

Research Abstract

A Good Governance Model from Viewpoints / Perspectives of Faculty Members at Srinakharinwirot University

By

Dr.Panee Boonprakob and associates

The objective of this research was to study and present a model of good governance within Srinakharinwirot University (SWU) based on the opinions of university community members in order to determine indicators of good governance at Srinakharinwirot University and to compare opinions of SWU administrators, lecturers, and other academic supporting staff members with regarding to good governance at Srinakharinwirot University .

The research study covered organization structure, university management (University Council and the University President), personnel administration, and financial & property administration; within the framework of 12 factors / aspects of good governance which are comprised of transparency, participation / involvement, fairness, effectiveness, efficiency, flexibility, awareness within community members, accountability, decentralization, incorporation of planning and assessment objectives, and responsiveness to society's needs.

Samplings from group of 112 people came from 17.0% of high-level administrators, 25.9% of middle level administrators and 57.1% of non-management personnel. The group samplings were divided into academics researchers, specialists and academic supporting staff personnel with percentages of 79.5%, 7.1% and 13.4% respectively.

The findings from study were summarized as follows: Most of SWU community members agreed that the main objective of the university's development was to produce quality students equipped with excellent academic skills, academic independence, and responsiveness to society's needs, under the ultimate governance of the University Council which decrees policy and long-term strategic plans. The University Council was

composed of at least 3 components : external senior experts, administrators, and representatives from faculty members; and should include representatives from community, students, or alumni as well. The community emphasized participation / involvement at all levels of policy establishment, administration, and auditing -- either directly or through appointed representatives; administration transparency, effectiveness, fairness, flexibility, decentralization of power, and performance appraisal that assessed operational process in parallel with operational results. In addition, the Faculty Senate should participate / be involved both in policy making, monitoring of justice process, as member of the University Council, Executive Board of University Administration, Grievances Committee, and University Affairs Sub-Committee. Furthermore, the Faculty Senate should play a crucial role as coordinator between community members and university administrators -- by surveillancing and monitoring work of university's administrators, giving advice and consultation to university administrators, as a center for appeals and grievances, and promotion of good ethics and moral conducts of faculty members and students.

On personnel administration, regarding work division / classification, either there should be classified into academic line and academic support line or without classification but with assigned duties & responsibilities. Personnel administration should be departmentally focused, staff hiring of 3 years' period or more, remuneration based on academic qualification and experiences, with committee for work appraisal by quantitative and qualitative evaluation criteria of knowledge, ability, responsibility, cooperation and concreted outputs; welfare benefits of personal and family medical expenses and children's tuition assistance. Termination of employment should be authorized by the University Council.

On financial and property management, the university should look for additional sources of incomes by creating organization or public enterprises. Categories of and regulation on expenditures should be various and flexible, independent financial management at the departmental level. Financial controllers of the university should be members of the university's Committee of Policy and Property, who were appointed by the University Council. There should be supervision and audit of all outflows with full

disclosure, with a special set of committees directly reporting to the university's Committee of Finance and Property who was responsible for financial auditing and accounting within the university.

Key indicators for good governance of the University consisted of the followings:

1. Organization structure and university administration: indicators were involvement of community members in recruiting administrators, the university president listen to ideas and opinions from community members, administrators had work plans which could be evaluated and which were accepted / endorsed by the university community members.

2. Personnel administration : indicators were publicity, selection criteria, recognition / commendation, welfare, grievances, evaluation, audit, and decentralization.

3. Financial and property administration : indicators were unambiguous work system and complete database.