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(ABSTRACT)

This study is phase two of a two-phase research effort designed to describe the role of the academic department chairperson in the public universities of Jordan and to develop a systematic, formal process for evaluating the performance of this position. The purpose of this phase (phase II) was to develop an evaluation model for the academic chairperson's performance that can be used in the public universities of Jordan. In phase I, the actual and the ideal role expectations were identified through interviews with deans, chairpersons, and faculty members in Jordan public universities during Summer, 1992. These expectations were profiled and used as the basis for phase II research.

A survey was employed to gather data for this study (phase II) from the groups of all deans, all chairpersons, and a selected sample of faculty members in the four public universities working during the summer of 1993. The survey included five categories and sixty-four items and was designed to determine how appropriate each of the role items
(derived from the profile in phase I) was to be included in an evaluation model for the academic department chairperson's performance in public universities of Jordan.

Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, and means) were used to determine the first research question, the importance of the various elements described in the survey. Analysis of variance was used to address the second research question, the level of consensus among the three groups, as well as the third research question, the possible differences by institutions. Where significant differences were indicated in the analysis of variance, the Newman-Keuls "post hoc" test was employed to identify where specific differences exist at the .05 alpha level. Chi-square analyses were computed on the demographic variables to test for response bias.

It was found that there was almost unanimous agreement that all the items of responsibilities suggested in the survey instrument should be included in the suggested chairperson's performance evaluation model (CPEM). It was found, also, that while there are differences by position, there are few significant differences by institutions regarding the degree of importance of survey items.

Specific findings and recommendations are offered, and a prototype of evaluation instrument is presented.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

There is a special and general interest in studying the current situation in Jordanian higher education. Higher education, along with the other levels of schooling, plays an important role in determining the type of knowledge delivered to citizens in Jordan and other countries in the area. During the past decade and the early 90's, Jordan went through the greatest expansion of higher education in its history. The rate of expansion was tremendous and out of proportion to population. The most profound expansion has been in the growth and development of universities. The race to establish more public and private universities has resulted in controversial public views concerning the effectiveness of higher education institutions in this era of declining financial resources and increased student needs in the country.

Until 1962, Jordanian students who were interested in obtaining college and university education, had to acquire it in other Arab or foreign countries. Since the University of Jordan was established, followed by the establishment of three other public universities during the 1970's and 80's, a large number of students were recruited, but the lack of more higher education institutions remained crucial for
several reasons. First, the Jordanian higher education system has produced many professionals who have left Jordan to other countries in the region. Additionally, the system of education in Jordan has been borrowed and implemented by neighboring countries. Second, as one of the results of the Gulf War, a considerable number of students, who were expected to pursue their studies abroad, returned to Jordan with their families, intending either to complete or start their college studies. Third, there has been an increasing demand for more diversity; selectivity; and a wider range of choices that match higher education with the needs, goals, and abilities of students, and with the rapid evolution in technology in all aspects of life.

Responding to the needs, the 1989 statute permitted the establishment of private universities and resulted, within two years, in the opening of seven such universities. Six others are being built in addition to the four public working universities, and another two public are currently being built.

This dramatic expansion in the number of Jordanian universities has taken place in a remarkably short time and under critical circumstances, considering that the whole population of Jordan is less than four million people.

The pressure of growth and expansion has afforded little time for evaluation. A serious focus on
accountability, or for a scientific measurement of productivity, are matters that might impact the quality of administration and instruction in higher education. The increased demand for accountability in all sectors of the collegiate community has increased the level of interest in the implications of successful business practices for higher education and the evaluation of administrative performance. Accountability suggests that the institution is accountable for all aspects of its operation and all of its products (McLeod, 1992). And accordingly, the call for accountability through evaluation is clear because "Accountability and evaluation are inseparable" (Coats, 1974, p. 2), and because "Evaluation is a necessary tool in determining accountability" (Featherstone and Romano, 1977, p. 413).

Public universities in Jordan are accountable to their governing university councils and Higher Education Council and to the public as a whole. In addition to their responsibilities to the law that must be observed by everyone, all universities have ethical responsibilities which are less defined but not less important.

With the growing number of higher education institutions, there have been increasing demands for accountability requiring these institutions to become more efficient, and for administrators to develop performance
measures and ways of becoming more efficient in management of their institutions. Meeting these challenges rests, partially, on the ability of administrators to manage and perform more efficiently and effectively.

A factor crucial to effective administration and management is the developing of reliable and valid methods of appraising administrative performance (Thomas, 1978). Yang (1987) has stated that "One of the most efficient and effective ways of improving the managerial and teaching function is to establish a systematic appraisal process at all levels of the organization" (p. 2).

The academic department chairperson, being the key link in the managerial-teaching-learning interaction influence system, can be assisted by a performance evaluation model.

"A key element in improving effectiveness and efficiency is the capability of a college to appraise and develop the managerial performance of its administrators. This capacity is particularly important for department/division chairpersons, who are expected, as first line administrators, to direct faculty and staff toward the attainment of institutional goals and objectives" (Thomas, 1978, p. 1).

Thus, an evaluation system with multiple criterion measures that can define the present situation for the position of the academic department chairperson and assess his/her performance, is a hot topic for study and research.

To accomplish this goal, phase I of a II phase research study was conducted by the researcher in the summer of 1992
to describe the role of the academic department chairperson in the public universities in Jordan. The second phase constitutes the study here being proposed and conducted to develop an evaluation model for the academic department chairperson’s performance that can be used in the public universities in Jordan. It is possible that the developed evaluation model can be applied to other key positions in public and private Jordanian universities.

Assumptions

There are three assumptions in this research study on performance evaluation of academic chairpersons of public universities of Jordan.

1. It is assumed that the survey instrument developed by the researcher will yield valid measures of the attitudes of the respondents and, subsequently, an evaluation model that better satisfies individual as well as institutional needs.

2. The terms performance evaluation, performance appraisal, assessment, and outcome measurement have been used interchangeably in the literature and will be used in a similar fashion in this study.

3. It is assumed that while there are differences by position there are few significant differences by institutions regarding the degree of importance of
survey elements.

Statement of the Problem

A review of the literature revealed that there are no published studies on the role of the academic department chairpersons in public universities in Jordan. No systematic plan for the collection of evaluation data by which the role performance of departmental chairperson could be judged is in evidence. Since clearly defined role statements which could be used to judge role performance are now available, as the product of phase one of this study, the absence of an adequate systematic evaluation model is the situational problem which provides the focal point of this phase of the study. Unless a systematic model is adopted, any evaluation will be deficient, vague in content, judgmental in purpose, and subjective in process.

The procedural problem is to document the critical quality and quantity elements essential for performance evaluation of public universities' department chairpersons in Jordan. The elements will become the infrastructure for the proposed academic department chairperson evaluation model.

Purpose of the Study

This study is phase two of a two-phase research effort designed to develop a systematic, formal process for
evaluating the performance of department chairpersons in public universities in Jordan. In phase one, the role of the department chairperson was reviewed and analyzed. Interviews were conducted with five academic deans, ten chairpersons, and five faculty members in Jordan public universities. Both actual and ideal role expectations were identified. These role expectations are the basis for the current study (phase II), that aimed to develop a model for the evaluation of the performance of department chairpersons in the public universities of Jordan.

Purposes of any study should be defined clearly. Uncertainty and/or ambiguity of purposes for any given study might be a major deficiency in the way of its success. Since purposes of the current study are clear, and the objectives are identified, it is easier to develop a methodology to assess the performance of chairpersons in the public universities in Jordan, and results are more likely to be satisfactory and conclusive.

The general purpose was to develop a chairperson performance evaluation model (CPEM) that can be used to evaluate the performance of the academic department chairpersons in the public universities of Jordan.

In order to accomplish this general purpose, six other ancillary purposes will also be addressed. They are:

1. To synthesize the extant literature.
2. To identify duties and responsibilities of
academic department chairperson in public Jordanian universities. (Profiled in phase one.)

3. To identify the qualitative elements of duties and responsibilities against which each academic department chairperson performance can be measured.

4. To compare dean, chairperson, and faculty perceptions of chairperson’s duties.

5. To compare individual perceptions of chairperson’s duties by institution.

6. To prioritize the elements in the chairperson performance evaluation model (CPEM).

Research Questions

The research questions for this study are intended to enable the researcher to identify the desirable components of a performance evaluation model to evaluate the academic department chairperson’s performance in the public universities of in Jordan.

The following questions are posed for this study:

1. What do deans, chairpersons, and a random sample of faculty members in Jordanian public universities perceive to be the desired elements in an evaluation instrument for the academic department chairperson’s performance in these universities?
2. To what degree is there consensus among deans as a group, department chairpersons as a group, and faculty members as a group regarding the elements of the academic department chairperson's performance evaluation model?

3. To what degree is there consensus among those at the four Jordanian institutions participating in the study regarding the elements of the academic department chairperson's performance evaluation model?

Delimitations

The delimitations of this study are the following:

1. The scope of the study is limited to academic department chairperson's performance in Jordanian public universities.

2. The study is limited to the participation of the deans, chairpersons, and faculty members from the four public working universities in Jordan in the summer of 1993.

3. The sample of the faculty members group was selected according to a proportional stratified random sampling technique procedure using the most recent directory of names at each university. Names not included in the directory were not included in the sampling.
4. This study is delimited to identifying general perceptions about the appraisal of chairpersons. No effort will be made to ascertain the reasons for their perceptions on particular issues.

5. This study is delimited to the development of the evaluation model of the chairperson's performance in the public universities of Jordan. Within this study no effort will be made to implement the model.

6. The study is delimited to the degree to which deans, chairpersons, and faculty members understand and respond to the items in the survey developed from the role expectations identified in phase one.

Limitations

The survey instrument was translated into Arabic for the purpose of respondents' convenience. The researcher was aware of the societal differences and cultural nuances and made the necessary adjustments to maintain the validity of meaning in translation by verifying the translation throughout the pilot study.

Significance of the Study

An urgent need exists to define the department chairperson's role performance by systematic evaluation
rather than letting it happen by chance. In considering the role and functions of a department chairperson, the degree to which this office operationally meets the expectations of its important status must be determined (Thomas, 1978). This becomes more important when we consider that the academic department chairpersons frequently come to the position relatively inexperienced in the day-to-day burdens of chairing and managing a department.

An important consideration revealed by the literature is that objective evaluative instruments for assessing the performance of academic chairpersons are very few. As an objective of the present study, it was necessary to develop a survey instrument that would aid in more objective assessment of administrator performance. This instrument had been designed to meet the necessary requirements of a survey research methodology instrument, as well as to incorporate strong theoretical models found in educational research, business, psychology and other related fields.

However, a review of the literature conducted in conjunction with the initiation of this study revealed virtually no discussion of chairperson performance evaluation and its potential as applied to institutions of higher education in Jordan. Due to this paucity and to the need of a real and accurate description and evaluation system of the position, and maybe of other university key positions, this study may be considered an important
contribution.

In phase one of this study it was stated that

"No research was found that pertains to the
assessment of the role of the department chairpersons
in either public or private universities in Jordan.
This study is of special importance for Jordanian
universities for several reasons: the lack of a
formal, systematic, institutionalized performance
evaluation system; the newness of the higher education
system in Jordan; and the growth this system is
experiencing" (Abu Qudais, 1993, p. 6).

An objective instrument of evaluation might benefit
higher education institutions throughout the country since
it focuses on a specific job available in all these
institutions and takes into account the various assignments
and responsibilities of the chairperson. By using a
specially designed evaluation instrument, the chairperson in
Jordanian public universities should be evaluated more
equitably and should be more motivated and productive in
performing his/her duties.

It is expected that a chairperson performance
evaluation model resulting from this study together with the
description of the duties and responsibilities of the
position could be beneficial for both incumbents of the
position and institutions of higher education in Jordan.
The development of an objective instrument to measure the
academic department chairperson’s performance may be
valuable in reducing human bias and provide educators with a
more accurate assessment of their performance (Goodman,
1980). The study could also contribute to the maturation of the field of higher education.

Definitions

Operational definitions of constructs are necessary because language is inherently ambiguous.

"Without an operational definition we could never be sure which of a wide variety of dimensions of a construct is being employed. However, once we are presented with an operational definition we may or may not agree that it captures all the dimensions of the construct. Nonetheless, we at last know how it was measured and can evaluate any conclusions resulting from the research accordingly" (Vasu, Stewart, and Garson, 1990, p. 338).

1. **Academic Department Chairperson**: "The designated individual responsible for management and operation of an academic department of a faculty (college) in a university" (Abu Qudais, 1993, p. 8).

2. **Accountability**: "Institutions being responsible to the public and their corporate governing bodies and constituents both for resources used and for goods and services produced" (McLeod and Atwell, 1992, p. 31).

3. **Appraisal methods** - The different ways used to assess performance, such as rating scales.

4. **Appraisal system** - All components of an evaluation scheme.
5. **Assessment**: The process of descriptively evaluating the performance or program product in an objective manner.

6. **Evaluation**: An assessment of an individual's performance of accomplishment of specific objectives, or fulfillment of prescribed duties and responsibilities.

   The appraisal of results, events, or behaviors in terms of predetermined goals or objectives. The act of comparing desired outcomes with actual outcomes; a measure of effectiveness or efficiency.

7. **Items**: Elements of responsibilities identified through the literature and constitute the survey.

8. **Performance**: An action, a deed, or thing done, or the exhibition of skill or capacity.

9. **Performance Appraisal**: An assessment of the degree to which the assigned duties and responsibilities have been accomplished during the prescribed time period. Performance appraisal is a systematic evaluation of the employee by his or her supervisor or some other qualified person who is familiar with the employee's performance on the job.

10. **Performance Evaluation**: The systematic, formal
evaluation of an employee's job performance and potential for future development.

11. **Phase I**: The first part of the study that the researcher had conducted for his master thesis.

12. **Phase II**: The present part of the study conducted for the Ph.D. dissertation.

13. **Role**: "A set of behaviors enacted by a person as a result of his occupying a certain position within the organization" (Abu Qudais, 1993, p. 8).

**Organization of the Study**

This document consists of five chapters. Chapter one presents the introduction, assumptions of the study, conceptual framework, problem statement, purpose of the study, research questions, delimitations and limitations of the study, significance of the study, definition of terms, and organization of the study. Chapter two contains a review of selected literature related to evaluation of administrators and academic chairpersons performance, in addition to evaluation methods. Methodology of the study is described in Chapter Three which contains a description of the research method, population, sample study, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis procedures. Chapter four contains the analysis and discussion of results. Findings, conclusions, and
recommendations for further studies are presented in Chapter Five, in addition to some suggested steps for the implementation processes of the model.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Introduction

The focus in the literature review was on the literature available in both American, Jordanian, and United Arab Emirates' libraries. It was helpful to apply theoretical concepts and scientific contributions in evaluation from other professions such as business, sociology and psychology, to the field of higher education administration so it may benefit from the previous research (Goodman, 1980). Therefore, the related literature from these fields was considered as well as the educational literature which deals specifically with evaluation of administrators and personnel in higher education and public schools.

Literature dealing with the performance appraisal system and research, performance evaluation of academic administrators in higher education, and evaluation of academic department chairpersons are identified and discussed. Grounds and directions regarding each of the research questions are derived from the literature about job evaluation and are discussed in this chapter.

It is clear that colleges and universities in Jordan, as well as researchers conducting studies about Jordanian
higher education, can benefit from the American literature. Although cultural and historical differences must be taken into account, the main features and characteristics of the higher education system in Jordan are similar to those of the United States. The Jordanian system of higher education, having adopted and adapted the American system finds substantial support in the American literature.

From the literature review, one can find that performance evaluation, performance appraisal, assessment, outcome measurement, are all terms which have commonality among them where they all refer to a control tool used to measure individual performance or a particular program.

Baum (1983) indicated that "Performance evaluation is a complex and time-consuming process with the overall goal of improving the administration of the organization and, as part of that, helping the individual develop" (p. 183). Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly (1979) emphasized the need for evaluation and stated "No organization has a choice as to whether or not it should formally or informally evaluate its employees and their job performance" (p. 346). "When well designed, and properly used, evaluation is essential to effective functioning of most organizations" (Locher & Teel, 1988, p. 139). The key to any professional development program is an assessment of administrative effectiveness (Knight & Holen, 1985).
Vasu, Stewart, and Garson (1990) indicated what evaluation is supposed to measure:

"With a trend toward increased employee participation in decision making and the heightened awareness of employees as a valuable resource, performance appraisal is now asked to measure employee potential and to create the context for heightened employee involvement in the overall planning process" (p. 359,60).

Performance appraisal is an exercise in measurement. Measurement is the attempt to define and quantify some aspect of reality. Measurement involves questions of reliability, validity, operational definitions, and constructs.

Zappulla (1983) defined performance appraisal or evaluation as, "The process of identifying, measuring and developing human performance in organization." He added:

"An effective appraisal system must not only accurately measure current performance levels, but also contain mechanisms for reinforcing strengths, identifying deficiencies and feeding such information back to rates in order that they may improve future performance" (p. 421).

Before the process of evaluation of an individual, or a particular program, it is necessary to determine in advance the answers to such questions as: Why?, How?, and Who?

Why do we evaluate? -- What is the purpose of the evaluation process?

How do we evaluate? -- What are the techniques, approaches, and methods of evaluation?
Who should evaluate the position?

Selected literature for and about these questions are included in the next sections.

Objectives of Performance Appraisal Systems

Vasu, Stewart, and Garson (1990) emphasized the need for setting up evaluation objectives. They believe that effective managers should know what they want from a performance appraisal, and make the choice of evaluation systems capable of producing the desired ends while remaining aware of the contextual features limiting the capacity of any system. One must possess also the interpersonal skills necessary to implement whatever system is chosen.

McLaughlin (1986) indicated the evaluation performance purposes:

"Evaluation of performance is done for one of several purposes: encourage the development of the individual, personnel decisions based on the performance of the individual, increase linkage between the goals of the unit and the individual, and demonstrate an organizational concern about efficiency" (p. 1).

"Each evaluation should begin with agreement on a clear statement of unit goals and objectives. Uncertainty about objectives has been a major deficiency in attempts to evaluate administrative units to date" (McManus, Todd and Wilson, 1982, P. 3). While they emphasized the need for
setting objectives of evaluation, James (1991) went beyond and emphasized the quality of objectives. He recommended that objectives should be worth doing, clearly written, conceptualized by the administrator, and accepted by the supervisor.

Lazer and Wikstrom (1977) suggested that all elements to be included in an evaluation or appraisal system should be tailored to meet these purposes. Doing this gives reasons for the existence, effectiveness, and direction to all other phases of the process (Bolton, 1980). Vasu, Stewart, and Garson (1990) summarized Lazer and Wikstrom (1977) and other researchers in setting proper objectives of evaluation. They pointed out that performance appraisal systems are adopted in order to serve one or more of the following objectives:

1. Management development—"to provide a framework for developing employees by identifying and preparing individuals for enlarged responsibilities."

