
Review of Literature

Concept of Governing Councils

Governing council of a university is a governing body established by law to provide for effective management of the institution. The Governing Councils of a University by law is charged with the general control, appointment and promotion of staff, superintendence of the policy, finances and property of the University. The supreme statutory body in the University is the Council which is charged with the powers of general control (superintendence) of policy, finances, property and staffing of the University including public relation, (Korgba, 2011:21). All contracts at the University and all appointments are made in the name of the Council even if such contracts or appointments are made by a committee of the Council or some designated individual like the Vice Chancellor. Contracts and appointments are only terminated by Council or in the name of Council, (Korgba 2011).

Odetola (1981) states that, the Chairman and external members of Council are usually, appointed by the visitor to the University, while the internal members of the Council are elected by their colleagues. The appointment is a period of four years renewable for another four years at the pleasure of the Visitor. University Council according to Korgba (2011) is composed of majority of members from outside the University (lay members) and a minority from the academic and non-academic staff including the Vice Chancellor and his deputy (or deputies) who are ex-officio members. The internal members are the representatives of Senate and Congregation elected by those bodies. However, the law establishing each University defines the composition of each Council. Akingbola (2006) asserts that, the structuring process of Governing Council of a University which is the Governing board is normally appointed by the Government.

Concept of University Management

According to Utile (2009) University management is an art of management which in its widest application includes the whole act of carrying into effect any policy, plan, or undertaking. The term used in this study is confined to that class of officers that engage in the day to day administration or management of the affairs of the University. These include the Vice Chancellor, his Deputy, the Provost and his Deputy the Registrar, the Bursar, the University Librarian, the administration Staff, the Deans of faculties and students; the various Heads of department, Sub-Deans and all those engaged in one form of administration or the other in the University.

University management is specifically concerned with Students, Lecturers, Non-teaching Staff and the rules, regulations and policies that govern the University system. In the University Management, both the University Governing Council, Vice Chancellor and staff must of necessity see themselves as a team working for the growth and development of the citizenry. Thus university management is guided by certain basic ideas, some of which incorporate the strive to create a community of learners who are both physically and mentally healthy, efficient, and a community where all the stakeholders including Council members participate in the decision making process over University affairs.

In the chain of administrative and managerial organization, the Chancellor is the head or the highest officer of the University. He presides over convocation ceremonies and other assemblies of the University for the Conferment of degrees, diplomas, certificates and other awards of the University. Utile (2009) asserts that, at the apex of the University system is the Visitor symbolizing the proprietor of the University. In the typical Nigeria situation, the Visitor is in the case of a Federal University, the president and commander-in-Chief, while in the case of state Universities, the Governor of the State, who appoints the Vice Chancellor on the recommendation of University Governing Council. University management is therefore an integrating-mechanism which pulls policies and processes together to achieve the best institutional outcomes. Conceptually, therefore Management of Universities can be seen as the process concerned with creating, maintaining, stimulating, controlling and unifying formally and informally within a unified system designed to accomplish pre-determined objectives (Aghenta, 1998). According to Shattock (2003) managing University is a holistic process in which all the interlocking elements need to work together.
Concept of Staff Personnel Administration

Staff personnel administration whether business, industry, church or school, lies at the core of the efficiency of the organization (Bello, 2004). Oboegbulem (2004:151) puts it more succinctly that; “Staff personnel administration has to do with manpower or human resources management in an organization. It refers to manpower activities of any organization which embrace recruitment of staff, staff maintenance, training and development, compensations, personnel policies and evaluation of staff for educational activities”. Staff personnel management according to Ibukun (2004) is concerned with motivation, transfer and discipline of staff. In order ways, it is the act of staff selection, recruitment, development, transfer, posting, discipline and supervision. Nwankwo (2007) notes the lay down criteria and mode of operations on how staff recruitment, motivation, development, welfare and discipline should be conducted properly. A University as an academic institution cannot function without the use of teaching and non teaching personnel. Staffing of facilities and departments with qualified and competent lecturers are based on qualification, experience and areas of specialization by those who desire to teach in the Universities. One of the most important functions of personnel management is the recruitment and selection of qualified staff into an organization, (Babalola, Ayeni, Adedeji, Suleiman and Arikowuyo, 2000).

According to Onah (2005), recruitment is that process of assessing a job, announcing the vacancy arousing interest and stimulating people to apply. Recruiting, according to Mathis and Jackson (1997) is the process of generating a pool of qualified applicants for organizational jobs. Onah (2008) notes that, it is important that recruitment as a key human relations activity be viewed strategically. In the opinion of Howe (1995), an important aspect of recruitment is to gain a thorough picture of the requirements of both the job and the individual so that selection criteria can be drawn up. Onah (2008) posited that, “the good name of any organization would depend, among other things but perhaps more importantly, on the quality of its staff”. Osuji (1985:80) puts it succinctly that: “The selection process involves the accumulation, evaluation and assimilation of a wide range of information about a candidate from many sources, matching the information against the present and the future skills and manpower requirements of the organization and arriving at a decision on the suitability of the candidate for hiring”.

Concept of Student Personnel Administration

Closely related to staff personnel administration is the student personnel administration. University management has the responsibility to provide adequate student services that supplement teaching and learning. Ndu, Ocho, Okeke (2007:55) enumerate these services as: School attendance and its related problems; Orientation of new students, admissions classification, assignment and reports on pupil progress, supervision of student discipline, guidance and counseling programmes, health and safety programme and the personal, social and emotional adjustment of students”. Mgbekem (2004:299) posits that, the provision of welfare services for students is a primary concern of the University Management.

Research Method

The design of the study was the descriptive survey. The area of the study was the North Central States of Nigeria. The states comprise; Benue, Nasarawa, Plateau, Kogi, Kwara, Niger and the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja. The population of the study was 1827 made up of 163 governing council members, 1292 Senate members, 98 Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) Executive members, 90 Senior Staff Association of Nigeria University (SSANU) Executive members, 83 Non Academic Staff Union (NASU) Executive members and 101 Students Union Government (SUG) executive members, from the 11 public funded universities in the North Central States, Nigeria. The sample of the study was 374 respondents consisting of 33 governing council members, 271 senate members, 53 staff union executive members, and 17 SUG executive members, drawn using proportionate stratified random sampling technique from 6 public funded universities of federal and states in the North Central States Nigeria, representing 20.5% of the total population. Three research instruments were used for data collection. These were; structured questionnaire,
interview schedule and focus group discussion. To establish the face validity of the research instrument, the questionnaires and interview schedules were validated by three (3) experts.

The reliability of the instrument was ascertained through trial-testing to determine the internal consistency reliability of the items and reliability coefficient using Cronbach alpha. Ten (10) respondents from Ebonyi State University were used for trial-testing the instrument. The overall reliability coefficient of 0.82 was obtained for the Governing Councils and Management Questionnaire (GCAUMQ). The reliability coefficient was obtained on the following: staff personnel administration (0.85) and students personnel administration (0.79). Data for this study was collected using a structured research questionnaire, structured personal interview and focus group discussion methods. Data was analyzed using simple descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviations to answer the research questions. One inferential statistical tool t-test was employed to test the hypotheses. The hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance. The responses from the interview and focus group discussions were qualitatively analyzed.

Results
The results were presented in line with the research questions and hypotheses that guided the study. The presentation of the results were in two phases. Phase one was a quantitative type which analyzed the questionnaire instrument that was sent out to key respondents. This was analyzed using Statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) computer software to obtain opinions and views of the respondents. In order to corroborate the findings from the quantitative phase, a qualitative phase was carried out which included face-to-face interview and focus group discussions. The results of qualitative phase were integrated in the discussion to complement the findings obtained in the quantitative phase using a parameter known as content analysis.