2. Performance measurement—"evaluating individual employee accomplishments and measuring the relative value of an employee’s contribution to the overall task of the organization."

3. Performance improvement—"identifying areas of individual weakness and devising strategies for strengthening employees accordingly."

4. Compensation—"determining salary and merit pay based upon performance."

5. Identifying potential—"targeting candidates for promotion or transfer within the
organization."

6. Feedback—"discussing actual performance level against the organization's performance standards for an employee."

7. Manpower planning—"evaluating the present supply of human resources for replacement planning."


Fisher (1977), in a survey of various reasons for establishing a formal evaluation process, provided ten reasons:

"...to define, through evaluation feedback, need areas of individual professional development and personal growth;
to improve individual administrative performance;
to help define more clearly individual objectives consistent with institutional missions and goals;
to improve internal communications, administrative teamwork, and overall management of the institution;
to reward outstanding administrative performance;
to validate the selection, retention and promotion or retraining;
to help answer the external demands for accountability from government, trustees, alumni, and the general public, and thus improve the creditability of the administrative process;
to help answer the internal demands for accountability from faculty and students...;
to enlighten all audiences regarding the institution's integrity and worth" (Baum, 1983, p. 184).

Many other writers referred to sets of purposes (Goodwin, 1979; Oliver, 1985; Craigh, Schnerier & Beatty, 1986; Regel & Hollman, 1987). They tried to state the purposes and objectives of administrative evaluation. James
(1991) summarized these purposes as follow: (1) improving performance, (2) determining promotability, (3) administering compensation or salary programs, (4) assessing performance, (5) improving communication/feedback, (6) identifying training needs, (7) establishing goals or objectives, (8) clarifying strengths and weaknesses, and (10) protecting the individual or the system.

Hammons and Thomas (1980) surveyed 776 chairpersons from 250 institutions and asked them to answer the question: "What are the purpose(s), procedures, criteria, and standards currently used to appraise the administrative performance of chairpersons?". They found that over 77% of the chairpersons conducted evaluations for either developmental purposes (39%) or for both developmental and judgmental purposes (49%). In predicting the desirable elements in a system of appraisal, chairpersons perceived the desirable purpose(s):

"The majority (59%) of chairpersons felt that the purposes of evaluation should be both developmental and judgmental. Another (38%) wanted evaluation to be conducted for primarily developmental purposes. Only a few (five chairpersons) preferred a judgmental evaluation process. At least 75% of the chairpersons would like to see a change in the present purpose(s) of their evaluation system" (p. 45).

To accomplish the job of evaluation effectively, a performance appraisal system should have some particular characteristics that guarantee the success of the process.
In promulgating its performance appraisal system for federal employees, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management suggested the following list of characteristics as providing a frame of reference for effective performance appraisal systems:

1. Performance is measured against established comprehensive standards which are written in a clear and explicit style and communicated to the employee at entry on the job and at the beginning of the appraisal period.

2. Performance appraisal information is used for specific purposes, e.g., to determine developmental needs, awards, and retention and not for vague abstract reasons, such as appraisal for promotion potential unrelated to particular type of job.

3. Appraisal criteria and techniques are appropriate to the specific purposes for which the appraisal is being done.

4. The information produced is useful for work-related decisions.

5. Data are as objective, reliable, and valid as possible.

6. Instruments for performance review and appraisal are easy for the participants to understand and use.
7. Supervisors are appraised in terms of how competently they perform their supervisory duties.

8. Employees are kept informed about methods and purposes of appraisals.

9. A process exists which allows for impartial resolution of complaints and review.

10. Employees are promptly notified in writing and preferably orally, too, of the results of their performance appraisal. To prevent misunderstanding about whether the appraisal was given or what the appraisal contained each employee is asked to indicate by signature and date, the receipt of the appraisal, not agreement with it.

11. Employees' performance appraisals are kept current.

12. There is no attempt to satisfy all the management purposes of the appraisal at a single annual discussion of performance. Systems provide additional opportunity for supervisors and employees to discuss, improve, and plan for job performance.

13. Employees are informed about the steps the agency will follow in using appraisal information to make decisions to reward, promote, reassign, train,
retain, or demote employees (Vasu, Stewart, and Garson, 1990; also in Levinson, 1980; Perry, Petrakis, and Miller, 1988).

Hoyt (1982) emphasized the necessity of fairness in the managerial models in evaluation of programs,

"The final criterion of sound evaluation programs is that they be fair. In contrast to the political nature of credibility and the technical nature of validity, fairness represents a moral imperative. It insists that professional ethics be followed, that procedures be applied uniformly, and that objectivity be pursued" (p. 90).

Vasu, Stewart, and Garson (1990) expressed that all performance appraisal systems attempt to measure tasks or functions, assess duties and responsibilities performance, and appraise how well, or badly, employees are doing.

Approaches, Techniques, and Models of Evaluation

This section focuses on some guidelines that propose to gain proper directions over the use of evaluation instruments and the information obtained from their completion. It contains a set of statements from the literature serving to regulate evaluation in advance so as to guarantee, insofar as possible, the proper application of an evaluation system and to answer the question: How to evaluate?

From the literature review, one can determine that evaluation is not characterized by any particular
methodology; instead, it draws upon relevant methodology from several disciplines. It may involve interview techniques; rating scales; aptitude and achievement tests; experimental or quasi-experimental designs; and the processing, interrelating and interpretation of these various types of evidence. Indeed, a recurring problem in any evaluation is to delimit the scope of the project so that it can provide evidence, interpretations, and suggestions in time to influence further developments.

Cheshire and Hagemeyer (1982) described the approaches of developing an evaluation system in a community college. They suggested that in order to accomplish the goals and to fulfill the purposes and objectives, it is necessary to establish the approach that would allow everyone on campus to have an opportunity to comment on the development of the new instrument.

Vasu, Stewart, and Garson (1990) indicated eight evaluation techniques which have been summarized as follows:

1. Essay Appraisal: "This technique asks appraisers to write a short statement covering a particular employee's strength, weaknesses, areas for improvement, potential and so on."

2. Graphic Rating Scale: "This assesses a person on quality and quantity of his or her work and on a variety of other factors that vary with specific jobs. The predetermined scale allows the supervisor to assess employees, whether they are outstanding, superior, above average, average, below average, unsatisfactory."
3. Field Review: It is a group judgment technique "used as a check on reliability of the standards used among raters. A member of the personnel or central administrative staff meets with a small group of raters from each supervisory unit to go over ratings for each employee and to identify areas of dispute and to arrive at a usable standard."

4. Forced-Choice Rating: The most common version of this method "asks raters to choose from among groups of statements those which best fit the person being evaluated, and those which least fit. The statements are then weighted and scored in much the same way psychological tests are scored."

5. Critical Incident Appraisal: "In this method, records are kept on each employee where the actual incidents of positive and negative behavior are recorded by supervisors."

6. Management by Objectives (MBO): "According to the approach, employees are asked to set, or help set, their own performance goals. Objectives are usually described in terms of performance standards or results, but employee development objectives are often included. Periodically employees and supervisors monitor progress against objectives and the end of an appraisal period employees and supervisors assess performance against each objective."

7. Work-Standards: "This approach provides for the organization to explicitly lay down work standards instead of asking employees to set goals and objectives. The work standards technique establishes work and staffing targets aimed at increasing productivity. Under work standards the organization develops or alters position descriptions for each position to reflect all the major responsibilities and standards of performance."

8. Ranking Methods: "For purpose of comparing people in different units, the best approach appears to be a ranking technique involving pooled judgment. The two most effective ranking methods include alteration-ranking and paired-comparison ranking. Both of these methods ask the supervisor to select
the 'most valuable' employees" (p. 347-350).

At the federal level a new performance appraisal system, characterized as the "cornerstone" of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, is now in place. It does not adopt a particular single method of evaluation. Instead, it represents a combination of several methods described above and includes identifying critical and analytical elements of an employee's position, as well as developing objectives, job related performance standards for those elements, periodic progress reviews and direct relationship between appraisal of performance and pay (Vasu, Stewart, and Garson, 1990).

Cummings and Schwab (1973) considered that the most common appraisal techniques are rating scales, essays, critical incidents, checklists, forced-choice, employee comparison, and the results-oriented technique.

For procedures, Hoyt (1982) recommended that two types of evaluative information are needed: The first has to do with outcomes, and this is needed for summative evaluation -- What information is needed?; the second concerns administrative style, relevant to formative evaluation -- How can information be obtained? He added:

"An effective evaluation system begins with a description of the responsibilities to be emphasized during the evaluation period. It ends with an interpretation of evaluation information based on performance standards and an
understanding of contextual factors. Between these two points evaluative information is collected" (p. 95).

Care must be taken in the selection or design of an evaluative procedure; it must be particularly suited to the modes of operation and institutional norms of the college or university. A 1976 survey, conducted by Berquist and Tenbrink of approximately four hundred colleges and universities in the United States, showed that at least six different procedures being used in the evaluation of administrators. These six procedures are:

1. Unstructured narration
2. Unstructured documentation
3. Structured narration
4. Rating scales
5. Structured documentation (portfolio)

Among criteria used to evaluate the chairperson’s performance, Hammons and Thomas (1980) in their survey of chairpersons found the following frequencies: job performance (95%), managerial skills (92%), personal traits (78%), and achievement of objectives (66%). They found that over 80% of the chairpersons felt that all four of these criteria should be used to evaluate their administrative performance. In rank ordering their preferences, responding
chairpersons ranked these categories: job performance (99.1%), managerial skills (96.9%), achievement of objectives (85.8%), and personal traits (80.7%). Thus, it appears that a high correlation exists between the criteria used for evaluating the chairperson's performance and the desirable criteria.

In their investigations Hammons and Thomas (1980) tried to examine the frequency of using different standards in appraisal systems. They reported that two thirds of the chairpersons stated that the standards in their appraisal systems were both objective and subjective and that more than a third (34%) of the chairpersons reported that they were evaluated using primarily subjective standards. Only (9%) of the respondents indicated that their appraisals used only objective standards.

As for the desirable standards, Hammons and Thomas (1980) found that over 80% of the chairpersons would like the standards in their appraisal system to be both objective and subjective, and 60% would like the standards to be the same for all chairpersons.

Development of an Evaluation Plan

Any attempt to measure performance requires one, at some point, to operationally define constructs that have a variety of dimensions. Simply stated, if you are measuring
performance, one of the first steps is to define the dimension(s) of the task or function whose performance you seek to measure (Vasu, Stewart, and Garson, 1990).

Evaluation against established standards is an essential ingredient for ultimately determining the effectiveness of any educational activity. Standards provide the yardsticks, milestones, or levels of achievement against which measures may be compared to determine the effectiveness of performance (Welker and Morgan, 1991). Bolton (1980) predicted that:

"If an administrator evaluation was to be successful, three steps or main phases of a well-defined process would be essential:

1. **Planning for Evaluation**, which involves analysis of a specific situation, establishment of purpose objectives, and deciding upon means for measuring the processes used and the eventual outcomes.

2. **Collecting Information**, which involves monitoring and measuring the activities planned and the outcomes that result from the activities.

3. **Using Information**, which includes communication regarding the analysis and interpretation of information, as well as making decisions about the next step to be taken" (p. 15).

A plan for administrative evaluation is suggested by Hoyt (1982):

"1. Administrative appointments should be for fixed periods, generally three to five years.

2. The appointment period should begin with a statement of goals, objectives, and priorities for the coming year and the next few years and end with a review of progress on these, the circumstances that altered plans or affected outcomes, and a projection for the next cycle."
3. The evaluation process, which requires relevant input from a variety of sources, should be conducted by a special committee whose members are respected representatives of each constituency. An authority in evaluation should lead the committee and, in the case of high-level administrators, might well include an advocate for the administrator—a person who understands the circumstances under which the administrator functioned and who deliberately attempts to interpret evaluative information in the best light. The chairman should see that sound principles of evaluation are followed.

4. At the conclusion of the evaluation, a decision should be made about reappointment. If this decision is affirmative, plans should be made to address professional development and program improvement needs identified by the evaluation.

5. A provision should also be made to obtain less-comprehensive evaluative input on an annual basis. Such input should be secured on a volunteer and confidential basis, and its purpose should be limited to diagnosis for developing improvement strategies" (p. 99).

Evaluation of Administrators in Higher Education

Administrative evaluation refers to the procedures used to assess the performance of noninstructional staff at collegiate institutions. In this area of evaluation, higher education has lagged behind the industrial and business world (Baum, 1983). There has been a marked and serious lack of systematic consideration of the many types of judgments required in the conduct and direction of colleges and universities.

Answering the question: Why evaluate administrator
performance?, Seldin (1988) responded:

"The core purpose is to initiate improvement, and this can be achieved by (1) sharper, clearer definition of the administrator's role; (2) assisting the administrator in planning career decisions; and (3) assessing administrative strengths and weaknesses to help guide professional and personal development" (p. 16).

Interest in evaluation of administrative performance grew out of an increasing demand in the middle 1970's for accountability in all sectors of the collegiate community. Baum (1983) explained the reasons for this increasing demand, "Its growing adoption seems to be derived from increased demands for accountability and for the growing concern for administrative effectiveness and efficiency in the face of the 'hard times' which the academic world is facing" (p. 182).

Thus, there has been growing interest in models and methods of administrator evaluation in academe (Rohrer, 1990). This interest has been further encouraged by growing concern for professional development programs among members of the instructional staff (faculty development), as well as by a growing interest in the implications of successful business practices for higher education (National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1973).

Farmer (1979) argued against what he considers a false rationale for rejecting formal evaluation in higher education. He believes that administrative effectiveness is
determined by situational variables and that appraisal systems must be designed accordingly. In deciding which aspects of administrator performance should be assessed, he stated eight categories: (1) education and experience, (2) productivity and deficiency, (3) performance criteria, (4) personal qualities, (5) educational statesmanship, (6) political and fiscal astuteness, (7) administrative style, and (8) unique criteria.

Hengstler and others (1981) identified 17 items for Administrator Evaluation Survey in their study, "Faculty Rating as Measure of Departmental and Administrator Quality".

Hoyt (1982) suggested some conclusions from his analysis to the administrators evaluation: First, administrator evaluation will almost always require criterion referenced measures. Secondly, multiple sources of evaluation judgment should be sought. Thirdly, an annual report that reviews objectives, priorities, activities, and outcomes is an essential ingredient, in addition to a second comprehensive evaluation which can be undertaken only every three to five years. Finally, he emphasized a commitment to using administrative evaluation for improvement.

Baum (1983) concluded from his study about "Evaluating the Evaluation Process for Academic Administrators" that the results suggest:
"that we still have quite a way to go in several of these, particularly the following: evaluation criteria and norms should be agreed on in advance; policies and procedures should be the result of participative planning by administrators and faculty; data should be descriptive rather than judgmental; evaluation should be linked to the reward system; and a development component should be added" (p. 193).

Based on a review of research literature and from discussions with more than 200 department chairpersons, deans, provosts, and presidents, Seldin (1988) developed ten guidelines for successful evaluation systems for campus executives which are summarized as follows:

1. The administrative evaluation program must be firmly rooted in the culture of college and university.

2. The program must be candidly, completely, and clearly presented to every administrator.

3. Administrators must have a significant hand in developing and implementing the evaluation program.

4. The primary purpose of the evaluation procedures should be to improve the quality of administration.

5. Top-level administrators must actively support the evaluation policies and practices.

6. All administrators must know the performance standards by which they will be evaluated.
7. Allow room for individual differences in developing evaluation criteria.

8. The evaluation instruments must provide reliable and valid data.

9. Avoid the common mistake of accepting the assessment of a single source, such as the administrator's immediate supervisor, as the comprehensive evaluation of the administrator.

10. Be sure to weigh the costs and benefits of maintaining and implementing an evaluation program from time to time.

Chickering (1981) stressed the importance of the environmental conditions in considering evaluation systems, "Any system of evaluation and assessment should take into account variations in institutional milieux that reward certain personal styles and talents and play down others" (p. 725).

Evaluating the Academic Department Chairperson's Performance

The need for comprehensive studies in all the areas of higher educational administration, especially regarding key positions, is crucial. The performance of the academic department chairperson is essential and of a diverse nature. "The role of a department chair is incredibly demanding because it is not completely administrative nor is it
completely faculty/collleague" (Roach, 1991).

The literature review for this study has attempted to cover the aspects which are believed to be necessary to provide a reliable base for future corresponding studies related to academic department chairperson performance in Jordanian higher education. However, although the department chairperson's position has been widely acknowledged as vital to the operation of colleges and universities, it has, even in the American literature, suffered from a general lack of attention from educational researchers (Knight & Holen, 1985).

Much of the research and commentary on faculty evaluation and administrator evaluation in higher education, though not specifically addressed to the special needs of the academic department chairperson, do have considerable applicability to our present purposes. The same arguments could be applied just as well to the chair's special responsibility for the direction, productivity and quality of output of the department as a whole over and above her/his own scholarly achievements.

Hammons and Thomas (1980) believe that while management performance appraisal at all levels is critical, no group is more important to evaluate than department/division chairpersons, and no group is more neglected with regard to evaluation. They summarized findings of a previous study
and offered recommendations regarding needed improvement in the appraisal of the department/division chairperson. They concluded that "the results confirmed our suspicions that there is much to be done in developing appropriate appraisal system for the department/division chairperson" (p. 42).

Thomas (1978) focused on the purposes that had been identified for evaluating the chairpersons or any other administrator in an institution. She stated three purposes: (1) developmental, (2) judgmental, and (3) accountability. She cited two articles that recommend specific procedures for evaluating chairpersons. The first by Anderson (1975), although not specifically addressed to chairpersons, discussed procedures that were meant to apply to all administrative appraisals, including those of chairpersons. Anderson recommended that:

1. The authority to conduct administrator evaluations needs to be clear to all concerned. It is proposed that final authority be held by the president.
2. An ad hoc evaluation committee comprised of administrators, faculty, students, alumni, and board members be formed. The specific task of the ad hoc evaluation committee be to prepare an assessment portfolio for a specific persons being evaluated.
3. The assessment portfolio should include the administrator’s self-evaluation and statements of groups represented on the ad hoc committee.
4. Those who will be evaluated should know and understand the process. Any modifications in the process should be communicated to all.
5. An essential part of the process should be the right of review or the use of an appeal process.
6. Results of the evaluation should be discussed
between the person evaluated and the president.

7. Outside of the evaluatee, results of the evaluation should be confidential (Thomas, 1978, p. 22).

In the second article, Ehrle (1975) suggested procedures where departmental faculty play an active role in the appraisal process in an effort to harmonize the perceptions of the chairperson with the opinions of the departmental members. His proposal includes a special evaluation committee comprised of departmental faculty which would be responsible for supervising the evaluation, summarizing the evaluation reports, discussing the report with the chairperson, and sending the report to the dean. The dean would then discuss all components of the report with the chairperson and assist the chairperson in developing future objectives.