Research Question One: To what extent do the Governing Councils’ activities in federal and states universities influence staff personnel administration?

**Table 1:** Influence of activities of Governing Councils in federal and state universities on staff personnel administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Item statement</th>
<th>Status of University</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Governing Council in my university insists that the laid down rules and procedures of the university must be followed in the recruitment of staff</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Governing Council in my university insists that staff promotion must be based on qualification and merit</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Discipline of academic, administrative and professional staff is made by joint committee of Council and Senate of my university</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Vice Chancellor of my university Federal in the case of misconduct by a member of staff which in his/her opinion is prejudicial to the interest of the University, suspends such member and report to the council for necessary action</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Staff disciplinary committee of my University makes recommendations on erring staff to the council for necessary action</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data on Table 1 indicated the mean ratings of the respondents on activities of governing councils on staff personnel administration in the federal and state universities in the North Central states, Nigeria. The mean ratings of the respondents from federal and state universities, showed that, to a high extent,
the Governing Councils influenced staff personnel administration. The mean ratings ranging from 2.88 – 3.32 indicated that, to a high extent, the activities of governing council members influenced staff personnel administration, in the North Central States, Nigeria.

In an interview with a member of SSANU in a federal university B, he commented that, “our university is known for due process in all it does in the campus. Recruitment and promotion are based on the university staff appointment guidelines”. Another interviewee in federal university C concurred “that due process is followed strictly in recruitment, appointment and promotion”. FGD in the two federal universities B and C maintained the same opinion that due process was always followed in the recruitment and appointment exercise.

**Research Question Two**: To what extent do the Governing Councils’ activities in federal and states universities affect students’ personnel administration?

**Table 2**: Extent of activities of Governing Councils’ that affect students’ personnel administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Item statement</th>
<th>Status of University</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Governing Council in my university insists that the welfare of students and regulation of their conducts are strictly adhered to by the Senate</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The governing council in my university does not interfere with the admission process</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Governing Council in my university does not interfere in the allocation of accommodation to students in halls of residence</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Governing Council in my university insists that students’ disciplinary procedures be followed</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Governing Council in my university insists that no student shall resort to a law court without prove of having exhausted the internal avenues for settling disputes or grievances or seeking redress</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cluster Mean

|           | Federal | 180  | 2.96 | .85  | HE  | 374  | 2.85 | .81  | HE  |
|           | State   | 194  | 2.74 | .75  | HE  | 374  | 2.85 | .81  | HE  |

Data on Table 2 showed the mean ratings of respondents on the activities of the governing councils on students’ personnel administration, in the federal and state universities in the North Central States Nigeria. The mean ratings of the respondents from federal and state universities ranging from 2.62 – 3.22 showed that to a high extent, the governing council activities affected students’ personnel administration. The cluster mean ratings of 2.96 and 2.74 for federal and state universities indicated that to a high extent, the activities of governing council members positively affected the students’ personnel administration in the federal and state universities in the North Central states, Nigeria.

The results above are indicative of the views and opinions expressed in both interview and FGD. A senate member from a federal university A stated that “our university has a committee that handles admission”. An interviewee in another federal university B who is a member of ASUU executive, asserted that, “admission in our university does not involve the council; Senate has committee on admission headed by the vice chancellor that handles all students admission. Focus groups A and B
agreed with the interviewees on the above submission. A similar position was maintained by an interviewee in a state university D who is a member of NASU. The FGD in the same university concurred with the above view that, admission is handled centrally by a committee. There was a different position by a member of senate in a federal university C over admission matters. This he said, “Admission is done in the vice chancellor’s office and does not even come to the senate committee on admissions”. FGD of the same university agreed with this member. Interviewees in state universities E and F had different views on admission and maintained that admission was amenable to intrigues. However, from the forgoing, the general opinions was that, activities of governing council positively affected students’ personnel administration.

**Hypothesis One:** There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of senate members and staff union executives of federal and state universities on the extent governing councils’ activities influence staff personnel administration.

**Table 3:** *T*- test analysis of the difference in the mean Ratings of Senate Members and Staff Union Executives on Extent Governing Council Activities Influence Staff Personnel Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Item statement</th>
<th>Bodies</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-cal</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>sig</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Governing Council in my University insists that the laid down rules and procedures of the university must be followed in the recruitment of staff</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Unions</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Governing Council in my University insists that staff promotion must be based on qualification and merit</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Unions</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Discipline of academic, administrative and professional staff is made by joint committee of Council and Senate of my university</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Unions</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The Vice Chancellor of my University in the case of misconduct by a member of staff which in his/her opinion is prejudicial to the interest of the University, suspends such member and report to the council for necessary action</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Unions</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Staff disciplinary committee of my University makes recommendations on erring staff to the council for necessary action</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Unions</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results presented on Table 3 showed that for item statements 3 and 4, there were significant differences in the mean opinions of senate members and staff union executives on the extent
governing councils’ activities influenced staff personnel administration in terms of recruitment and discipline of staff. These are shown by the calculated t-values of 2.26 and 3.08 for items 3 and 4 respectively which are significant at the 0.05 level of probability. The data further showed that for items 1,2 and 5, there were no significant differences in the mean ratings of senate members and staff union executives on the extent governing council activities influenced the staff personnel administration. The calculated cluster t-value of 1.28 indicated that there was no significant difference in the mean ratings of senate members and staff union executives on the extent governing council activities influenced staff personnel administration in the federal and state universities in the North Central states of Nigeria. The calculated t-value of 1.28 which is not significant at .20 levels of probability is not significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Thus the null hypothesis of no significant difference in the mean ratings of senate members and staff union executives on the extent governing councils’ activities influenced staff personnel administration was not rejected. This implies that any physical difference between the mean ratings of Senate members and staff union executives on the extent governing councils’ activities influenced Staff personnel administration must have arisen from sampling error or any other sources.

**Hypothesis Two:** The Council and Senate members in federal and state universities do not significantly differ in their mean responses on the extent the governing councils’ activities affect the students’ personnel administration

**Table 4:** T-test analysis of the difference in the mean ratings of council and senate members on the extent Governing Council Activities affect Students’ personnel Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Item statement</th>
<th>Bodies</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-cal</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>sig</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Governing Council in my University insists that the welfare of students and regulation of their conduct are strictly adhered to by the Senate</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The governing council in my university does not interfere with the admission process</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Governing Council in my university does not interfere in the allocation of accommodation to students in halls of residence</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Governing Council in my university insists that students’ disciplinary procedures be followed</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Governing Council in my university insists that no student shall resort to a law court without prove of having exhausted the internal avenues for settling disputes or grievances or seeking redress</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results on Table 4 showed that there was a significant difference in the mean ratings of council and senate members on the extent Governing Council activities affected students’ personnel administration. The calculated $t$-values for items 8-10 which range from 3.26-4.01 are significant at 0.05 level of probability. The cluster $t$-value of 5.53 was also significant at .000 and at 0.05 levels. The null hypothesis of no significant difference in the mean ratings of council members and senate members on extent Governing Council activities affected students’ personnel administration was therefore rejected and the alternate hypothesis of significant difference accepted. This implies that there is statistical significant difference in the mean ratings of council members and senate members in Federal and State Universities on the extent the activities of governing councils’ affected student personnel administration. This equally implies that, the mean ratings of council members on the student personnel administration are higher than that of Senate members.

Results of the face-to-face interviews (FFI) and focus group discussions (FGD) from respondents of Federal and State Universities are presented qualitatively below. The excerpts;

**Staff Personal Administration: Appointment, recruitment and promotions.**

Responses from an ASUU member of University A in face-to-face interview (FFI):

“Yes due process is strictly followed in the appointment, recruitment and promotions of staff personnel. Jobs are advertised and interviews scheduled. It may interest you to know that a representation of federal character commission is also a member of the interview committee. The presence of a member of Federal character Commission is a further guarantee of fairness”.