Thomas (1978) concluded that three commonalities appear in the procedures outlined in Ehrle and Anderson: "(1) more than one person should conduct the evaluation, (2) results of the evaluation should be summarized in writing, and (3) a conference should be held between the supervisor and the chairperson to discuss the results of the evaluation" (p. 23).

Lyons (1982) identified eleven evaluative dimensions for assuring chairperson performance in his study of the use of behaviorally anchored rating scales.
Nicoll (1971) considered three primary functions for the purposes of department chairperson evaluation. These functions include:

1. an effective liaison between the departmental colleagues and administrative superiors,
2. a leader of the departmental colleagues in maintaining a vital and educationally purposeful departmental program, and
3. a model teacher-scholar in their discipline (p. 9, 10).

Cornett (1977) suggested a fourth function about the "department machinery" such as budgets and correspondence. While Cornett considered this fourth function secondary, it might be considered essential in the Jordanian institutions.

In their survey about the procedures used to appraise the administrative performance of chairpersons, Hammons and Thomas (1980) had received answers for twenty-seven questions related to procedures of an evaluation system. The following data summarize the responses:

1. Responsibilities for those conducting the evaluation must be completed in writing (60%).
2. Written statements cover responsibilities (62%).
3. Dates are established when the evaluation must be completed (62%).
4. A date is projected to be notified of results of evaluation (53%).
5. Procedures require chairpersons and supervisors to establish goals and objectives (55%).
6. Chairpersons are permitted to have or see a copy of their evaluation report (92%).
7. Chairpersons are required to sign their evaluation report (75%).
8. Chairpersons are allowed to make additional comments on the final report (74%).
9. Evaluation report becomes part of permanent record (90%).
10. Someone above the supervisor reviews the results of evaluation (73%).
11. Chairpersons are allowed to appeal results of evaluation (78%).
12. Supervisors are given special training in appraisals (29%).
13. Periodic review of the entire evaluation system is required (38%) (p. 43).

The researchers found that:

14. Eighty percent of all chairpersons are evaluated using a uniform set of procedures.
15. Fifteen percent of the chairpersons receive progress reports on their performance prior to final assessment.
16. Ninety-three percent of all chairpersons are re-evaluated each evaluation period.
17. Ten percent of the chairpersons classified their performance appraisal interview as judgmental; forty-two percent felt their supervisors conducted developmental interviews; while forty-nine percent said their performance appraisal interview contained both judgmental and developmental components.
18. Chairpersons receive a written report on their performance (66%).
19. Supervisors are required to recommend such action as retention, termination, or suspension as part of the final results of the appraisal (57%).
20. Supervisors rate chairpersons as satisfactory, conditional, or unsatisfactory (57%).
21. Supervisors must specify the activities to overcome identified weaknesses (33%).
22. Twenty-seven percent of the chairpersons are given a specified time period for correcting performance.
23. Ninety-seven percent of the chairpersons feel their supervisor allows them to express their opinions during the appraisal interview.
24. Eighty-five percent of the chairpersons have supervisors who meet and openly discuss the degree to which their performance is satisfactory and explain what is expected in the future (p. 43,44).

The researchers also found that chairpersons are required to set goals and objectives. Of these
chairpersons:

25. Ninety-two percent set goals and objectives related to departmental/divisional or institutional priorities with their supervisor.

26. Fifty-eight percent have procedures for periodic review of progress toward fulfillment of established goals and objectives before final assessment.

27. Ninety-seven percent have procedures which enable modification of the established goals and objectives (p. 44).

And now, who evaluates the academic department chairperson? Is the evaluation to be top down evaluation or will it include elements of peer evaluation or subordinate evaluation?

First, chairpersons are evaluated by deans. They evaluate chairpersons' performance according to criteria that consider the managerial part of the job, and they provide them with feedback to help them run their departments effectively. Whitmore (1985) stated:

"It does seem clear that a dean’s responsibilities include the evaluation and motivation of chairs to improve their performance and to run their departments as effectively as possible. The dean should, on an annual basis, evaluate the chair’s fulfillment of his or her role as leader, manager, motivator, organizer, planner, and evaluator in order that each division can function at its best" (p. 30).

Tucker (1992) focused on the managerial part of performance when deans evaluate chairs. He argued that although deans may associate a chair’s performance with the overall performance of his or her department, they also
evaluate chairs in terms of how well they seem to behave as managers. He added that "Chairs are perceived by deans to be members of a management team" (p. 533).

Secondly, faculty members are also considered an important source for evaluating chairpersons. They view them through many lenses and may provide them, freely and independently, with critical feedback (Abu Qudais, 1993). Tucker (1992) indicated three areas where faculty evaluate department chairperson performance:

"Nevertheless, they [faculty] do form one of the chair's most important constituencies, and their views can ultimately determine how successful a chair will be. Faculty perspectives on the chair's performance come from their own contact with the chair, and with the kind of impact the chair has on their ability to do their jobs. Faculty usually evaluate the performance of department chairs in at least three areas: managerial, academic, and political" (p. 531).

As a result, chairpersons receive positive or negative feedback on their performance, formal or informal. In all cases they need to benefit from this useful feedback to develop their future decisions and actions.

Reasons for Evaluating the Academic Department Chairperson's Performance

There are many reasons for undertaking administrative evaluation of academic department chairperson performance. Determining why formal evaluation should be performed, and
then, how shall it be performed, become of practical importance.

The department chairperson is a key position in affecting the operations of the university. This position is viewed as highly significant, perhaps essential one, in the smooth functioning of the college, in the maintaining and raising of faculty standards and in the resolution of communication problems between faculty and upper echelon administrators (Thomas, 1978). Effective performance in the department chairmanship is of such importance in the operation of a dynamic institution that every campus should have a program aimed at the continuing improvement of that performance (Goodman, 1980).

Knight & Bolen (1985) believe that the growing complexity of American colleges and universities creates a need for systematic study of this important administrative position. They stated that:

"What affects the effectiveness of chairpersons has often been debated, and recommendations outlining particular courses of action for chairpersons have seldom been based on empirical studies of the chair’s position. Rather, recommendations have been distillations from the experiences of those who have held the position" (P. 677).

The purpose of evaluation is to assist the development of the chairperson as a leader of the department (Ehrle, 1975). Ehrle believes that, "It is intended not only to
identify strengths and limitations but to harmonize the chairman's perception of his own performance with the opinions of those whom he affects" (p. 32).

For determining the reasons of conducting administrator evaluation, Farmer (1979) indicated that it "can be categorized in three functional areas: summative, formative, and institutional." He added "Whatever the reasons may be, they should be clearly identified and understood by everyone involved" (p. 11). Seldin (1988) stated three reasons to evaluate college and university administrators: "(1) to improve their performance, (2) to provide a rational and equitable basis for personnel decisions, and (3) to anticipate and be able to respond to demands to assess performance" (p. 24).

Approaches to and Criteria of Evaluation of the Academic Department Chairperson's Performance

The literature indicates that there is a substantial amount of research in the fields of administration, administrator performance, leadership, and evaluative instrumentation. It is also apparent that a trend towards systematic research involving administrative theory and its application to higher education and departmentship has evolved in the past two decades. This study may give further insight into the concept of chairperson performance
in educational settings in order to aid in the advancement of future research.

The strength of any evaluative system is in the formulation of the process, and the commitment of the administrator and his colleagues to consciously assess and collectively address problem areas in administrative leadership. Whatever model is used in the evaluation, the process should be growth oriented, directed toward enhancing competencies, and not ridding an institution of the individuals being evaluated. "Recommendations to improve effectiveness should be a normal part of every evaluation. Efficiency is concerned with the optimal use of resources in carrying out responsibilities" (McManus, Todd, & Wilson 1982, p. 3).

There must be agreement among all participants that the results of the review will be taken seriously, and that the areas of weaker performance will be addressed. Thus, the challenge is to create a process which will identify weaknesses and strengths, and consequently improve the individual's ability to be an administrative leader (Goodman, 1980).

Three approaches described in the literature were: (1) rating scales, (2) committee, and (3) management by objectives (MBO) (Thomas, 1978). Ehrle (1975) developed a model and questionnaire explaining how institutions can
better select and evaluate chairpersons. Fenker (1975) took a different approach with a similar evaluative rating. Fenker used a questionnaire in a case study at one university. He factor analyzed the questionnaire in an attempt to develop an evaluative instrument that would meet the requirements of psychometric testing.

Evaluation of academic department chairpersons is concerned with the assessment of many diverse areas: student progress; the impact of distinctive environments; various instructional methodologies and learning experiences; cost and effectiveness of alternative programs in the department; attitudes, values, and goals of students, faculty, and, even, the public; student services; effectiveness of research and public service programs and tactics; strategies and politics of affecting desirable change in the department.

In his report to the American Association for Higher Education, Booth (1982) called for constructing realistic priorities and goals in order for chairs to be properly evaluated. He presented several choices available to institutions with regard to the evaluation of chairpersons which may be internally or externally developed:

1. A self-made evaluation approach which is exemplified by a questionnaire that has been used by the College of Arts and Science of the
University of Missouri, Kansas City (Chair Evaluation Questionnaire 1979). This questionnaire is largely objective although it asks for voluntary additional comments, including a request for large-scale review of the department.

2. An administrator evaluation survey (AES) developed by Dennis D. Hengstler and associates (1981), using a questionnaire to compare faculty perceptions of the chair's overall effectiveness on a diverse set of characteristics.

3. The Departmental Evaluation of Chairperson Activities for Development (DECAD) system designed by Hoyt (1979) and involving faculty in an evaluation system which was developmental as well as judgmental.

4. Another evaluation system was developed by Stone (1977) in which some division heads in four community colleges were asked to describe their "best and worst" division head. With the information, an evaluation instrument was developed showing how well the division head works with people. It also describes his or her professional qualities. With an increase in the face validity of this instrument, it could be
extended to develop compatible evaluation instruments for chairs in other divisions or institutions.

Since the chairperson evaluation focuses on performance, the criteria for evaluation should be directed toward performance as outlined in the job description. Smith and Pennypacker (1982) suggested six criteria which should be taken into account when adopting a job evaluation method: (1) the fitness of the job evaluation method to the particular characteristics, needs, and circumstances of the organization; (2) the simplicity of the job evaluation method, as non-complex as possible; (3) the objectivity, in order to minimize the effects of bias and opinion; (4) the flexibility and adaptability; (5) the reasonable limit of resulting changes, as it should not result in too many changes; and (6) the limited cost, it must not be too high.

Thomas (1978) referred to two articles including criteria used in evaluating the chairperson performance. In the first article, Hillway (1973) listed the following criteria: (1) interest in the educational process, (2) sympathetic attitude toward students, (3) fairness in dealing with students, (4) considerate attitude toward faculty, (5) sense of humor, (6) tolerance to new ideas, (7) trustworthiness, (8) skill in securing group action, (9)
ability to inspire confidence, (10) ability to organize, (11) ability to maintain morale, (12) ability to maintain faculty performance, and (13) appearance.

Hillway believes that the chairperson's methods should be examined, and that the evaluation should include the ability of the chairperson to (1) encourage democratic participation, (2) communicate with group members, (3) adhere to group decisions, (4) respect professional rights of faculty, (5) assign work fairly, (6) make decision on promotion and salary, and (7) use appropriate administrative methods.

In the second article, Anderson (1975) referred to much less specific criteria and felt that they should relate to the following: (1) education and training, (2) experience, (3) performance as an academic leader, (4) performance as an academic manager, (5) personality, health, energy, and personal values, (6) administration style, and (7) astuteness and sophistication in political, social and economic affairs. Thomas (1978) concluded that both articles suggested criteria related to personality traits rather than to measurable performance.
Role of the Academic Department Chairperson

An initial step in the process of performance evaluation is the identification of the tasks and activities for which each individual administrator is responsible (McManus, Todd, & Wilson 1982). Administrative performance, once identified, "must also be described in such a fashion that the appraiser is in a position to observe the demonstrable outcomes of the performance" (Zappulla, 1983, p. 220). Therefore, in order to build up the base for a systematic performance evaluation model for the chairperson, it is necessary to present an overview of the literature on the role of the position.

Nothing was found in the Jordanian literature about the key positions in higher education administration. No clear definition or detailed description of the job duties or responsibilities of the chairperson is available in the universities' bylaws or regulations. There is no evidence that Jordanian researchers have attempted to conduct a comprehensive analysis or any kind of study about the department chairperson in Jordanian institutions until the researcher conducted his study in phase one, "The Work of Department Chairperson in Jordanian Public Universities" (Abu Qudais, 1993).

The international literature, especially that of the United States, from which the Jordanian universities adopted
their system, includes discussions about the role of the academic department chairperson associated with the culture of the country and the characteristics of its higher education system.

Tucker (1992), after conducting intensive studies and workshops about the position of the academic chairperson, presented a list of roles for department chairpersons. He developed, a list of 53 components that shows, by category, the responsibilities and duties that face the department chairperson.

Herr (1989) designed a handbook for department chairpersons at Colorado State University in 1989. The roles and duties of the department chairperson indicated by an earlier version of Tucker (1992) were expanded upon, adapted, and used in Herr's handbook.

Taylor (1985) designed a list for what she called the "reasonable role" for the department where she sits at George Mason University. She indicated, "It should be obvious that what is appropriate in one environment may be, no doubtless is, quite inappropriate in another environment" (p. 4). Taylor added:

"To discuss a role, one must take into consideration the position and the culture of the system within which the role exists. Chairs in some situations are expected to do things expected of deans in other situations and of faculty in yet other situations. Therefore, my first conclusion about appropriate roles for a chair: a chair
behaves in an ideal manner when s/he performs according to the reasonable expectations of the social system of which the role is a part" (p. 4).

Smith (1970) developed a list of 46 components for what he called "Job Activities of Department for Chairmen to Perform" (p. 75). Yang (1987) mentioned 59 "possible statements" (pp. 96-100) about the department chairperson's role, and used 53 of them in designing an appraisal instrument for his study of the evaluation of department chairpersons in Taiwan colleges. Miller and Whitcomb (1978) stated 16 categories to be the chairperson's duties. Brann and Emmet (1972) borrowed a list of 28 items from the Pennsylvania State University Faculty Handbook to be the "Chairperson's Task List of The Academic Department or Division Chairman".

Hoyt (1977) designed the (DECA) system of evaluating chairpersons for the Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Manhattan, Kansas. The system permits faculty to report anonymously on the work of chairpersons in personnel management, departmental planning and development, and building the department's reputation.

Similar work was designed by many other authors and universities to clarify the role of the academic chairperson so as to organize, develop, and evaluate his/her performance.

It seems that the research of phase I of this study
(1993) is so far, the only work done, as a research, about higher education in Jordan in general, and the role of the department chairperson in Jordan universities in particular. In that phase, the author suggested the following as a profile that represents the work of the academic chairperson in the public universities of Jordan. The profile consists of five categories and contains sixty items in total.

Suggested Profile of the Work of Department Chairpersons in the Public Universities of Jordan

This study explains the actual and the ideal roles of the academic department chairperson in the public universities of Jordan as perceived by deans, chairpersons, and faculty members in two public universities. The following is a profile of listed duties and responsibilities derived from their responses and considered the most appropriate combination to represent the work of the academic chairperson in the public Jordanian universities.

A. Administration and Paperwork:
   1. Run the day-to-day business of the department.
   2. Regulate the department correspondence and maintain records for different needs.
   3. Manage department facilities and equipment.
4. Supervise and evaluate the clerical and technical staff of the department.

5. Process department correspondence and requests for information.

6. Prepare and propose recommendations for the department budget.

7. Represent the department in all stages of formation and authorization of the department budget.

8. Administer the department budget.

9. Prepare the annual budgetary report.

10. Complete forms and surveys.

11. Monitor building security and maintenance.

B. **Departmental, Council, and Committee Activities:**

1. Call the departmental council for regular and unscheduled meetings.

2. Prepare the agenda and conduct the meetings.

3. Establish departmental committees.

4. Use committees effectively, lead the department teamwork, and implement effective leadership principles.

5. Supervise the work done by the departmental council regarding all of the council's
6. Develop long-range departmental programs, plans, and goals.

7. Implement long-range departmental programs, plans, and policies, and carry out the recommended actions and decisions of the departmental council.

8. Determine what services the department should provide to the university, community, and country.

9. Share decision-making with the departmental council and faculty council.

10. Serve as an advocate for the department.

11. Delegate some departmental administrative responsibilities to individuals and committees.

12. Encourage faculty members to communicate ideas for improving the department.

13. Carry out the decisions of the faculty council related to the department.

14. Prepare the annual report about departmental activities to be presented to the departmental council and the dean.

15. Participate on university and community committees.

16. Represent the department in the faculty (college) council and in university meetings related to
departmental affairs.

17. Encourage community service contributions and participation of departmental faculty members.

18. Improve and maintain the department's image and reputation.

C. Leadership and Interaction With Superiors and Subordinates:

1. Help in training and orienting inexperienced and new faculty members.

2. Recruit and recommend selection and appointment of faculty members.

3. Preserve fairly good relationships with and among faculty members and create a positive interpersonal work environment.

4. Assign responsibilities, such as teaching, committee work, and so forth to faculty members.

5. Evaluate faculty members' performance; emphasize the positive and deal with the unsatisfactory cases.

6. Encourage and monitor faculty members' service contributions.

7. Initiate promotion and tenure recommendations.

8. Make merit recommendations.
9. Keep faculty members informed of departmental, faculty, and institutional plans, activities, and expectations.

10. Maintain good morale.

11. Reduce and prevent conflict among faculty members.

12. Preserve good relationships with the dean and the upper-level administration.

13. Communicate departmental needs to the dean and the upper-level administrators.

D. Instruction, Teaching, Student Affairs, and Curriculum Affairs:

1. Teach one or more classes.

2. Design semester schedules and update departmental courses and programs with the cooperation of the departmental council and the dean.

3. Monitor theses and dissertations, prospectuses, and programs of study for graduate students.

4. Regulate and supervise the periodical exams in the department.

5. Supervise, schedule, monitor, and grade department examinations.

6. Suggest development of curricula and propose new courses with the cooperation of faculty members.
7. Advise and counsel students, graduates and undergraduates, in the department.

8. Monitor the progress of departmental scholarship students inside and outside the country, and recommend the renewal or cancellation of their scholarships.

9. Reduce, resolve, and prevent problems among groups of students and between students and faculty members.

10. Assign students to faculty members for advising.

11. Coordinate activities and arrange for supplementary class activities, such as speakers, visitors, trips, etc.

12. Perform high quality teaching.

13. Foster good teaching techniques in the department.

14. Foster the development of each faculty member's special talents and interests.

15. Initiate programs and tasks outside the university and implement them.

E. Research:

1. Perform a reasonable quantity and quality of research.

2. Stimulate faculty members' research and publications.
3. Encourage faculty members to participate in regional and national professional meetings and conferences.