The researcher sought to know the opinions of discussants in FGD of the University, this they said; “Appointment, promotion and recruitment are advertised and interview called with Federal character commission in attendance”. Confirming this stand point, a member of Governing Council of University B availed that; “Our University is known for due process in all it does in the campus. Recruitment, promotions and appointment are based on the University Staff appointment guidelines”. This assertion reflected what the FGD of the same University B said, “Staff Personnel Administration, especially recruitment and promotions are done by qualification and merit through due process mechanism”.

FGD in University D agreed with the position of this interviewee, as they maintained that, “due process is strictly followed in the appointment, recruitment and promotions of staff personnel. There were mixed reactions in state University F as a member of senate said, as a State University, the process cannot completely be without irregularities, but due process is allowed to follow in the recruitment, promotion of staff. This implies that, State Universities are more proned to irregularities on recruitment, appointment and promotions as they show no evidence of Federal Character representation in their exercise of recruitment, promotions and appointment of staff.

**Students Personnel Administration: Admissions, discipline and welfare.**

Excerpts;

“Our University has a committee that does the admission and the committee ensures that, all states of the Federation are well represented. (FFI with a council member from a Federal University ‘A’)

FGD was of the same view above. A member of Senate in University B availed that.
“Admission in our University does not involve the council. Senate has a committee headed by the Vice Chancellor that oversees admission process. However, the Vice Chancellor list could be manipulated by the council and other extraneous factors. Generally, due process is followed in allocation of students in halls of residence."

The FGD was not too committal on this matter as discussants availed thus,” However, they all consented that, the University has a committee where matters relating to admission of students are handled. (FGD of Federal University B).

The FGD of the same University maintained that, “Politics rather than due process was the order of the day in the University. The State Universities were also divided on the issue of students admission. Excerpts from an executive member of SSANU:

“Admission is done by a central committee of the senate headed by the Vice Chancellor. University Governing Council does not interfere as well as in the halls of residence.” (SSANU member from a state University D).

The discussants in focus groups were of the same opinion that, “admission into the University is done by a central Committee of the Senate headed by the Vice Chancellor”. Interviewees and FGD in University F were also divided in different opinions as a member of senate said; “Admissions, discipline and welfare of students do not follow due process.” PGD however said; Admissions and other Sundry matters to a high extent follow due process. By this position, it was clear to suggest that, there were divided opinions on Students Personnel Administration.

Discussions

The findings of the study were discussed in line with the research questions and hypotheses raised in the study.

Extent Governing Councils’ activities in Federal and State Universities influence staff personnel administration

Findings from data on table 1 indicated the mean ratings of the respondents on activities of Governing Councils’ of universities on staff personnel administration in Federal and state Universities. The results showed that, to a high extent, the Governing Councils influenced staff personnel administration. These findings are in consonance with the Law establishing the university and the council, concerning the staff discipline, procedure for appointment promotion and recruitment of staff. Section 17(1) (a) (b) of University of Abuja insists that strict procedure must be followed on matters concerning staff, of the university. It is in this line of thought that, Ibukun (2004) posited that, motivation; transfer and discipline of staff should be a concern for any organization including universities. Despite the common position being maintained by Federal universities on the finding, states are also resolute on staff matters. Section 16(i) of Benue State University statute 1996 provides for removal and discipline of staff. This applies to all state universities with little modification in the arrangement of sections of such laws.

Nwankwo (2007, Oboegbulem 2003) aligned with the lay down criteria and mode of operations on how staff recruitment, development, welfare and discipline should be conducted properly. Nwankwo (2007) posited that, staffing of university with qualified and competent lecturers should be based on qualification, experience and area of specialization by those who desire to teach in the university. In a well researched work by Babalola, Ayemi, Adedeji, Suleiman and Arikewuyo (2006) all were in concurrence with this finding that, recruitment and selection decisions should meet the university’s strategic planning objectives. Mgbekem (2004), holds the same position on staff personnel administration as he maintained, that, University as an academic body saddled with the responsibility of imparting knowledge to students, cannot function without the use of teaching and non teaching personnel. Onah (2008) agrees with the above view in his finding that, it is important that recruitment as a key human relations activity should be viewed strategically. In the same vein, Ndu, Ocho and Okeke (1997) were of the view that, staff personnel administration forms the second cardinal
leadership responsibility of the school administrator in achieving the goals of the school in particular and education in general. Howe (1995) says, this would give a thorough picture of requirements of the job and individuals.

Onah, (2008, Bello, 2004, Mathis and Jackson 1997) posit that “the good name of the university would depend among other things but perhaps more importantly, on the quality of its staff personnel.” In an interview with a council member in University ‘A’ on staff personnel administration, he had this to say; “yes, due process is followed strictly to the later in the appointment and recruitment of staff personnel. Jobs are advertised and interview scheduled. It may interest you to know that, a representative of the Federal Character Commission is also a member of the interview committee. The presence of a member of the Federal Character Commission is a further demonstration of fairness”. This position was maintained by focus group discussion. In University ‘B’ an interviewee who doubles as a member of Council and Senate had this to say on staff personnel administration. “Recruitment and promotion are based on the University Staff appointment guidelines: making reference to section 17(1) (a) (b) of the university statute. The focus group discussants confirmed this finding when they availed that, recruitment and promotion were based on qualification and merit as it is stated in university guidelines”. An interviewee from University ‘C’ who is a member of University Staff Union (ASUU) agreed with the above finding on due process and added that qualification and merit formed the basis in the university.

On the same subject matter, a member of Senate from University ‘F’ who was interviewed stated that “As a state university, the process cannot completely be devoid of irregularities but to a high extent, we can say that, due process is allowed to follow in the appointment and recruitment of staff based on qualification and merit”. This position was confirmed to be true with almost all the discussants in the focus group discussion of the same university. From the findings of this study, it appears there were divided opinions on the subject matter. This can be observed by the results on table 3 which showed that, for item statements 3 and 4, there were significant differences in the mean opinions of Senate members and staff union executives on the extent Governing Councils’ activities influenced staff personnel administration, in terms of recruitment and discipline of staff. However, by the empirical position of this study as revealed by finding of hypothesis 1, it confirms that; there was no significant difference in the mean ratings of Senate members and staff union executives of Federal and Senate Universities on the extent Governing Councils’ activities influenced staff personnel administration.

**Extent Governing Councils’ activities in Federal and State Universities affect students’ personnel administration.**

Data on table 2 showed the mean ratings of respondents on the activities of Governing Councils on students’ personnel administration in Federal and State Universities in the North Central States, Nigeria. The mean ratings of the respondents from Federal and State Universities showed that, to a high extent, the Governing Council activities affected students’ personnel administration.

These findings are in agreement with the Law establishing the University Council, concerning the student’s personnel administration. Section 7AAA (a) (b) of universities (miscellaneous) provisions, Amendment Act of (2007) provides for students participation and welfare including admission and discipline. This is echoed in university statute of all the sampled universities. Alabi (2002) agrees with these views. In an interview with a SUG executive member from university ‘E’ on the subject of students’ personnel administration, he had this to say; “admission is not done through due process, as people with the highest scores are denied admission. Welfare of students is something else. As I speak with you, hostel accommodations on the campus are not enough and even the ones available, there is no fairness in the allocation procedure. Few students bring in all kinds of notes from members of council”.