This profile of duties and responsibilities provided an adequate basis for the development of a survey instrument that was used to assess the subjects' beliefs and attitudes in order to develop an appropriate model for evaluation. These duties and responsibilities are considered the role expectations of the academic chairperson in the public universities in Jordan as perceived by the deans, academic chairpersons, and the faculty members. They are the "job description" of the chairperson position in these institutions. The items of this profile were used to construct the survey instrument in phase II of this study. In order to avoid the complexity, some items were broken down into more than one. That resulted in a sixty-four usable items in total.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

The research for this study is descriptive in nature, using a survey instrument to clarify the perceptions and priorities of the subjects concerning evaluation items about the work of the academic department chairpersons in the public universities of Jordan. Best (1970) reported that "Descriptive research describes what is. It also involves the description, recording, analysis, and interpretation of conditions that now exist. It often involves some type of comparison or contrast and may attempt to discover cause-effect relationships that exist" (p. 15).

In this chapter, attention was given to the description of methods and procedures that were employed to achieve the purpose of phase II of the study and to trace its development. The chapter contains: (a) a description of the population, (b) a description of the sample plan and the pilot study, (c) summaries of the procedures for the administration of the instrument, and (d) the collection and analysis of data.

In designing an evaluation procedure, special attention should be given to the way data will be analyzed before the data are collected. This precaution will help define which data are important and how they can be used to address the
questions and concerns which guide the evaluation (McManus, Todd, & Wilson 1982).

For this study, it was necessary to develop a survey that would ultimately meet the requirements of psychometric testing.

The Study Sample

The study dealt with the development of a model for evaluating the performance of academic department chairpersons in public Jordanian universities. The four existing public universities on the summer of 1993 were the pool of the study.

These universities are:

1. Jordan University of Science and Technology
2. Yarmouk University
3. Mu'ta University
4. The University of Jordan

The subjects of the study consisted of three groups as follows:

A) The entire population of the deans in the four universities.
B) The entire population of the academic department chairpersons in the four universities.
C) A randomly selected sample of 10% of the faculty members of each academic department in the four
universities (a stratified random sample). One faculty member was randomly selected from the list of names in each department where the number of faculty was 10 or fewer. When the number in the particular department was between 11 and 20, two faculty members were randomly selected, and three members when the number was between 21 and 30, and so on.

Since the universities participating in the study differ in size, and accordingly in size and numbers of colleges and departments, the number of subjects that was sampled from each group was different from one university to another.

A check was made with the personnel department in each university to ensure the availability of the population from which the sample of faculty members was drawn during the period of the research. Those who were not available were replaced by the same method.

The total number of the subjects of the three groups from the four institutions was 382. This number included all deans, all academic department chairpersons, and the number of faculty members selected according to the proportional random stratified sampling technique procedure mentioned previously. Since the survey instrument included sixty four statements, the number of subjects was consistent
sixty four statements, the number of subjects was consistent with what Popham (1993) suggested for administering the Likert Scale. He suggested that "You should have at least five times as many persons as statements" (p. 166). This assumed a 75% response rate (286/382) which was high.

A letter (Appendix A) explaining the study and asking for personal interview appointments during the period of the research was faxed to the presidents of the four universities. The letter included the request of a directory containing the names and university addresses of all deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members in each department of the university.

**Instrument**

A survey instrument (Appendix C) was developed to obtain data determined as relevant for the study. The survey items, which were designed to judge the performance of the academic department chairperson in the public universities of Jordan, were derived from the previous research in phase I of the study. The exploratory study in phase I yielded 64 items determined to be components of the academic department chairperson's work in the public universities in Jordan. Conceptually these items were categorized into five groups according to the item content.

A Likert-type scale was employed because of its
practicability and simplicity and was used to measure the importance of a particular statement of an attitude, belief or judgment. Furthermore, this method was selected because it creates numerical data that could be analyzed statistically.

This instrument contained choice responses to items representing the work of academic department chairpersons in Jordanian public universities. Respondents were asked to indicate the degree of importance that each item should be given in the evaluation model by placing a circle around the one response which best corresponds to their judgment of each item. The survey was developed both in English and Arabic. Respondents were free to complete either the English or the Arabic version according to their preference. A 4-point rating scale, extending from 1 for "not important" to 4 for "very important", according to Likert-type scale, was employed in this study to estimate the emphasis given by the subjects in each of the chairperson's performance items. The option of "no opinion" was provided but not used in the statistical analysis. Only items with responses of "very important" and "important" among the majority of the respondents was included in the final model. Each survey form was coded to permit follow up of nonrespondents, and to be used for statistical analysis. Both the English and Arabic versions were coded the same way and both copies for
a single subject carried the same code.

A coordinator was appointed by the president of each university participating in this study as the facilitator on the campus. The survey was distributed to the subjects at their university addresses via campus mail. A return envelope with the researcher's name and the coordinator's address (in Arabic) was supplied for the convenience of the respondents and to maximize the likelihood of response. A two-version cover letter in Arabic and English (Appendix B) was included. The letter explained the objectives of the study; requested the respondent's participation; and provided assurance of confidentiality of data collection, analysis and subsequent reporting. The survey recipients were asked to return the completed survey via campus mail within two weeks from the date of receipt. As Dillman (1978) recommended, a follow-up letter was sent to subjects who did not respond fourteen days after the initial mailing. Telephone contacts were conducted to follow-up on selected individuals based on responses to the follow-up letter.

The Pilot Study

To test the face validity of the survey statements, and their adequacy prior to their distribution to the study sample, three reference groups from the United Arab Emirates University were utilized for a pilot study. The rationale
for selecting the subjects of the pilot study from the United Arab Emirates University was because this university is adopting a similar kind of higher education system as in Jordan, and a number of the deans, chairpersons, and faculty members in this university are Jordanians. To guarantee consistency with the population sample of the study, the groups of the pilot study included two deans, two academic department chairpersons, and two faculty members. Copies of the survey and cover letter, both the English and the Arabic versions, were presented to them and the procedures planned for the main study were followed. The participants were not selected at random, but were invited to take part in the study.

The form of the pilot study provided space for the respondents to make comments about the survey itself and to indicate whether the items were clearly and understandably written and translated, and whether there were other points that can lead to improving the instrument. Based on the recommendations of the pilot group, modifications were made to the original survey.

Data Analysis

All the returned surveys were examined for completeness and correctness. All data resulting from the scaled items were coded and entered on a computer terminal and analyzed.
The analysis of data for this study had involved a variety of statistical techniques. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to facilitate the analysis of the data. For the purpose of analyzing survey data, distinctions were made during the analysis between the four institutions participating in the study, as well as among the three groups (deans, chairpersons, and faculty) in the study. The responses of the three groups and the four institutions were compared. Chi-square analyses were computed on the demographic variables to test for response bias. Responses to survey items were crossed with demographic variables including position of respondents and universities participating. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, and means) were used to used to determine the importance of the various items described in the survey and to address the first research question. Analysis of variance was used to address the second research question, the level of consensus among the three groups, as well as the third research question, the possible differences by institutions. When a majority of respondents in agreement or disagreement was indicated for a given item in the survey, a consensus existed despite contrary viewpoints expressed by a minority. Where significant differences were indicated in the analysis of variance, a post hoc (Newman-Keuls) test was used to identify where
specific differences exist at the .05 alpha level.

Narrative comments were edited, summarized, and presented.

Chapter Four will include the analysis of data and the results.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Analysis of Data

This chapter discusses answers by respondents to three research questions developed for this study. It was anticipated that respondents' answers would enable the researcher to identify the desirable items of a performance evaluation instrument for academic chairpersons at public universities in Jordan. Questions posed for this study were:

1. What do deans, chairpersons, and a random sample of faculty members in Jordanian public universities perceive to be the desired elements in an evaluation instrument for the academic department chairperson's performance in these universities?

2. To what degree is there consensus among deans as a group, department chairpersons as a group, and faculty members as a group regarding the elements of the academic department chairperson's performance evaluation model?

3. To what degree is there consensus among those at the four Jordanian institutions participating in the study regarding the elements of the academic department chairperson performance evaluation
model?

Reported in this chapter are the results of the survey used to collect data from the subjects of the study. The subjects consisted of three groups from the four working public universities surveyed during the summer of 1993. Those universities were:

1. Jordan University of Science and Technology
2. Yarmouk University
3. Mu'ta University
4. The University of Jordan

The three groups were:

A) The entire population of deans in the four universities.

B) The entire population of the academic department chairpersons in the four universities.

C) A stratified random sample of 10% of the faculty members of each academic department in the four universities.

Profile of Respondents

Of the 382 subjects surveyed, 286 returned usable surveys for a response rate of 75%. Table 1 shows the number of subjects, respondents, and response rate by university. The highest response rate among the four participating universities was the rate of response of
Yarmouk University (87%), the lowest was the response rate of Jordan University of Science and Technology (71%).

Table 2 describes the number of respondents from each university in the study shown as a percentage of all respondents from the four universities. The largest number of respondents was from The University of Jordan (123 respondents out of 172 subjects surveyed) with a percentage of 43.0% of the total response. The smallest number of respondents was from Mu‘ta University (44 respondents out of 59 subjects surveyed) with a percentage of 15.4% of the total response.

Table 3 shows the number of subjects and respondents from each university by position and the rate of response. Among the groups of deans in the four universities, the highest response rate was of the group of deans in the University of Jordan (80%), the lowest was the response rate of the group of deans in Mu‘ta university (43%). Among the groups of chairpersons, the highest rate of response was the response rate of the group of chairpersons in Yarmouk University (96%), while the lowest was the response rate of the group of chairpersons in Mu‘ta University (68%). Among the group of the random sample of faculty members, the highest rate of response was the response rate of the group of faculty members in Mu‘ta University (89%), while the lowest response rate was the response rate of the group of
faculty members in J.U.S.T. (70%).
Table 1

Survey Response Rate by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.U.S.T. *</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmouk</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu’ta</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of J.**</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Jordan University of Science and Technology.
**The University of Jordan.

Table 2

Percentage of Respondents From the Four Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.U.S.T.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmouk</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu’ta</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. OF J.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To determine if there were differences in response rate by position and university, chi-square tests were run. When responses of all deans, all chairpersons, and the random sample of faculty members were subjected to this statistical test, it revealed no statistically significant differences in response between either position (deans, chairpersons, and faculty members) or universities (the four participating public universities) at the .05 level of significance, (chi-square = 4.9, df = 6). As a consequence, it was assumed that the responses fairly represent those of the population for this area of study.

Respondents were free to complete either the English or the Arabic version of the survey according to their preference. Respondents preferred the English version were 40.9%, while 59.1% preferred the Arabic version. When a chi-square test was run to test whether position and language version were related, it was found that there were no significant differences at .05 level, (chi-square = 4.107, df = 2). Chi-square was run also to test for the relationship between university and language, and significant differences were found at the .05 alpha level, (chi-square = 13.615, df = 3). The likely reason for these differences was that some of the universities are scientific oriented and therefore use the English more either for textbooks or in teaching. Others are arts oriented.
Table 3

Subjects and Respondents by Position and Rate of Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th>Chairpersons</th>
<th>Faculty Mem.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.U.S.T.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7 64%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YARMOUK</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 63%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU’TA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 43%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.OF J.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12 80%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27 69%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>101 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. No. = number of subjects surveyed. Resp = number of respondents. Pct = percentage.
where the English language is less used. In addition, most of those working in the science oriented universities were educated in Western countries such as the United States of America and the United Kingdom, thus, it is possible that they are more able to use the English language.

The proportion of female respondents (17 respondents) was 5.9% of the whole number of respondents, while the proportion of male respondents (269) was 94.1%. These proportions were consistent with the proportions of the two groups in the number of subjects. It, also, reflects the rate of females working in the three positions in the public universities of Jordan. The highest proportion of responding females (64.7%) was from the University of Jordan, while the lowest proportion (5.9%) was from Mu’ta University. The University of Jordan is the oldest among the public universities in Jordan and located in the capital where life is more liberal, while Mu’ta university was, relatively, recently established in a more conservative area.

From the 286 respondents, 46 respondents (16.1%) indicated additional comments on the space provided in the survey form. Most of these comments indicated the need for evaluation instruments for the different academic disciplines. Some respondents questioned whether the application of such an evaluation model to department
chairpersons will be possible while other positions (e.g., deans, vice presidents) do not have any evaluation system.

In the sections which follow, each research question is stated followed by the analysis of data and presentation of results related to that question.

Research Question 1: What do deans, chairpersons, and a random sample of faculty members in Jordanian public universities perceive to be the desired elements in an evaluation instrument for the academic department chairperson's performance in these universities?

The respondents were asked to complete the survey and indicate the degree of importance that they think each item in the instrument should be given in evaluating the performance of academic chairpersons in Jordanian public universities. Responses were analyzed to identify the desired items that could be used to evaluate the chairperson's performance. The survey data were tabulated and reported by frequency and percentage of responses using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

The numerical values derived from responses to the survey itself show that a majority of all groups together considered almost every item included in the survey to be "Very Important" or "Important". All groups mutually determined that almost all the items were essential components of the desirable Chairperson Performance Evaluation Model (CPEM). For this reason, it is redundant
to report all the favorable responses here. However, a very small number of the respondents rated some items to be "Slightly Important" or "Not Important". The ratings of those respondents did not significantly affect the overall indication that almost all of the items are essential components of the CPEM.

A complete listing of responses can be found in Tables E-1 through E-5. These tables include the frequencies as well as the percentages of responses regarding the importance of the evaluation items of the different categories in the survey as perceived by respondents of the three groups from the four universities.

When the percentages of the degrees of "Very Important" and "Important" for each item in the returned forms were computed and combined, the following numbers of items were obtained for each percentage range (Table 4).

According to the data shown in Table 4, there was almost unanimous agreement that all the items should be included in a model for the evaluation of the academic department chairperson's performance.
Table 4

Percent of Items Rated as "Very Important" or "Important"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th># of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% - 100%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% - 89.9%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% - 79.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% - 69.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% - 59.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50%</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentage for this item was 49.7%.

To identify the importance of each of the survey items, an analysis was done for the sixty-four survey items based on the mean desirability score of each item (mds.). The mean desirability scores were computed out of the four-points of the Likert Scale used in this study.

The rank order of the types of activities undertaken by the academic department chairperson as perceived by the respondents was as follows according to the mean desirability score (mds) of each activity item:
1. Preserve good relationships with and among faculty members; create a positive interpersonal work environment (mds = 3.741).

2. Manage the day-to-day operation of the department (mds = 3.731).

3. Improve and maintain the department's image and reputation (mds = 3.685).

4. Share the departmental council and faculty council decision-making (mds = 3.647).

5. Call departmental council for regular and special meetings (mds = 3.622).

6. Serve as an advocate for the department (mds = 3.605).

7. Represent the department in the faculty council and in university meetings related to departmental affairs (mds = 3.587).


9. Prepare agenda and conduct meetings (mds = 3.549).

10. Lead the department teamwork (mds = 3.545).

11. Encourage faculty members to communicate ideas for improving the department (mds = 3.542).

12. Keep faculty members informed of departmental, faculty, and institutional plans, activities, and expectations (mds = 3.528).

13. Conduct high quality teaching (mds = 3.517).

14. Communicate departmental needs to the dean and the upper-level administrators (mds = 3.514).

15. Implement long-range departmental programs, plans, and policies; carry out the recommended actions and decisions of the departmental council (mds = 3.510).

16. Foster good teaching techniques in the department (mds = 3.493).

17. Maintain good morale (mds = 3.479).
18. Carry out the decisions of the faculty council related to the department (mds = 3.462).

19. Suggest development of curricula and propose new courses with the cooperation of faculty members (mds = 3.448).

20. Develop long-range departmental programs, plans, and goals (mds = 3.437).

21. Implement effective leadership principles (mds = 3.434).

22. Stimulate faculty members' research and publications (mds = 3.423).

23. Preserve good relationships with the dean and the upper-level administration (mds = 3.420).


24. Encourage faculty members to participate in regional, national, and international professional meetings and conferences (mds = 3.406).


27. Supervise the work done by the departmental council regarding all of council's responsibilities (mds = 3.374).


29. Teach one or more classes (mds = 3.360).

30. Prepare the annual report about departmental activities to be presented to the departmental council and the dean (mds = 3.353).

31. Evaluate faculty members' performance, emphasizing the positives and dealing with the unsatisfactory cases (mds = 3.350).

32. Initiate promotion and tenure recommendations (mds = 3.343).

33. Maintain records for different needs (mds = 3.325).
34. Foster the development of each faculty member's special talents and interests in academic affairs (mds = 3.311).

34. Assign faculty members' responsibilities, such as teaching, committee work, and so forth (mds = 3.311).

36. Regulate the department correspondence (mds = 3.308).

37. Process department correspondence and requests for information (mds = 3.301).

38. Update departmental courses and programs with the cooperation of the departmental council and the dean (mds = 3.294).

39. Reduce, resolve, and prevent problems among groups of students and between students and faculty members (mds = 3.290).

40. Design semester schedules (mds = 3.283).

41. Recruit and recommend selecting and appointing faculty members (mds = 3.273).

42. Help in training and orienting inexperienced and new faculty members (mds = 3.266).

43. Delegate some departmental administrative responsibilities to individuals and committees (mds = 3.255).

44. Prepare and propose recommendations for the department budget (mds = 3.252).

45. Determine what services the department should provide to the university, community, and country (mds = 3.182).

46. Manage department facilities and equipment (mds = 3.178).

47. Advise and counsel students, graduates and undergraduates, from the department (mds = 3.136).

48. Encourage community service contributions and participation of departmental faculty members (mds = 3.126).
49. Supervise and evaluate the clerical and technical staff of the department (mds = 3.119).

50. Participate on university committees (mds = 3.070).

51. Represent the department in all stages of formation and authorization of the department budget (mds = 3.059).

51. Encourage and monitor faculty members' service contributions (mds = 3.059).

53. Administer the department budget (mds = 3.038).

54. Monitor the progress of departmental scholarship students inside and outside the country; recommend the renewal or cancellation of their scholarships (mds = 3.024).

55. Assign students to faculty members for advising (mds = 3.017).

56. Prepare the annual budgetary report (mds = 2.969).

57. Supervise, schedule, monitor, and grade department examinations (mds = 2.923).

58. Regulate and supervise the periodic exams in the department (mds = 2.822).

59. Monitor theses and dissertations, prospectuses, and programs of study for graduate students (mds = 2.818).

60. Coordinate activities and arrange for supplementary class activities, such as speakers, visitors, etc (mds = 2.780).

61. Initiate and implement programs and tasks outside the university (mds = 2.695).


63. Complete forms and surveys (mds = 2.434).

64. Monitor building security and maintenance (mds = 2.427).

From the above ranking, one clearly can realize the degree of importance respondents perceived item 36 in the
survey should be given in the proposed evaluation model. This item calls for preserving good relationships and positive work environment among faculty members in the department, "Preserve good relationships with and among faculty members; create a positive interpersonal work environment".

Nine of the first fifteen highly ranked items were listed in the survey under the category of "Departmental, Council, and Committee Activities". These items are stated respectively beginning with the most important:

1. Item number 33 in the survey "Improve and maintain the department's image and reputation", was ranked as number 3.

2. Item number 23 in the survey "Share the departmental council and faculty council decision-making", was ranked as number 4.

3. Item number 13 in the survey "Call departmental council for regular and special meetings", was ranked as number 5.

4. Item number 24 in the survey "Serve as an advocate for the department", was ranked as number 6.

5. Item number 31 in the survey "Represent the department in the faculty council and in university meetings related to departmental affairs", was ranked as number 7.
6. Item number 14 in the survey "Prepare agenda and conduct meetings", was ranked as number 9.

7. Item number 17 in the survey "Lead the department teamwork", was ranked as number 10.

8. Item number 26 in the survey "Encourage faculty members to communicate ideas for improving the department", was ranked as number 11

9. Item number 21 in the survey "Implement long-range departmental programs, plans, and policies; carry out the recommended actions and decisions of the departmental council", was ranked as number 15.

Four of the first fifteen highly ranked items were listed in the survey under the category of "Leadership and Interaction With Deans and Faculty Members". These items are stated respectively beginning with the most important:

1. Item number 36 in the survey "Preserve good relationships with and among faculty members", was ranked as number 1.

2. Item number 43 in the survey "Reduce and prevent conflict among faculty members", was ranked as number 8.

3. Item number 41 in the survey "Keep faculty members informed of departmental, faculty, and institutional plans, activities, and expectations", was ranked as number 12.
4. Item number 44 in the survey "Communicate departmental needs to the dean and the upper-level administrators", was ranked as number 14.

These results clearly indicate the degree of importance that subjects perceived the two areas of responsibilities "Departmental, Council, and Committee Activities" and "Leadership and Interaction With Deans and Faculty Members" (category B and C in the survey) should be given in the proposed model for the evaluation of the academic department chairperson performance. It seems that there was a mutual agreement among the groups of all deans, all chairpersons, and the random sample of faculty members that these two areas come to be at the top of the importance scale of the suggested evaluation model of the academic department chairperson's performance.

From the other hand, five of the last fifteen lowest ranked items were listed under the category of "Administration". These items are stated respectively beginning with the least important:

1. Item number 12 in the survey "Monitor building security and maintenance", was ranked as number 64.
2. Item number 11 in the survey "Complete forms and surveys", was ranked as number 63.
3. Item number 10 in the survey "Prepare the annual budgetary report", was ranked as number 56.
4. Item number 9 in the survey "Administer the department budget", was ranked as number 53.
5. Item number 8 in the survey "Encourage and monitor faculty members' service contributions", was ranked as number 51.

Six other items from the last fifteen lowest ranked items were listed under the category of "Instruction, Teaching, Student Affairs, and Curriculum Affairs". These items are stated respectively beginning with the least important:

1. Item number 57 in the survey "Coordinate activities and arrange for supplementary class activities, such as speakers, visitors, etc.", was ranked as number 60.
2. Item number 49 in the survey "Monitor theses and dissertations, prospectuses, and programs of study for graduate students", was ranked as number 59.
3. Item number 50 in the survey "Regulate and supervise the periodic exams in the department", was ranked as number 58.
4. Item number 51 in the survey "Supervise, schedule, monitor, and grade department examinations", was ranked as number 57.
5. Item number 56 in the survey "Assign students to faculty members for advising", was ranked as number 55.
6. Item number 54 in the survey "Monitor the progress of departmental scholarship students inside and outside the country; recommend the renewal or cancellation of their scholarships", was ranked as number 54. This ranking shows the degree of importance that subjects perceived the two areas of responsibilities "Administration" and "Instruction, Teaching, Student Affairs, and Curriculum Affairs" (category A and D in the survey) should be given in the proposed model for the evaluation of the academic department chairperson performance. It seems that reference groups like to have less emphasis on these two areas than the other areas in the survey, so, it is not surprising that these two areas came at the lowest rank of the suggested importance.

The items of the area of the area of "Research" (category E in the survey) were given a higher degree of importance than the average of the survey items. These items were ranked as follow:

1. Item number 62 in the survey "Perform a reasonable quantity and quality of research" was ranked as number 24.
2. Item number 63 in the survey "Stimulate faculty members' research and publication" was ranked as number 22.
3. Item number 64 in the survey "Encourage faculty
members to participate in regional, national, and international professional meetings and conferences" was ranked as number 24 also.

This gives a clear idea that the reference groups considered the responsibilities of research in a degree of importance not less than the literature indicates as a part of the academic chairperson's role. They ranked research to lower than departmental work and leadership, but higher than the managerial work.

The table F - 1 shows the rank order of each of the survey items according to the respondents' preferences measured by the desirability mean score of each item.

**Research Question 2:** To what degree is there consensus among deans as a group, department chairpersons as a group, and faculty members as a group regarding the elements of the academic department chairperson performance evaluation model?

An analysis of variance was run to determine the degree of consensus and to find out whether there are significant differences (p < .05) in viewing the importance of the survey items among positions and universities. Results showed that there were no significant differences in thirty-one of the sixty-four survey items, among positions or among universities. However, significant differences (p < .05) were determined in thirty-three of the sixty-four items among either positions or universities or both, clearly
exceeding the likelihood of a chance occurrence. Table 5 shows all items in the survey classified into items not significantly different as valued by groups of respondents or universities, items significantly different as valued by groups of respondents according to position in all four universities together, and items significantly different as valued by all respondents from each university.
Table 5

All Items Classified According to Significance of Difference by University and Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of the Survey</th>
<th>No Sig.Dif.</th>
<th>Sig.Dif. by Pos.</th>
<th>Sig.Dif. by Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Manage the day-to-day operation of the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regulate the department correspondence.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maintain records for different needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Manage department facilities and equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervise and evaluate the clerical and technical staff of the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Process department correspondence and requests for information.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Prepare and propose recommendations for the department budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Represent the department in all stages of formation and authorization of the department budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of the Survey</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sig.Dif. by Pos.</th>
<th>Sig.Dif. by Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Administer the department budget.</td>
<td>.....x.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Prepare the annual budgetary report.</td>
<td>.................x.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Complete forms and surveys.</td>
<td>.....x.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Monitor building security and maintenance.</td>
<td>.................x.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Call departmental council for regular and special meetings.</td>
<td>.................x.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Prepare agenda and conduct meetings.</td>
<td>.................x.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Establish departmental committees.</td>
<td>.................x.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Organize committees effectively.</td>
<td>.................x.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lead the department teamwork.</td>
<td>.....x.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Implement effective leadership principles.</td>
<td>.................x.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Supervise the work done by the departmental council regarding all of council's responsibilities.</td>
<td>.....x.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items of the Survey</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sig.Dif. by Pos.</td>
<td>Sig.Dif. by Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Develop long-range departmental programs, plans, and goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Implement long-range departmental programs, plans, and policies; carry out the recommended actions and decisions of the departmental council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Determine what services the department should provide to the university, community, and country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Share the departmental council and faculty council decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Serve as an advocate for the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Delegate some departmental administrative responsibilities to individuals and committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Encourage faculty members to communicate ideas for improving the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of the Survey</th>
<th>No Sig.Dif.</th>
<th>Sig.Dif. by Pos.</th>
<th>Sig.Dif. by Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Carry out the decisions of the faculty council related to the department.</td>
<td>.............x..................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Prepare the annual report about departmental activities to be presented to the departmental council and the dean.</td>
<td>x..................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Participate on university committees.</td>
<td>x..................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Participate on community committees.</td>
<td>x..................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Represent the department in the faculty council and in the university meetings related to departmental affairs.</td>
<td>.............x..................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Encourage community service contributions and participation departmental faculty members.</td>
<td>x..................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Improve and maintain the department’s image and reputation.</td>
<td>x..................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Help in training and orienting inexperienced and new faculty members.</td>
<td>.............x..................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of the Survey</th>
<th>No Sig.Dif.</th>
<th>Sig.Dif. by Pos.</th>
<th>Sig.Dif. by Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Recruit and recommend selecting and appointing faculty members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Preserve good relationships with and among faculty members; create a positive interpersonal work environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Assign faculty members' responsibilities, such as teaching, committee work, and so forth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Evaluate faculty members' performance, emphasizing the positives and dealing with the unsatisfactory cases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Encourage and monitor faculty members' service contributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Initiate promotion and tenure recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Keep faculty members informed of departmental, faculty, and institutional plans, activities, and expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of the Survey</th>
<th>No Sig.Dif.</th>
<th>Sig.Dif. by Pos.</th>
<th>Sig.Dif. by Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42. Maintain good morale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Reduce and prevent conflict among faculty members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Preserve good relationships with the dean and the upper-level administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Communicate departmental needs to the dean and the upper-level administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Teach one or more classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Design semester schedules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Update departmental courses and programs with the cooperation of the departmental council and the dean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Monitor theses and dissertations, prospectuses, and programs of study for graduate students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Regulate and supervise the periodic exams in the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items of the Survey</td>
<td>No Sig.Dif.</td>
<td>Sig.Dif. by Pos.</td>
<td>Sig.Dif. by Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Supervise, schedule, monitor, and grade department examinations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Suggest development of curricula and propose new courses with the cooperation of faculty members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Advise and counsel students, graduates and undergraduates, from the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Monitor the progress of departmental scholarship students inside and outside the country; recommend the renewal or cancellation of their scholarships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Reduce, resolve, and prevent problems among groups of students and between students and faculty members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Assign students to faculty members for advising.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Coordinate activities and arrange for supplementary class activities, such as speakers, visitors, trips, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items of the Survey</td>
<td>Sig.Dif. by Pos.</td>
<td>Sig.Dif. by Univ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Conduct high quality of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Foster good teaching techniques in the department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Foster the development of each faculty member's special talents and interests in academic affairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Initiate and implement programs and tasks outside the university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Perform a reasonable quantity and quality of research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Stimulate faculty members' research and publications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Encourage faculty members to participate in regional, national, and international professional meetings and conferences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** No Sig. Diff.: there are no significant differences regarding marked items. Sig. Diff. by Pos.: significant differences by position of respondents available. Sig. Diff. By Univ.: significant differences by universities available.
Regarding items where significant differences were found, results were consistent with the assumption reported in Chapter One of this study. The assumption indicated: "It is assumed that while there are differences by position, there are few significant differences by institutions regarding the degree of importance of survey elements." The results of analysis showed that while there were significant differences (p < .05) in the assessed degree of importance for thirty of the survey items among positions, there were significant differences in only six items among institutions. Three of these items were found to be significantly different among both positions and universities. These three items were:

1. Item number 20 in the survey: Develop long-range departmental programs, plans, and goals.
2. Item number 45 in the survey: Communicate departmental needs to the dean and the upper-level administration.
3. Item number 56 in the survey: Assign students to faculty members for advising.

Table G - 1 shows all items in the survey with significant differences by position and university regarding the F ratio and the probability level of each resulted from the analysis of variance (df = 285).
Regarding the location of these significant differences, the Newman-Keuls "post hoc" test was run and revealed that the largest number of item differences was between the group of deans and the group of faculty members. Twenty-five items were found to be significantly different between the group of deans and the group of faculty members. Seventeen items were significantly different between chairpersons and faculty members, while only nine items were significantly different between deans and chairpersons, and one item (item number 38 in the survey: Evaluate faculty members' performance, emphasizing the positives and dealing with the unsatisfactory cases) was significantly different among each pair of the three groups. Table 6 shows the items that were valued differently by groups of respondents according to their position and the location of differences.
Table 6

*Items Valued Differently Between and Among the Tree Groups of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Item</th>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Regulate the department correspondence.</td>
<td>Deans vs. Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deans vs. Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairs vs. Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maintain records for different needs.</td>
<td>....................x.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prepare and propose recommendations for the department budget.</td>
<td>....................x.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Represent the department in all stages of formation and authorization of the department budget.</td>
<td>....................x.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prepare the annual budgetary report.</td>
<td>....................x.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Monitor building security and maintenance.</td>
<td>....................x.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Prepare agenda and conduct meetings.</td>
<td>....................x.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Item</td>
<td>Response Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans vs. Chairs</td>
<td>Deans vs. Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish departmental committees.</td>
<td>..................x..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Organize committees effectively.</td>
<td>..................x..........................x...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Implement effective leadership principles.</td>
<td>..................x..........................x...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Develop long-range departmental programs, plans, and goals.</td>
<td>..................x..........................x...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Implement long-range departmental programs, plans, and policies; carry out the recommended actions and decisions of the departmental council.</td>
<td>..................x..........................x...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Carry out the decisions of the faculty council related to the department.</td>
<td>..................x..........................x...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Represent the department in the faculty council and in the university meetings related to departmental affairs.</td>
<td>..................x..........................x...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 - Continued.
Table 6 - Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Item</th>
<th>Response Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Help in training and orienting inexperienced and new faculty members.</td>
<td>Deans vs. Chairs x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Recruit and recommend selecting and appointing faculty members.</td>
<td>Deans vs. Faculty x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Assign faculty members' responsibilities, such as teaching,</td>
<td>Deans vs. Faculty x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee work, and so forth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Evaluate faculty members' performance, emphasizing the positives</td>
<td>Deans vs. Faculty x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and dealing with the unsatisfactory cases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Initiate promotion and tenure recommendations.</td>
<td>Chairs vs. Faculty x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Preserve good relationships with the dean and the upper-level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Communicate departmental needs to the dean and the upper-level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Teach one or more classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Item</td>
<td>Response Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Design semester schedules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Regulate and supervise the periodic exams in the department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Supervise, schedule, monitor, and grade department examinations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Reduce, resolve, and prevent problems among groups of students and between students and faculty members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Assign students to faculty members for advising.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Foster good teaching techniques in the department.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Initiate and implement programs and tasks outside the university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Perform a reasonable quantity and quality of research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding items to be included in the evaluation model of the academic chairperson, agreement was found to exist between deans and faculty members on thirty-nine of the sixty-four items. The number of significantly different items (twenty-five) between deans and faculty members groups was larger than those between any of the other two combination of groups; and that was expected since the two positions work less closely with each other.

Agreement was found to exist between groups of chairpersons and faculty members on forty-seven out of the sixty-four items. Significant differences appeared to exist on seventeen items.

Results indicated that agreement was found to exist between groups of deans and chairpersons on fifty-five of the sixty-four items of the survey. Only nine items differed significantly between these two groups.

It is obvious that the significant differences were less between the group of chairpersons and the group of faculty members, and lesser between the group of deans and the group of chairpersons. These two pairs of groups appeared to be in closer agreement within each other than deans with faculty members since these positions (deans and chairpersons) work more closely with each other.

In all items where deans and chairpersons significantly differed (nine items), the deans reported that the duty was
more important than the chairpersons did and expected the duty to be done at the department level. Chairpersons like to be involved in a much lesser extent in these activities which they seem to consider routine paperwork which should not be given a priority in the evaluation process of their performance (items 2, and 12). Chairpersons also consider some of these duties (items 7, 8, and 10) of a financial nature where it is expected that chairpersons perceived themselves to be less involved in the budgetary process. Other items, where significant differences were found, refer to some departmental, council, and committee activities (items, 18, and 27); leadership and interacting with deans and faculty members (item, 38); and instruction, teaching, student affairs, and curriculum affairs (item, 59).

In all items where chairpersons and faculty members significantly differed (seventeen items), the chairpersons reported that the duty of the chairperson in these cases was more important than the faculty members did. Only one significantly different item between these two groups (item, 2) was listed under the category of administration in the survey; five items (items, 14, 16, 20, 21, and 31) were listed under the category of departmental, council, and committee activities; four items (items, 35, 37, 38, and 45) under the category of leadership and interacting with deans and faculty members; six items (items, 46, 47, 50, 51, 56,
and 61) under the category of instruction, teaching, student affairs, and curriculum affairs; and only one item (item, 62) under the category of research.

The number of items indicating significant differences between deans and faculty members was the largest (twenty-five items). In all these items the deans reported that the duty of the chairperson was more important than the faculty members did. However, faculty members perceived that less emphasis should be placed on these duties in the chairperson’s evaluation model. These items were distributed among four categories of the survey. Six were listed under the category of administration (items, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, and 12); eight under the category of departmental, council, and committee activities (items, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 27, and 31); seven under the category of leadership and interacting with deans and faculty members (items, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 44, and 45); and four duties fall under the category of instruction, teaching, student affairs, and curriculum affairs (items, 50, 51, 55, and 59). These two groups appeared to be in less agreement with each other than deans with chairpersons or chairpersons with faculty members, maybe because the two positions work less closely with each other.

Differences in perceptions are expected among positions for many reasons. The most important reasons for these
differences may stem from two factors: First, the period of experience for deans and chairpersons, in general, is longer than that of faculty members. Deans, in particular, have been around for a long time, while many of faculty members are recently appointed. Secondly, the feeling of administrative accountability is, often, more deep among deans and chairpersons, since they are more responsible for the administrative work than faculty members.

It is obvious that the more the groups work closely with each other the more they are in agreement, while the more the groups work apart the more they view things differently. It is obvious also that judgments of importance are likely to be different according to the way the groups view a particular item. Differences among groups are less likely when it comes to items of traditional, conventional, expected, and routine work items; while these differences are more likely to exist when it comes to nontraditional, nonconventional, intangible work items.

Research question 3: To what degree is there consensus among those at the four Jordanian institutions participating in the study regarding the elements of the academic department chairperson’s performance evaluation model?

The findings indicate that generally there were few significant differences (p < .05) among universities. Analysis of variance showed that there were no significant
differences among the four participating universities on 91% of the items surveyed. It seems that there was a high degree of consensus among deans, chairpersons, and the random sample of faculty members in each university as a group with the similar groups in the other universities about the desirable items of the evaluation model of chairpersons' performance. These results were consistent with the assumption reported in Chapter One of this study that assumed few significant differences among universities will be found. However, universities indicated significant differences ($p < .05$) regarding 9% of the items. These differences were obvious in the six items: item 13, item 20, item 36, item 45, item 49, and item 56 (Table 5).

A Newman-Keuls "post hoc" test was run to identify where specific differences exist among universities. Table 7 exhibits these items and the location of differences for each item among the four participating universities.