Denial of admissions to students is what Prof. Ibidayo-Obe defended on why more universities should be established to cater for this situation when he said, “…it is true that, we must increase access to university education in the country” (the Nation 3/5/12 pp. 25). There appears to be a consensus
opinion on the issue of admission in University ‘E’, as focus group discussants seemed to agree that, council hides under management to control admission process.” However an interviewee from university ‘B’ consented that, “our university has a committee that handles admissions, and this committee ensures that all states are represented. As a Federal institution, admission is not a one man affair”. Another interviewee from University ‘B’ who is a member of Senate and ASUU agrees with the above submission as he posited that, “admission in the university does not involve the council. Senate has a committee headed by the Vice Chancellor that oversees admission process”.

Focus group discussants asserted that, the relationship between the Vice Chancellor and Council could make the admission questionable. An interviewee from a State University ‘D’ added that, “admission is done by a central committee of the Senate, headed by the Vice Chancellor”. She exonerated the council’s involvement in the allocation of students’ halls of residence. Focus group discussants maintained this position that council does not handle allocation of halls of residence to students.

Results on table 4 showed that, there was significant difference in the mean ratings of council and senate members on the extent Governing Councils’ activities affected students’ personnel administration. This position appears to be supported by the majority of interviewees and focus group discussants. This equally implies that, the mean ratings of council members on the students’ personnel administration were higher than those of the Senate members. Corroborating the above views and findings, the empirical stand of this study as revealed by finding of hypothesis 2, showed that, the Council and Senate members in Federal and State Universities significantly differed in their mean responses on the extent the Governing Council’s activities affected the students’ personnel administration.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to look into the Governing Councils’ activities in the Management of Universities in the North Central States, Nigeria. Specifically, the study sought to; establish the extent of governing councils’ activities on staff and students personnel administration. From the foregoing discussions based on the results of the study, the following conclusions were made. This position was supported by the majority of interviewees and focus group discussants. The results indicated that both the governing councils and the senate members exerted a lot of influence on staff and students personnel administration in terms of recruitment and discipline of both the staff and students. Most Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) members, who were interviewed indicated that in most cases due process was not followed in the recruitment, appointment and promotion of staff personnel. On the other hand, students disciplinary issues and welfare were more on favouritism. The position of FGD was not different on this issue as they were on one accord. Most members were of the view that, admissions of students were done sometimes not taken into account of merit.

It was on these observations that, a conclusion was drawn; both federal and state governing councils expressed significant influence on staff and students personnel administration. While there are dividing opinions on students’ personnel administration especially on admission and discipline among respondents, majority of those interviewed and in the FGD differed significantly.

Implications of the Findings

The findings of this study have tremendous implications on Governing Councils’ activities in the management of Universities on one hand and educational planning and administration on the other. The implications are discussed as follows:

1. For the fact that, there was no statistical significant difference in the mean ratings of Senate members and Staff Union Executives of Federal and State Universities on the extent, the Governing Councils’ activities influenced Staff personnel administration, it implies that, cases of recruitments, appointments and promotions of university staff which are being made fail short of the norms of the university.

2. The Councils and Senate members in federal and state universities significantly differed in their mean responses on the extent the governing councils’ activities affected the students’
personnel administration. This implies that, cases of students’ misconduct, preferential admissions and allocation to halls of residence are a concern. This sometimes leads to destruction of properties and distortion of academic activities.

Recommendations
On the basis of the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made with a view to bringing activities of Governing Councils to the fore.
1. Governing councils of federal and state universities should follow due process in the recruitment, appointment and promotion of staff.
2. Governing councils of universities at federal and state should not intimidate or harassed SUG leadership on matters affecting student body. Again, students should not be discriminated against on admission matters on the basis of ethnic and local government considerations.
3. Governing Councils of Federal and State Universities should strive to maintain harmony in the university campuses on matters that concern students and staff.
4. There should be training and retraining of staff as a way of motivating them for optimal performance.
5. Students are a volatile group in the university, therefore there should be a consultative committee between the students and university management on one hand and, or students and the university community on the other.
6. Issues of staff and students’ welfare should be a priority for a harmonious co-existence among members of staff and students in the university.
7. There should be mentoring programme among new staff and comprehensive orientation for new students so they can be part of the university community within the shortest possible time.
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