Five items (items, 13, 20, 36, 45, and 49) were found to be perceived significantly different between Jordan University for Science and Technology (J.U.S.T.) and Mu'ta University; four between Mu'ta and each of Yarmouk University (items, 20, 45, 49, and 56), and The University of Jordan, U. of J., (items, 20, 36, 45, and 49); three
### Table 7

**Items Valued Differently by Universities and the Location of Difference:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Valued Significantly Different Among Universities</th>
<th>Location of Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call departmental council for regular and special meetings.</td>
<td>x........x........x....x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop long-range departmental programs, plans, and goals.</td>
<td>x........x........x....x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve good relationships with and among faculty members; create a positive interpersonal work environment.</td>
<td>x........x........x....x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate departmental needs to the dean and the upper-level administration.</td>
<td>x........x........x....x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor theses and dissertations, prospectuses, and programs of study for graduate students.</td>
<td>x........x........x....x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign students to faculty members for advising.</td>
<td>x........x........x....x.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Reference numbers are denoted as:

- 1x2: Refers to J.U.S.T. vs. Yarmouk.
- 1x3: Refers to (J.U.S.T.) vs. Mu’ta.
- 1x4: Refers to J.U.S.T. vs. U. of J.
- 2x3: Refers to Yarmouk vs. Mu’ta.
- 2x4: Refers to Yarmouk vs. U. of J.
- 3x4: Refers to Mu’ta vs. U. of J.
between J.U.S.T. and each of U. of J. (items, 13, 20, and 36), and Yarmouk (items, 13, 36, and 56); and only one item (item, 56) between Yarmouk and U. of J. (Table 7).

In eleven items out of twelve, where Mu'ata University interacted and had significant differences with the other three universities, Mu'ata rated the items as less important than the other three universities did. One case only (Call departmental council for regular and special meetings), Mu'ata rated the item as more important than J.U.S.T. did.

Regarding the three cases differed significantly between J.U.S.T. and U. of J., J.U.S.T. rated two items more important than U. of J. did, while the third item was rated highly by U. of Jordan.

Two out of the three items differed significantly between J.U.D.T. and Yarmouk, J.U.S.T. considered one item to be more important than Yarmouk did, while Yarmouk considered two items to be more important than J.U.S.T. did.

And finally, the one single item differed significantly between U. of J. and Yarmouk was rated more important by Yarmouk.

It is obvious that the older universities (University of Jordan and Yarmouk University) have less differences between them, while the recent universities (Mu'ata University and J.U.S.T) have more differences between each other and with other universities. It seems that old
universities had established deeper traditions and stereotypes and have the lines of responsibilities more obvious than recent universities who are still struggling to establish their traditions.

In most of the difference points, it is no surprise that Mu‘ta University was different because it is, relatively, recently established (1981) and many of its faculty members are new. Although Jordan University for Science and Technology was established after Mu‘ta (1986), it was a part of Yarmouk University until that time when Yarmouk University broke itself into two universities.

Chapter Summary

The first step in this chapter, after profiling the respondents, was to rank order the items according to the respondents’ preferences. Then, two approaches were employed. The first was to compare the responses of the different positions to the survey items, and second, to compare the responses of the different institutions to these items. Results from the analysis led to the conclusion that was consistent with the assumption of this study. It showed that while there were some significant differences among positions in viewing the importance of the survey items as indicators for the chairpersons performance evaluation, and a few significant differences among institutions, the
general assumption of no significant differences among institutions was supported.

Chapter Five includes a summary of the study and the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further studies. Suggested steps for the implementation processes of the model (CPEM) will be presented.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

With the growing numbers of higher education institutions in Jordan, there have been increasing demands for accountability requiring these institutions to be more efficient. A factor crucial to effective administration and management in higher education is the development of a reliable method of appraising administrative performance. The academic department chairperson, being the key link in the managerial-teaching-learning interaction influence system, can be assisted by a performance evaluation model.

This study is phase two of a two-phase research effort designed to describe the role of the academic department chairperson in the public universities of Jordan and to develop a systematic, formal process for evaluating the performance of this position. The purpose of this phase (phase II) was to develop an evaluation model for the academic chairperson's performance that can be used in the public universities of Jordan. In phase I, the actual and the ideal role expectations were identified through interviews with deans, chairpersons, and faculty members in Jordanian public universities during Summer, 1992. These
expectations were profiled and used as the basis for phase II research.

A survey was employed to gather data for this study (phase II). The survey included five categories and sixty-four items and was designed to determine which of the role items, from the profile in phase I was to be included in an evaluation model for the academic department chairperson performance in public universities of Jordan, and to answer the following research questions:

1. What do deans, chairpersons, and a random sample of faculty members in Jordanian public universities perceive to be the desired elements in an evaluation instrument for the academic department chairperson's performance in these universities?

2. To what degree is there consensus among deans as a group, department chairpersons as a group, and faculty members as a group regarding the elements of the academic department chairperson's performance evaluation model?

3. To what degree is there consensus among those at the four Jordanian institutions participating in the study regarding the elements of the academic department chairperson's performance evaluation model?
The survey was distributed during the summer of 1993 to all deans, academic chairpersons, and a random sample of faculty members in the four public working universities during that time (n = 382). The number of respondents was 286 for a response rate of 75%.

Data Treatment and Statistical Analysis

Data were coded and processed by the computer through the employment of the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, and means) were used to determine the importance of the various elements described in the survey, the first research question. Analysis of variance was used to address the second research question, the level of consensus among the three groups, as well as the third research question, the possible differences by institutions. Where significant differences were indicated in the analysis of variance, the Newman-Keuls "post hoc" test was employed to identify where specific differences exist at the .05 alpha level. Chi-square analyses were computed on the demographic variables to test for response bias.

Summary of Findings

Research Question 1.

This question was designed to identify the desired
items for the academic department chairperson's performance evaluation model by deans, chairpersons, and a random sample of faculty members selected as reported in the research methodology. It was designed to rank the desired items according to their importance in the evaluation model. The principal findings regarding this questions were:

1. The desired elements in a system of evaluation for the academic department chairperson's performance in the public universities of Jordan included all the survey items. There was almost unanimous agreement that all the items should be included in the suggested model for the evaluation of the academic department chairperson's performance (CPEM).

2. The areas of "Departmental, Council, and Committee Activities" and "Leadership and Interaction With Deans and Faculty Members" were the most important to be included in the evaluation model of the academic department chairperson performance in the public universities of Jordan according to the perceptions of the reference groups. The areas of "Administration" and "Instruction, Teaching, Student Affairs, and Curriculum Affairs" were perceived to be less important. The area of research was perceived to be of more importance than the average of all of the survey items as a group.
Research Question 2.

This question was designed to explore the degree of consensus among the groups of deans, department chairpersons, and faculty members by position in the public universities of Jordan regarding the items of the academic department chairperson performance evaluation model. The principal findings related to this question were:

1. There were no significant differences in thirty-one items of the sixty-four survey items either among positions or among universities.

2. Significant differences (p < .05) were determined in thirty-three of the sixty-four items among either positions or universities or both, clearly exceeding the likelihood of a chance occurrence.

3. Items significantly different among positions were as follows (see Table 6 for listing of the specific items):
   a) Twenty-five items between the group of deans and the group of faculty members.
   b) Seventeen items between the group of chairpersons and the group of faculty members.
   c) Nine items between the group of deans and the group of chairpersons.
   d) One item where each group was significantly different from each of the other two.
Research Question 3.

This question was designed to determine the degree of consensus among those at the four Jordanian institutions participating in the study regarding the items of the academic department chairperson performance evaluation model? The principal findings for this question were:

1. There was a high degree of consensus among those at the four universities regarding the desirable items of the evaluation model of chairperson's performance (91% of the items).

2. There were few significant differences (p < .05) among the four universities (9% of the items).

3. Items significantly different among universities were as follows (see Table 7 for listing of the specific items):

   a) Five items between Mu'ata University and Jordan University for Science and Technology.

   b) Four items between Mu'ata University and Yarmouk University.

   c) Four items between Mu'ata University and The University of Jordan.

   d) Three items between Jordan University for Science and Technology and Yarmouk University.

   e) Three items between Jordan University of Science and Technology and The University of
Conclusions

1. Based upon the way the sample of the study was handled (random sample of faculty members), the response rate achieved, and the statistical analysis of the demographic variables used, it appears that the sample adequately represents the population, and the results would not be different if the whole population of the faculty members had been used.

2. Based upon the results of the study, it is concluded that the group of deans value the importance of the evaluation items more highly than the two groups of chairpersons and faculty members. At the same time, the group of chairpersons value these items higher than the group of faculty members do.

3. The differences among universities were a result of either the length of experience period of the university and those working in it, or the differences in missions and subjects taught, or both.

4. Some findings of the study deserve special mention. Among those are:

   A) Differences were found among the three reference
groups employed for this study regarding the importance of the evaluation items of the academic department chairperson's performance. Differences are expected because, as the literature suggests, such differences are normal in all healthy higher education institutions, though they may differ in size, degree, and location.

B) More effective communication among the three reference groups might result in fewer differences in perceptions regarding the importance of the suggested evaluation items and other topics which might be the subject of future studies.

C) High consideration among the three reference groups of the study was given to social relationships. The most highly valued item of the survey was the one requiring the chairperson to "Preserve good relationships with and among faculty members; create a positive interpersonal work environment." This indicator is not unusual in the life of the Jordanian institutions since it is an essential part of the society. It is consistent with the culture of the Jordanian community and with societal values which value social relationships highly. People in the Jordanian university workplace are highly motivated by good and strong social relationships. So, it is not
surprising that the reference groups focus highly on items that put more emphasis on such concepts as a part of the academic department chairperson's duty.

C) Differences among universities, exist in only six of the sixty-four items suggested in the survey employed in this study.

D) Although instruction and curriculum affairs are considered important components of the university mission for all Jordanian public universities, results of the study show that the reference groups did not consider it at the same level of importance as part of the job of the academic department chairperson. That does not mean that this mission component is losing its importance among the tasks of the chairperson; instead, it might mean that the responsibility of this mission component should be distributed among all positions including the position of the chairperson.

E) Public universities in Jordan are not research oriented institutions. However, they still consider research an important part of the university duty. Results of the study show that reference groups ranked research items of more importance than the average of all items of the survey as a group.
Based upon the findings and analysis of data, it was observed that the differences in perceptions among reference groups regarding the importance of items to be included in the academic department chairperson's performance evaluation model may have resulted from a number of factors. Those factors considered most obvious by the researcher include:

1. The lack of a formal, systematic, institutionalized performance evaluation system.

Evaluation systems, particularly for those in key positions, do not exist in Jordan higher education institutions. The present roles for these positions are not examined or measured to criteria of either national or international dimensions to determine, improve, or develop the level of their performance. This lack of systematic evaluation increases the likelihood of differences in judgments on the degree of importance that each item was given when reference groups tried to determine the level of its importance.

2. The newness of the higher education system in Jordan and the immaturity of institutions.

The system of higher education in Jordan has a forty year history. Despite the progress the system has accomplished during this short period, it is still, comparatively, young. It still lacks a mutual
conceptual basis for higher education administration that all those working in the system agree on. Some of the explanation of these differences lies in the relative newness of higher education and its continuing evolution.

3. The fast growth in the higher education system Jordan is experiencing.

This growth had afforded little time for giving the literature of higher education administration enough consideration. Except for sources from the international literature, concerned people cannot find enough resources about this subject in the Jordanian library. Thus, differences are expected to occur.

4. The fact that reference groups have different philosophical backgrounds.

As a result of these differing philosophical backgrounds, reference groups cannot always agree concerning the importance of duties of the academic department chairperson. Although most professors in Jordanian universities, are graduated from Western countries especially in the United States; there are others who have graduated from different systems in Western and Eastern Europe, Canada, Arab countries, and several other countries. Therefore, conceptual differences are expected regarding the administrative
systems at the university level to exist among members of such mixed organizations.

Next Steps

The suggested model for the evaluation of the academic department chairperson performance (CPEM) had been developed by the researcher with complete participation of deans, chairpersons, and faculty members. At the time the study began, the conceptions of these groups were incorporated and the groups gave their input throughout the stages of defining the roles and choosing and evaluating the items. This should increase the acceptance of the instrument and ensure that it can be implemented so that chairpersons in the public universities of Jordan can be evaluated against established elements that define the dimensions of the tasks and functions of their position.

Higher education in Jordan can benefit from the use of the prototype instrument (Appendix H) which can be implemented successfully in the Jordanian institutions. Public universities can use the model as a whole or employ selected items that better serve the goals and objectives of a specific institution and enable it to achieve its mission.

In order to implement the results of this study, some additional steps are recommended and the adoption of some principles is suggested:
A. Additional steps:

1. A pilot study in the public universities of Jordan may be conducted to test the implementation of the instrument and to find out whether there are negatives in the implementation stage.

2. A factor analysis may be run to find out the categories that the items of the instrument might better relate to.

3. Drawing from the findings of the pilot study and the factor analysis, the final categories and items can be presented for implementation.

B. Suggested principles:

1. Goals and objectives of the evaluation should be identified and related to the fulfillment of the mission of the university.

2. The evaluation process should ensure broad faculty participation in addition to the deans.

3. A systematic evaluation plan that meets the university goals and objectives should be adopted by the university on a regular basis.

4. The results of the evaluation should be considered for promotion and developing training programs.

5. The evaluation instrument, as a part of the evaluation process, should be reviewed periodically to guarantee updating.
For better results, some procedures outlined in the literature of higher education are recommended:

1. More than one person should conduct the evaluation.

2. Superiors (deans) and subordinates (faculty members) should participate in the evaluation process in addition to the self evaluation by the chairperson himself.

3. Results of the evaluation should be summarized in writing by a special evaluation committee comprised of departmental faculty.

4. A conference should be held between the superior (the dean) and the chairperson to discuss the results of evaluation.

5. Chairpersons should be required to sign their evaluation reports and should receive a copy.

Recommendations

This study has identified the components of a desirable evaluation model for the academic department chairperson's performance. A study could be undertaken with different data collection techniques to test the implementation of the proposed model and to examine the positives and negatives in the application process. It is recommended that other national studies should be undertaken to develop evaluation
models for other key positions in the public and private universities of Jordan.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

LETTERS TO THE PRESIDENTS OF THE FOUR PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY
February 1993

Dr. President

Dear Dr.

Mr. Mahmoud M. Abu Qudais, a citizen of Jordan, is enrolled in the Ph.D. program in "College and University Administration" at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, U.S.A. As part of his doctoral program Mr. Abu Qudais is conducting his dissertation research on evaluating the work of the academic chairperson in the public universities of Jordan.

To complete his doctoral dissertation Mr. Abu Qudais needs to collect names and telephone numbers of all academic chairpersons in public universities in Jordan. These chairpersons will be contacted during the summer of 1993 to complete a written survey designed especially for this study. The survey is designed from a data base developed in 1992 as part of Mr. Abu Qudais' master degree.

Attached to this letter is a form we hope you will take time to complete and return by mail. Your time and cooperation are greatly appreciated and needed, and will help Mr. Abu Qudais complete his doctoral program.

Sincerely,

Dr. Robert J. Stalcup
Professor/College and University Administration/Co-Chair

Dr. John A. Muffo
Director of Program Review and Outcomes Assessment/Co-Chair
May 3, 1993

Dr. - President

Dear Dr.

Referring to the letter of my research committee Co-Chairs faxed on March 9, 1993, you will recall the discussions that they initiated for my doctoral research project, which will result in the development of a model for evaluating department chairpersons in Jordanian public universities.

In order for this project to be fully developed, the research committee is requiring a modification of the research design. That modification requires that I survey a sample of department faculty members and deans. The faculty sample and the deans will be surveyed in addition to the department chairpersons whose names I have already required. These additions to the survey groups should strengthen substantially the research effort and result in the development of a model in which we can have much more confidence.

Therefore, during my return to Jordan this summer, I am requesting a directory of faculty members in all departments as well as names and addresses of all deans in your respective university. I hope that I will be in touch with your office sometime during the third week of June, 1993 to set up an appointment to visit with you and discuss in person the current study. I will present the results of my previous study regarding the work of department chairpersons.

With much appreciation for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mahmoud M. Abu Qudais
APPENDIX B

LETTER TO SUBJECTS OF THE STUDY
REGARDING THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT
AND THE DATA COLLECTION

1. THE ENGLISH VERSION
2. THE ARABIC VERSION
July 4, 1993

Dear ...,

You have been selected to participate in a nationally based research study designed to determine the items of might be used to evaluate the work of academic department chairpersons in Jordan public universities. This study is a part of my Ph.D. program in "College and University Administration" at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The questionnaire used in this study will require twenty-five to thirty minutes of your time and should be of interest to you as a practicing (position).

A previous research study had been conducted at some Jordanian public universities on the summer of 1992 resulted a profile of descriptors of the role of the academic department chairperson. The Profile included five role areas with sixty four items represent the basis for the current study.

A questionnaire identical to yours has been sent to all deans, all academic department chairpersons, and a selected sample of faculty members in all the academic departments in the Jordanian public universities both in English and Arabic language. You are free to complete the survey in Arabic or in English according to your convenience.

Anonymity and confidentiality of responses are assured each participant. A "code number" will be used to identify the participants for follow up mailing and to allow me to identify you in the event you request a copy of the abstract of the study.

Please complete and mail as soon as possible. An addressed, postage paid envelope is enclose for your convenience. Your time and cooperation are greatly appreciated and needed.

Sincerely,

Mahmoud M. Abu Quida
Ph.D. Candidate
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia, U. S. A.

Mailing Address:
Mahmoud M. Abu Quida
P.O.Box: 2994
Irbid, Jordan
Tel: (2) 275597
عزيمي الدكتور

لقد تم اختياركم للمشاركة في بحث على نطاق الأردن مم لتحديد البند الذي يمكن أن تستخدم لتقديم عمل رئيس الدائرة الأكاديمية في الجامعات الأردنية الحكومية. هذه الدراسة (البحث) هي جزء من دراستي للدكتوراه في "إدارة الكليات والجامعات" بجامعة فرجينيا الحكومية - بلاكبيرغ، الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية. تجبي الاستثناء المستعمل في هذه الدراسة، والتي يفترض أن تكون متماسكًا باعتبارهم ممارسين للعمل (الإدارة)، تحتاج لمدة خمسة وعشرين إلى ثلاثين دقيقة من وقتكم.

في دراسة (بحث) سابقة، جربت في عينة من الجامعات الأردنية الحكومية في منتصف 1993، تم استخدام توصيف لدور رئيس الدائرة الإدارية الأكاديمية، يحتوي على خمس مجالات تتضمن أربعة وستين بنداً. هذه المجالات والبندات تمثل الأساسي للدراسة الحالية.

لهذا تم إرسال نماذج مشابهة من هذه الاستبانات إلى جميع عمداء الطيارات، جميع رؤساء الدوائر الأكاديمية، وعديد من أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية في جميع الدوائر الإدارية بالجامعات الحكومية الأردنية باللغتين العربية والأنجليزية. تلك الحرية في ملء الاستبانة اما بالعربية أو بالإنجليزية حسب ما يانبهك.

إن السرية وعدم ذكر الاسماء مضمونة لجميع المشاركين، وستعمل أرقام خاصة لمساعدة الأعمال مع المشاركين وتمكيني من تزويدكم بنسبة من خلاصة الدراسة عند طلبكم ذلك.

يرجى تكويمكم بتبعية الاستبانة وارسالها. للتسهيل عليهم تجدون معلومات مجهزة، فمثلكم التسليم وتعاونكم موضع التقدير.

مع تحياتي،

محمد محمد أبو دوى
مرشح الدكتوراه
جامعة ولاية فرجينيا الحكومية
بلاكبيرغ - فرجينيا
الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية
APPENDIX C

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

THE ENGLISH VERSION
EVALUATION OF THE WORK OF ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT
CHAIRPERSONS IN JORDIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Dear Dean,

This is a questionnaire concerning the evaluation items which are derived from the responses of a sample of deans, academic chairpersons, and faculty members in Jordanian public universities regarding the work of the chairperson. Your cooperation in finishing this questionnaire will be a great help to my study and will be appreciated very much.

The following are suggested possible statements of duties and responsibilities of an academic department chairperson in the Jordanian public universities. Please indicate the degree of importance that each item should be given in the evaluation model by placing a circle round one response which best represents your judgment of each item at the right of each statement on the rating scale:

scale: VI = Very important
       I = Important
       SI = Slightly important
       NI = Not important
       NO = No opinion

A. Administration

1. Manage the day-to-day operation of the department. VI I SI NI NO
2. Regulate the department correspondence. VI I SI NI NO
3. Maintain records for different needs. VI I SI NI NO
4. Manage department facilities and equipment. VI I SI NI NO
5. Supervise and evaluate the clerical and technical staff of the department. VI I SI NI NO
6. Process department correspondence and requests for information. VI I SI NI NO
7. Prepare and propose recommendations for the department budget. VI I SI NI NO
8. Represent the department in all stages of formation and authorization of the department budget. VI I SI NI NO
9. Administer the department budget. VI I SI NI NO
10. Prepare the annual budgetary report. VI I SI NI NO
11. Complete forms and surveys. VI I SI NI NO
12. Monitor building security and maintenance. VI I SI NI NO

B. Departmental, Council, and Committee Activities:

13. Call departmental council for regular and special meetings. VI I SI NI NO
14. Prepare agenda and conduct meetings. VI I SI NI NO
15. Establish departmental committees. VI I SI NI NO
16. Organize committees effectively. VI I SI NI NO
17. Lead the department teamwork. VI I SI NI NO
18. Implement effective leadership principles. VI I SI NI NO
19. Supervise the work done by the departmental council regarding all of council's responsibilities. VI I SI NI NO
20. Develop long-range departmental programs, plans, and goals. VI I SI NI NO
21. Implement long-range departmental programs, plans, and policies; carry out the recommended actions and decisions of the departmental council. VI I SI NI NO
22. Determine what services the department should provide to the university, community, and country. VI I SI NI NO
23. Share the departmental council and faculty council decision-making. VI I SI NI NO
24. Serve as an advocate for the department. VI I SI NI NO
25. Delegate some departmental administrative responsibilities to individuals and committees. VI I SI NI NO
26. Encourage faculty members to communicate ideas for improving the department. VI I SI NI NO
27. Carry out the decisions of the faculty council related to the department. VI I SI NI NO
28. Prepare the annual report about departmental activities to be presented to the departmental council and the dean. VI I SI NI NO
29. Participate on university committees. VI I SI NI NO
30. Participate on community committees. VI I SI NI NO
31. Represent the department in the faculty council and in university meetings related to departmental affairs. VI I SI NI NO
32. Encourage community service contributions and participation departmental faculty members. VI I SI NI NO
33. Improve and maintain the department's image and reputation. VI I SI NI NO

C. Leadership and Interaction With Deans and Faculty Members

34. Help in training and orienting inexperienced and new faculty members. VI I SI NI NO
35. Recruit and recommend selecting and appointing faculty members.  
   
36. Preserve good relationships with and among faculty members; create a positive interpersonal work environment.  
   
37. Assign faculty members' responsibilities, such as teaching, committee work, and so forth.  
   
38. Evaluate faculty members' performance, emphasizing the positives and dealing with the unsatisfactory cases.  
   
39. Encourage and monitor faculty members' service contributions.  
   
40. Initiate promotion and tenure recommendations.  
   
41. Keep faculty members informed of departmental, faculty, and institutional plans, activities, and expectations.  
   
42. Maintain good morale.  
   
43. Reduce and prevent conflict among faculty members.  
   
44. Preserve good relationships with the dean and the upper-level administration.  
   
45. Communicate departmental needs to the dean and the upper-level administrators.  
   
D. Instruction, Teaching, Student Affairs, and Curriculum Affairs:  
   
46. Teach one or more classes.  
   
47. Design semester schedules.  
   
48. Update departmental courses and programs with the cooperation of the departmental council and the dean.  
   
49. Monitor theses and dissertations, prospectuses, and programs of study for graduate students.  
   
50. Regulate and supervise the periodic exams in the department.  
   
51. Supervise, schedule, monitor, and grade department examinations.  
   
52. Suggest development of curricula and propose new courses with the cooperation of faculty members.  
   
53. Advise and counsel students, graduates and undergraduates, from the department.  
   
{\text{Scale:}}  

\begin{align*}  
\text{VI} & = \text{Very important} \\
\text{I} & = \text{Important} \\
\text{SI} & = \text{Slightly important} \\
\text{NI} & = \text{Not important} \\
\text{NO} & = \text{No opinion} 
\end{align*}
54. Monitor the progress of departmental scholarship students inside and outside the country; recommend the renewal or cancellation of their scholarships. **VI I SI NI NO**

55. Reduce, resolve, and prevent problems among groups of students and between students and faculty members. **VI I SI NI NO**

56. Assign students to faculty members for advising. **VI I SI NI NO**

57. Coordinate activities and arrange for supplementary class activities, such as speakers, visitors, trips, etc. **VI I SI NI NO**

58. Conduct high quality teaching. **VI I SI NI NO**

59. Foster good teaching techniques in the department. **VI I SI NI NO**

60. Foster the development of each faculty member's special talents and interests in academic affairs. **VI I SI NI NO**

61. Initiate and implement programs and tasks outside the university. **VI I SI NI NO**

**E. Research:**

62. Perform a reasonable quantity and quality of research. **VI I SI NI NO**

63. Stimulate faculty members' research and publications. **VI I SI NI NO**

64. Encourage faculty members to participate in regional, national, and international professional meetings and conferences. **VI I SI NI NO**

**Comments**

You have now completed the survey. Your cooperation in this regard has been much appreciated! If you have any questions, please direct them to the researcher at the address below.

Please return the completed survey in the envelop provided either in English or in Arabic to:

Mahmoud M. Abu Qudais
PO. Box: 2994
Irbid, Jordan
Tel: (2) 275597
APPENDIX D

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

THE ARABIC VERSION
الاستاذ / الدكتور

تتكون هذه الاستمالة من ملخص من النصوص التي تصف دور رئيسي الدائرة الأكاديمية في الجامعات الأردنية الحكومية. هذه النصوص تشير إلى أن الاستمالة تشمل جميع مراكز الجامعات، وتتضمن الدراسات والدراسات الأكاديمية في جامعات الأردنية الحكومية.

لبيان مدى مناسبة كل من هذه النصوص لتجسيد مهام رئيسي الدائرة الأكاديمية، نأمل مساعدةكم في ملء هذه الاستمالة.

لذا، برجي بيان درجة الأهمية التي ترون أن تعطي لكل بنود تنويه مهام رئيسية الدائرة الأكاديمية وذلك برم الدائرة على النقل المتبادل من بنود التنويهات المهمة.

باستخدام الاستمالة بالتعمال اما النشاط العربي أو النشاط الإنجليزية.

المعيار: يتم جدا

مع م م م

لم م ن نا ما

ليس ماما

لا راي محدد

6 - مجال الأعمال الإدارية

1. القيام بإدارة وتكييف الأعمال اليومية للدائرة

2. تنظيم مراحل الدائرة

3. حفظ مسالك الدائرة الاستثنائيات

4. إدارة مراقبة وتحليزات الدائرة

5. الالتزام بجهة التنظيم والغضبة للدائرة وتشييع عمل إدارتها

6. التواصل مع مراحل الدائرة وما يطلب منها من معلومات

7. إعداد وإرجاع التوصيات لوزارة الدائرة

8. تشكيل الدائرة في كل مراحل إعداد واعتماد التنظيمية

9. إدارة موافقة الدائرة

10. إعداد التقرير السنوي للموازنة

11. استمالة النشاط والخدمات

12. ملاحظة سلامة وميادين مباني الدائرة
13. دعوة مجلس الدائرة للاجتماعات المعمّرة وغير المعمّرة
14. إعداد خطة الاجتماعات وإدارتها
15. تكوين اللجانamina طبقة بالدائرة
16. تنظيم اللجان بناءً على
17. قيادة فريق عمل الدائرة
18. غير مبادئ ادارية عامة
19. الإشراف على اعمال مجلس الدائرة
20. تشغيل برامج الدائرة طويلة الأمد
21. تحقيق برامج الدائرة طويلة الأمد
22. تطوير برامج الدائرة طويلة الأمد
23. تحديد الخدمات التي يجب أن تكون عند مجلس الدائرة، المجتمع المحلي والمدينة
24. الاستماع إلى جميع القرارات من مجلس الدائرة ومجلس المدينة
25. الدعاية عن حقوق الدائرة
26. تقديم بعض السلطات الإدارية للأمراء أو لجان في الدائرة
27. تجهيز محاكاة للبيئة التشريعة بالدائرة للتدريبات الإستعراضية
28. تنفيذ قرارات مجلس المدينة المتعلقة بالدائرة
29. إعداد التقارير السنوية عن نشاطات الدائرة وتقديمها لمجلس الدائرة
30. المشاركة في لجان جامعة
31. المشاركة في لجان المجتمع المحلي
31. تشغيل الدائرة في مبنى الكلية وإجتحامات الجلسة التي تتم.

32. تشجيع عضو هيئة التدريس ومشاركتهم في خدمة المجتمع.

33. تحسن سعة الدائرة والمحافظة على الصرورة الجيدة لها.

34. مجال القيادة والعلاقات مع العميد ومع أعضاء هيئة التدريس.

35. المساعدة على أعداد وتدريب أعضاء هيئة التدريس الجدد.

36. التشغيل بالإيجابي مع عضو هيئة التدريس.

37. المحافظة على علاقة جيدة مع أعضاء هيئة التدريس.

38. تعزيز وتطوير أعداد هيئة التدريس وعملية التعليم.

39. تشغيل وملاحظة مساعدة أعضاء هيئة التدريس في الخدمات.

40. رفع شؤون الشريحة الرقمية والترفيه ضمن الدائرة.

41. إنشاء أعضاء هيئة التدريس باستمرار على خط وانشطة ونشاطات الكلية والجامعة.

42. تحقيق وحفظ روح معنية عالية.

43. الحد من أي معي وصادرات بين أعضاء هيئة التدريس.

44. المحافظة على علاقات طيبة مع العميد والإدارات العليا.

45. وضع طلبات الدائرة للمعهد والإدارات العليا.
المعيار: 3 مم جداَ

46. تدريس مادة دراسيَّة أو أكثر

47. تصميم جداول الفصل الدراسي

48. التوزيع الزمني لبرامج الدائرة والتعاون مع مجلس الدائرة والعديد

49. الإشراف على رسائل التدريس، رسائل الدكتوراه، منشورات بحوث برامج دراسة لبعض طالبات الدورات العليا

50. التنظيم والإشراف على الامتحانات، تقييمه، متابعته، وتقديراته

51. الإشراف على امتحانات الدائرة

52. إشراف تطوير المناهج وادخال مادة جديدة بالتعاون مع أعضاء هيئة التدريس

53. ارشاد ونجح طلبة النهاية الأولى وطلبة الدورات العليا بالدائرة

54. متابعة تحمل الطلبة البعوضين من الدائرة داخل وخارج البلد

55. الحد من وجل، أو حتى منع حدوث مخالفات أية اتفاقات طلبتية، أو بين الطلبة وإلى هيئة التدريس

56. توزيع الطلبة على أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية للدراية

57. الإشراف على النشاطات، وشبيبة الجو، من النشاطات الفنية المفيدة، كالحفلات واستغاثة المحترفين والرازيين

58. إعداد مشاريع متقدمة من التدريس

59. تعزين أمل التدريس عالية المستوى بالدارة

60. تحضير مشاريع، وإشراك أي من أعضاء هيئة التدريس في البرامج التدريسية
المحار: مم جد
مم
مم نما ما
ل م
لا راي محدد

11. المبادرات بتنفيذ برامج ومهام خارج حدود الجامعة

ه - مجال البحث العلمي

12. إعداد نشرات من البحث العلمي من حيث الكيم والكيمياء

13. تشجيع أعضاء هيئة التدريس على البحث العلمي والثاني

14. تشجيع أعضاء هيئة التدريس على المشاركة في الأكاديميات والمؤتمرات المدنية الداخلية والإقليمية والدولية

ملخصات:

شكراً جزيلاً لتعاونكم ومساعدتكم في هذا الجهد من البحث العلمي، يرجى التكرم بإعادة الاستعانة المستمرة في المغزى المرتقب والمعد خصيصًا.

محمود محمد أبو تدبي
م. ب. 1994
البلد - الأردن
APPENDIX E

FOLLOW UP LETTER

1. THE ENGLISH VERSION

2. THE ARABIC VERSION
July 20, 1993

Dear Dr. ...

On July 4, 1993, a questionnaire seeking your opinion about the items might be use for evaluation the performance of academic chairpersons in Jordan public universities was sent to you.

If you have already completed and returned it to me please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. It is extremely important that your response be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of participants.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me right now, collect at (2) 275997, and I will get another one in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Mahmoud M. Abu Qudais
Ph.D. Candidate
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia, U. S. A.

Mailing Address:
Mahmoud M. Abu Qudais
PO. Box: 2994
Irbid, Jordan
Tel: (2) 275597
عزيزي الدكتور

 بتاريخ ١٧ /٧ /١٩٩٣ أرسلت لحضرتكم استماني تتطلب إدراك رؤيكم في البنود التي يمكن أن تستخدم لتحقيق إداة رئيس الدائرة الأكاديمية في الجامعات الحكومية الأردنية.

إن كنت قد أكملت الاستماني وأعدت ترويجها، أرجو أن تقبلوا شكري الجزيل، وإن لم تكونوا قد نُعلمت فرجاني أن نُرسلها اليوم، حيث إنه من الأهمية بمكان أن تتضمن الدراسة رأيكم أن كانت تستملن معد آراء المشاركين.

إن كنت لسبب آخر لم تلتقوا نماذج الاستماني، أو أن كنت النماذج قد نُقلت لديكم، أرجو أن تتحملوا بي توا وعلى حسابي على الرقم (١٠٧٧٧) (أربد)، وسأقوم توا برسال نع أخرى لحضرتكم.

مع تحياتي،

محمود محمد أبو قديس
طالب الدكتوراه
جامعة ولاية فرجينيا الحكومية
بلد كنبرغ، فرجينيا
الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية
APPENDIX F

TABLE CONTAINING ALL FREQUENCIES
AND PERCENTAGES REGARDING THE
SURVEY ITEMS
Table 1.

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of the Evaluation Items of Administration as Viewed by Respondents of the Three Groups From the Four Universities

(N = 286)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Evaluation Items (Administration):</th>
<th>Type of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Manage the day-to-day operation of the department.</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regulate the department correspondence.</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maintain records for different needs.</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Manage department facilities and equipment.</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervise and evaluate the clerical and technical staff of the department.</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Process department correspondence and requests for information.</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Evaluation Items (Administration):</th>
<th>Type of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Prepare and propose recommendations for the department budget.</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Represent the department in all stages of formation and authorization of the department budget.</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Administer the department budget.</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Prepare the annual budgetary report.</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Complete forms and surveys.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Monitor building security and maintenance.</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- First entry in column represents frequency.
-- Second entry in column represents percentage.
-- Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest decimal number.
-- Responses of no answer or no opinion about any item were subtracted from the percentage of that item, and, as a result, the total percentage for the item may not equal 100%.
-- Impor. = Important. Sl. = Slightly.
Table 2.

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of the Evaluation Items of Departmental, Council, and Committee Activities as Viewed by Respondents of the Three Groups From the Four Universities

(N = 286)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Items (Departmental, Council, and Committee Activities):</th>
<th>Type of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Call departmental council for regular and special meetings.</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Prepare agenda and conduct meetings.</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Establish departmental committees.</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Organize committees effectively.</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lead the department teamwork.</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Implement effective leadership principles.</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Supervise the work done by the departmental council regarding all of council's responsibilities.</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Evaluation Items (Departmental, Council, and Committee Activities):</td>
<td>Type of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Develop long-range departmental programs, plans, and goals.</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Implement long-range departmental programs, plans, and policies; carry out the recommended actions and decisions of the departmental council.</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Determine what services the department should provide to the university, community, and country.</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Share the departmental council and faculty council decision-making.</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Serve as an advocate for the department.</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Delegate some departmental administrative responsibilities to individuals and committees.</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Items (Departmental, Council, and Committee Activities):</th>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Encourage faculty members to communicate ideas for improving the department.</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Carry out the decisions of the faculty council related to the department.</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Prepare the annual report about departmental activities to be presented to the departmental council and the dean.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Participate on university committees.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Participate on community committees.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Items (Departmental, Council, and Committee Activities):</th>
<th>Type of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Represent the department in the faculty council and in the university meetings related to departmental affairs.</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Encourage community service contributions and participation departmental faculty members.</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Improve and maintain the department's image and reputation.</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- First entry in column represents frequency.
--- Second entry in column represents percentage.
--- Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest decimal number.
--- Responses of no answer or no opinion about any item were subtracted from the percentage of that item, and, as a result, the total percentage for the item may not equal 100%.
Table 3.

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of the Evaluation Items of Leadership and Interaction with Deans and Faculty members Viewed by Respondents of the Three Groups From the Four Universities

(N = 286)

| C. Evaluation Items (Leadership and Interaction With Deans and Faculty members): | Type of Response |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 34. Help in training and orienting inexperienced and new faculty members. | 134 | 109 | 32 | 7 | 46.9% | 38.1% | 11.2% | 2.4% |
| 35. Recruit and recommend selecting and appointing faculty members. | 135 | 116 | 20 | 8 | 47.2% | 40.6% | 7.0% | 2.8% |
| 36. Preserve good relationships with and among faculty members; create a positive interpersonal work environment. | 225 | 50 | 10 | - | 78.7% | 17.5% | 3.5% | - |
| 37. Assign faculty members' responsibilities, such as teaching, committee work, and so forth. | 137 | 116 | 21 | 9 | 47.9% | 40.6% | 7.3% | 3.1% |
| 38. Evaluate faculty members’ performance, emphasizing the positives and dealing with the unsatisfactory cases. | 158 | 86 | 29 | 10 | 55.2% | 30.1% | 10.1% | 3.5% |
| C. Evaluation Items (Leadership and Interaction With Deans and Faculty members): | Type of Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 39. Encourage and monitor faculty members' service contributions. | 98 | 123 | 853 | 8 |
| | 34.3% | 43.0% | 18.5% | 2.8% |
| 40. Initiate promotion and tenure recommendations. | 148 | 108 | 14 | 12 |
| | 51.7% | 37.8% | 4.9% | 4.2% |
| 41. Keep faculty members informed of departmental, faculty, and institutional plans, activities, and expectations. | 170 | 99 | 15 | 2 |
| | 59.4% | 34.6% | 5.2% | 0.7% |
| 42. Maintain good morale. | 168 | 100 | 10 | 3 |
| | 58.7% | 35.0% | 3.5% | 1.0% |
Table 3 - Continued

| A. Evaluation Items (Leadership and Interaction with Deans and Faculty members): | Type of Response |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 43. Reduce and prevent conflict among faculty members. | 191 | 76 | 11 | 3 |
| | 66.8 | 26.6 | 3.8 | 1.0 |
| 44. Preserve good relationships with the dean and the upper-level administration. | 163 | 94 | 18 | 8 |
| | 57.0 | 32.9 | 6.3 | 2.8 |
| 45. Communicate departmental needs to the dean and the upper-level administration. | 175 | 90 | 15 | 5 |
| | 61.2 | 31.5 | 5.2 | 1.7 |

-- First entry in column represents frequency.
-- Second entry in column represents percentage.
-- Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest decimal number.
-- Responses of no answer or no opinion about any item were subtracted from the percentage of that item, and, as a result, the total percentage for the item may not equal 100%.
Table 4.
Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of the Evaluation Items of Instruction, Teaching, Student Affairs, and Curriculum Affairs as Viewed by Respondents of the Three Groups From the Four Universities

(N = 286)

| D. Evaluation Items (Instruction, Teaching, Student Affairs, and Curriculum Affairs): | Type of Response |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 46. Teach one or more classes. | 152 | 101 | 23 | 4 |
| | 53.1% | 35.3% | 8.0% | 1.4% |
| 47. Design semester schedules. | 146 | 93 | 34 | 8 |
| | 51.0% | 32.5% | 11.9% | 2.8% |
| 48. Update departmental courses and programs with the cooperation of the departmental council and the dean. | 140 | 106 | 29 | 6 |
| | 49.0% | 37.1% | 10.1% | 2.1% |
| 49. Monitor theses and dissertations, prospectuses, and programs of study for graduate students. | 88 | 124 | 35 | 12 |
| | 30.8% | 43.4% | 12.2% | 4.2% |
| 50. Regulate and supervise the periodic exams in the department. | 80 | 127 | 40 | 26 |
| | 28.0% | 44.4% | 14.0% | 9.1% |
| 51. Supervise, schedule, monitor, and grade department examinations. | 96 | 111 | 49 | 21 |
| | 33.6% | 38.8% | 17.1% | 7.3% |
Table 4 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52. Suggest development of curricula and propose new courses with the cooperation of faculty members.</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Advise and counsel students, graduates and undergraduates, from the department.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Monitor the progress of departmental scholarship students inside and outside the country; recommend the renewal or cancellation of their scholarships.</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Reduce, resolve, and prevent problems among groups of students and between students and faculty members.</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Assign students to faculty members for advising.</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Coordinate activities and arrange for supplementary class activities, such as speakers, visitors, trips, etc.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Items (Instruction, Teaching, Student Affairs, and Curriculum Affairs):</th>
<th>Type of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58. Conduct high quality of teaching.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Foster good teaching techniques in the department.</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Foster the development of each faculty member's special talents and interests in academic affairs.</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Initiate and implement programs and tasks outside the university.</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- First entry in column represents frequency.
-- Second entry in column represents percentage.
-- Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest decimal number.
-- Responses of no answer or no opinion about any item were subtracted from the percentage of that item, and, as a result, the total percentage for the item may not equal 100%.
Table 5.

**Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of the Evaluation Items of research as Viewed by Respondents of the Three Groups From the Four Universities**

(N = 286)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62. Perform a reasonable quantity and quality of research.</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Stimulate faculty members' research and publications.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Encourage faculty members to participate in regional, national, and international professional meetings and conferences.</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- First entry in column represents frequency.
-- Second entry in column represents percentage.
-- Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest decimal number.
-- Responses of no answer or no opinion about any item were subtracted from the percentage of that item, and, as a result, the total percentage for the item may not equal 100%.
APPENDIX G

TABLE CONTAINING THE RANKING OF THE SURVEY ITEMS ACCORDING TO THE RESPONDENTS' PREFERENCES
Table 1.

Rank of the Survey Items According to the Respondents' Preferences Measured by the Desirability Mean of Each Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Item in the Survey</th>
<th>Desired Rank</th>
<th>Mean Desired Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Item in the Survey</th>
<th>Desired Rank</th>
<th>Mean Desired Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

TABLE CONTAINING ITEMS FROM THE SURVEY WITH
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES REGARDING THE
LOCATION OF DIFFERENCES, THE F RATIO,
AND THE DEGREE OF SIGNIFICANCE
Table 1.

**Items of the Survey With Significant Difference Regarding the Location of Difference, The F Ratio, and the Degree of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Loc. of Dif.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>9.829</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4.828</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4.311</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.636</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5.280</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.925</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4.639</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>U**</td>
<td>5.593</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7.744</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4.864</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7.873</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.130</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6.350</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8.431</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.856</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.130</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6.074</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.502</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6.069</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4.192</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>20.373</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.733</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5.709</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7.484</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.072</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4.275</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5.229</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>6.809</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4.478</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4.219</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5.370</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.319</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>13.278</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5.699</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Position

** University
Table 1 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Loc. of Dif.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.227</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.446</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.828</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.925</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>5.095</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4.811</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* position.
** university.
APPENDIX I

A PROTOTYPE OF THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT OF THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS IN THE PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES OF JORDAN

THE ENGLISH VERSION
A PROTOTYPE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON'S PERFORMANCE IN THE PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES OF JORDAN

UNIVERSITY OF (Name of the respective university)

Chairperson Name: ........................................ Faculty (College): .................
Date Started in Higher Education: / / 19 .... Date Started at University: / / 19 ....
Date Started This Position: / / 19 .......... Period Covered: From: ........... To: ........

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>(4) Excellent</th>
<th>(3) Good</th>
<th>(2) Average</th>
<th>(1) Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A. Administration

1. Manage the day-to-day operation of the department. (2) 4 3 2 1
2. Regulate the department correspondence. (36) 4 3 2 1
3. Maintain records for different needs. (32) 4 3 2 1
4. Manage department facilities and equipment. (46) 4 3 2 1
5. Supervise and evaluate the clerical and technical staff of the department. (49) 4 3 2 1
6. Process department correspondence and requests for information. (77) 4 3 2 1
7. Prepare and propose recommendations for the department budget. (44) 4 3 2 1
8. Represent the department in all stages of formation and authorization of the department budget. (51) 4 3 2 1
9. Administer the department budget. (53) 4 3 2 1
10. Prepare the annual budgetary report. (56) 4 3 2 1
11. Complete forms and surveys. (63) 4 3 2 1
12. Monitor building security and maintenance. (64) 4 3 2 1

B. Departmental, Council, and Committee Activities:

13. Call departmental council for regular and special meetings. (5) 4 3 2 1
14. Prepare agenda and conduct meetings. (9) 4 3 2 1
15. Establish departmental committees. (26) 4 3 2 1
16. Organize committees effectively. (28) 4 3 2 1
17. Lead the department teamwork. (10) 4 3 2 1
18. Implement effective leadership principles. (21) 4 3 2 1
19. Supervise the work done by the departmental council regarding all of council's responsibilities. (27) 4 3 2 1
20. Develop long-range departmental programs, plans, and goals. (20) 4 3 2 1
21. Implement long-range departmental programs, plans, and policies; carry out the recommended actions and decisions of the departmental council. (15) 4 3 2 1
22. Determine what services the department should provide to the university, community, and country. (45) 4 3 2 1
23. Share the departmental council and faculty council decision-making. (4)  
24. Serve as an advocate for the department. (6)  
25. Delegate some departmental administrative responsibilities to individuals and committees. (43)  
26. Encourage faculty members to communicate ideas for improving the department. (11)  
27. Carry out the decisions of the faculty council related to the department. (18)  
28. Prepare the annual report about departmental activities to be presented to the departmental council and the dean. (30)  
29. Participate on university committees. (50)  
30. Participate on community committees. (62)  
31. Represent the department in the faculty council and in university meetings related to departmental affairs. (7)  
32. Encourage community service contributions and participation departmental faculty members. (48)  
33. Improve and maintain the department's image and reputation. (3)  

C. Leadership and Interaction With Deans and Faculty Members  
34. Help in training and orienting inexperienced and new faculty members. (42)  
35. Recruit and recommend selecting and appointing faculty members. (41)  
36. Preserve good relationships with and among faculty members; create a positive interpersonal work environment. (1)  
37. Assign faculty members' responsibilities, such as teaching, committee work, and so forth. (34)  
38. Evaluate faculty members' performance, emphasizing the positives and dealing with the unsatisfactory cases. (31)  
39. Encourage and monitor faculty members' service contributions. (51)  
40. Initiate promotion and tenure recommendations. (32)  
41. Keep faculty members informed of departmental, faculty, and institutional plans, activities, and expectations. (12)  
42. Maintain good morale. (17)  
43. Reduce and prevent conflict among faculty members. (8)  
44. Preserve good relationships with the dean and the upper-level administration. (14)  
45. Communicate departmental needs to the dean and the upper-level administrators. (23)  

D. Instruction, Teaching, Student Affairs, and Curriculum Affairs:  
46. Teach one or more classes. (29)  
47. Design semester schedules. (40)  
48. Update departmental courses and programs with the cooperation of the departmental council and the dean. (38)  
49. Monitor theses and dissertations, prospectuses,
and programs of study for graduate students. (59)  
50. Regulate and supervise the periodic exams in the department. (58)  
51. Supervise, schedule, monitor, and grade department examinations. (57)  
52. Suggest development of curricula and propose new courses with the cooperation of faculty members. (19)  
53. Advise and counsel students, graduates and undergraduates, from the department. (47)  
54. Monitor the progress of departmental scholarship students inside and outside the country; recommend the renewal or cancellation of their scholarships. (54)  
55. Reduce, resolve, and prevent problems among groups of students and between students and faculty members. (39)  
56. Assign students to faculty members for advising. (55)  
57. Coordinate activities and arrange for supplementary class activities, such as speakers, visitors, trips, etc. (60)  
58. Conduct high quality teaching. (17)  
59. Foster good teaching techniques in the department. (16)  
60. Foster the development of each faculty member's special talents and interests in academic affairs. (34)  
61. Initiate and implement programs and tasks outside the university. (61)  

E. Research:

62. Perform a reasonable quantity and quality of research. (24)  
63. Stimulate faculty members' research and publications. (22)  
64. Encourage faculty members to participate in regional, national, and international professional meetings and conferences. (24)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (the accumulated grades of all items' evaluation): (............)  
Average (the total divided by number of items - 64): (............)  

Comments:

Suggestions:

Signature of Evaluator:  
Signature of Chairperson:  
Approved/ Dean of Faculty (College):  

Date: / / 19  
Date: / / 19  
Date: / / 19

Note. Numbers in parenthesis after each item represent the degree of importance given the specific item in the ranking process of the sixty-four items resulting from the study (The Development of a Model to Evaluate The Performance of Academic Department Chairpersons in Jordan Public Universities).
APPENDIX J

A PROTOTYPE OF THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT
OF THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS
IN THE PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES OF JORDAN

THE ARABIC VERSION
نموذج مقترح لتقييم عمل رئيس الدائرة الأكاديمية

في الجامعات الأردنية الحكومية

جامعة .. (اسم الجامعة المعنية)

اللغة : طبیعی

اسم رئيس الدائرة (قسم) :
تاريخ التعيين بالجامعة :
تاريخ التعيين رسمياً للدائرة :
النقاط التي يتم التقييم عنها :

المعيار : (4) ممتاز (3) جيد (2) متوسط (1) ضعيف

ا- مجال الأعمال الأدارية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ب- مجال تكاليف وتحصيصات لجان المجلس (مجلس الدائرة) والدائرة

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. اعداد خطة الاجتماعات وإدارتها (9).
2. تكوين لجان خاصة بالدائرة (26).
3. تنظيم لجان بفاعلية (28).
4. قيادة فريق عمل الدائرة (10).
5. غرس مبادئ إدارية فعالة (21).
6. الإشراف على جميع أعمال الدائرة فيما يخص جميع مسؤوليات المجلس (27).
7. تطوير برامج الدائرة طويلة المدى وكذلك خططها وأهدافها (20).
8. تحقيق برامج الدائرة بعيدة المدى، خططها وأهدافها؛ وذلك بوضع توصيات مجلس الدائرة وقراراته (15).
9. تحديد الخدمات التي يجب أن تضطلع الدائرة بتحقيقها على مستوى الجامعة، المجتمع المحلي، والدولة (45).
10. المشاركة في صنع القرارات مع كل من مجلس الدائرة ومجلس الكلية (4).
11. الدفاع عن حقوق الدائرة (3).
12. تفويض بعض السلطات الإدارية لأفراد أو لجان في الدائرة (43).
13. تشجيع أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية بالدائرة لتقديم الاقتراحات لتحسين عمل الدائرة (11).
14. تنفيذ قرارات مجلس الكلية المتعلقة بالدائرة (18).
15. إعداد التقرير السنوي عن نشاطات الدائرة وتقديمه لمجلس الدائرة ومجلس الكلية (30).
16. المشاركة في لجان الجامعة (50).
17. المشاركة في لجان المجتمع المحلي (26).
18. تمثيل الدائرة في مجلس الكلية واجتماعات الجامعة التي تختص شؤون الدائرة (7).
تشجيع مساهمة أعضاء هيئة التدريس ومشاركتهم في خدمة المجتمع (48).

تحسين سمعة الدائرة المحافظة على الصورة الجيدة لها (3).

- مجال القيادة والعلاقات مع المعيد ومع أعضاء هيئة التدريس

3.4 المساعدة على إعداد وتدريب أعضاء هيئة التدريس الجدد وحديثي الخبرة (44).

3.5 استقطاب أعضاء هيئة تدريس جديد وتراثكم الاختبارات لتعيينهم (41).

3.6 المحافظة على علاقات جيدة مع، فيما بين أعضاء هيئة التدريس، وخلق جو تعاوني إيجابي (1).

3.7 تعيين مسؤوليات أعضاء الهيئة، كأي تدريس، وأعمال اللجان، وما شابه (34).

3.8 تقييم أداء أعضاء هيئة التدريس، تعزيز الإجابيات ومعالجة السلبيات (33).

3.9 تشجيع وملاحظة مساهمات أعضاء هيئة التدريس في الخدمات (51).

3.10 رفع ترشيحات الترقية والترقيع ضمن الدائرة (32).

3.11 نظرة أعضاء هيئة التدريس باستمرار على خطط وأنشطة وتوفيات الدائرة، لكلية، والجامعة (12).

3.12 تحقيق وحفظ روح معنوية عائمة (17).

3.13 الحد من أو منع المصادمات بين أعضاء هيئة التدريس (8).

3.14 المحافظة على علاقات طيبة مع المعيد وال administrations العليا (14).

3.15 رفع طلبات الدائرة للمعيد وال administrations العليا (23).

- شؤون التعليم التدريس، شؤون الطلبة والمناهج

4.6 تدريس مساق دراسي أو أكثر (29).

4.7 تصميم جداول الفصل الدراسي (4).
التوزيع الزمني لبرنامج الدائرة بالتعاون مع مجلس الدائرة والممدي (38).

الأشراف على رسائل ماجستير، رسائل دكتوراه، مقترحات بحوث وبرامج دراسية لبعض طلبة الدورات العليا (39).

التنظيم والإشراف على الامتحانات الفضائية ضمن الدائرة (58).

الإشراف على الامتحانات الدائرة، تنظيمها، مناعتها، وتفديدها (57).

اقتراح وتطوير المناهج وانشال مساقات جديدة بالتعاون مع أعضاء هيئة التدريس (15).

إشراف وتصحيح طلبة الشهادة الأولى وطلبة الدورات العليا بالدائرة (47).

متابعة تحصيل الطلبة المبعوثين من الدائرة داخل وخارج البلاد (54).

الحد من، وحل، أو حتى منع حدوث مشاكل بين جماعات الطلبة، أو بين الطلبة وأعضاء هيئة التدريس (39).

توزيع الطلبة على أعضاء الهيئة التدريبية للإشراف (55).

الإشراف على النشاطات، وتهيئة الجو لمزيد من النشاطات الدراسية و⇌ واعظات و⇌ المحاضرين والزائرين (10).

أداء مستوى متقدم من التدريس (13).

تعزيز سلامة تدريس عالية المستوى بالدائرة (16).

توزيع موارب واهتمامات أي من أعضاء هيئة التدريس في الشؤون الأكاديمية (14).

المبادرات بتنفيذ برامج ومهام خارج حدود دائرة (11).

- مجال البحث العلمي

لقاء قدر معقول من البحث العلمي من حيث الكم والكيف (24).
تشجيع أعضاء هيئة التدريس على البحث العلمي والتأليف (22).

تشجيع أعضاء هيئة التدريس على المشاركة في الاجتماعات والمؤتمرات المهنية الداخلية والخارجية (24).

المجموع (مجموعة تقييمات الدورات): 14
المعدل (المجموع مضاعفاً على 14): 14
التقدير العام: 2

ملاحظات:

مقررات:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الاسم وتقييم المقرر</th>
<th>التاريخ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

توقيع رئيس الدائرة بالعلم: 19

توقيع عمد الكليّة: 19

ملاحظة: الرقم بين القوسيين الذي يلي كل بند من بنود التقييم يعني ترتيب تلك البند بالأهمية قياساً بقية البندود، حسب نتائج الدراسة (تطوير نظام تقييم لأداء رئيس الدائرة الأكاديمية - رئيس القسم - في الجامعات الأردنية الحكومية).
VITA
MAHMOUD MOHAMMAD ABU QUDAIS
Irbid, Jordan

Date and Place of Birth
May 15, 1941; Soum - Irbid, Jordan

EDUCATION BACKGROUND

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, (Higher) Education Administration, Ph.D., 1994.


Arab University of Beirut, Law, B.A., 1982.

Arab University of Beirut, Economic and Political Science, B.A., 1968.


PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE


ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Worked as a volunteer in social work in Jordan, 1961-1972 in the following aspects:

1. Secretary General of culture and sports club in Irbid, Jordan.

2. Member and Treasurer of the Jordanian Association

3. Leader of Scouting, holding the "Wood Badge of Scouting for Leaders" since 1963.

3 Member of the Jordanian Association of Handball Referees, a referee of handball since 1960.

4. Member of the Jordanian Association of Football (Soccer) Referees, a referee of football since 1959.


6 Member of the Board of the Jordanian Federation of Football (Soccer), 1967-1969.

7. Member of the Board of the Jordanian Youth Housing, 1964-1967.

M. Abu Oudais

[Signature]