Quality Assurance in Higher Education: A Critical Review of Use of Internal Measures in Universities in Kenya

Edwin Andama Ombasa
Kenyatta University, College of Education and Life Long Learning
Corresponding e-mail:edwinombasa458@gmail.com

Abstract
An audit report by the Commission for University Education between January and February 2017 established that many universities in Kenya do not adhere to a number of quality guidelines put in place. Consequently, it was against this background that the study sought to investigate the application of internal measures of quality assurance in universities in Kenya.Its specific objectives were to:explore internal measures used to ensure quality in student intake in universities in Kenya; investigate internal measures used to ensure quality in evaluation of student learning experiences in universities in Kenya; and finally describe internal measures used to ensure lecturer quality in universities in Kenya. The study applied a descriptive survey design and it targeted all the 70 public and private universities in the republic. Out of this population, 21 public and private universities were purposefully sampled to take part in the study. Respondents were sampled randomly. They comprised of 210 members of academic staff from various faculties. The researcher engaged the services of 21 research assistants who were responsible for administering questionnaires in the sampled institutions. Validity and reliability of the instruments was tested by piloting them in one university which was not included in the final study. Quantitative data from the questionnaire was coded into categories based on the study objectives and fed into SPSS computer software version 20 which analyzed it using percentages and frequencies. Data was presented in frequency tables. The study established that although internal quality assurance mechanisms exist in universities, most of them are flawed. In student intake for instance, some universities issue students with admission letters without first of all authenticating their certificates. Things are not any better in other stages of quality assurance such evaluation of students' learning experiences and teaching staff's quality. In some universities, once students evaluate their lecturers at the end of the semester, the matter ends there. The reports are not analyzed and feedback communicated to individual lecturers. Besides this, few institutions use feedback from these reports to organize capacity building workshops for lecturers. In staff recruitment, the study found that in some universities, new recruits are not subjected to an elaborate orientation process in order to familiarize themselves with syllabi for various courses, the curriculum and even the administrative structures of the individual universities. In light of this, a number of workable recommendations were proposed to address these challenges.

Key Words: *Internal Measures, Learning Experiences, Lecturer Quality, Student Intake, Quality Assurance*

1.0 Introduction

Concern about the quality of higher education in Africa is on the rise. This comes against a background of a growing recognition of the potentially powerful role of tertiary education for growth, and it's a natural response to public perception that educational quality is being compromised in the effort to expand enrollment in recent years; growing complaints by employers that graduates are poorly prepared for the workplace; and increasing competition in the higher education market place as many private and transnational providers enter the scene (Materu, 2007). Little is available in the literature on what African countries are doing to regulate and improve higher education quality.

In Kenya, an audit report by the Commission for University Education (CUE) between January and February 2017 established that many universities do not adhere to a number of quality guidelines put in

place. The report covered all the 70 universities in the country (33 public and 37 private). Its findings were baffling. For two consecutive years a private university was found to have awarded degrees to candidates who had not qualified as they never met graduation requirements; some admitted students who didn't meet the minimum university entry requirements; some students completed bachelor's degree courses within nine to twelve months – a rare feat because the courses ordinarily take a minimum of four years; another private university got an approval to offer a diploma course in clinical medicine but went ahead to offer degree studies in medicine and surgery, meaning that it admitted and taught the students fraudulently; there were many cases of missing marks; poor supervision of postgraduate students and low completion rates for postgraduate students; others have fragmented courses such that what are typically taught as units have been made full-fledged degree courses, leading to premature specialization; shortage of full time and qualified academic staff; opening up of satellite campuses without adhering to guidelines and quality standards and; flouting guidelines on promotion of academic staff. These findings put to question the quality of education offered to the close to 500,000 students enrolled at this level of education. It was against the background of this situation that the current study emerged to investigate the use of internal measures to ensure quality assurance in Kenyan universities. The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Explore internal measures used to ensure quality in student intake in universities in Kenya.
2. Investigate internal measures used to ensure quality in evaluation of student learning experiences in universities in Kenya.
3. Describe internal measures used to ensure lecturer quality in universities in Kenya.

1.1 The Concept of Quality Assurance

The concept of quality is hard to define precisely especially in the context of tertiary education where institutions have a broad autonomy to decide on their own visions and missions. Any statement about quality implies a certain relative measure against a common standard. In tertiary education, such a common standard doesn't exist. Various concepts have evolved to suit different contexts ranging from quality as a measure for excellence to quality as perfection, quality as value for money, quality as customer satisfaction, quality as fitness for purpose, and quality as transformation in the learner (SAUVCA, 2002). Depending on the definition chosen, quality implies a relative measure of inputs, processes, outputs or learning outcomes. Institutions, funders, and the general public need some method for obtaining assurance that the institution is keeping its promises to its stakeholders. This is the primary goal of quality assurance. Quality assurance is concerned with consistently meeting product specification or simply getting things right, first time and every time. Quality assurance in the university system implies the ability of the institutions to meet the expectations of the users of manpower in relation to quality of skills acquired by their outputs (Ajayi and Akindutire, 2007). Furthermore, quality assurance in university education can be said to be the ability of the universities to meet certain criteria relating to academic matters, staff-student ratio, staff mix by rank, staff development, physical facilities, funding, and adequate library services. Adequacy of various inputs in the university systems in terms of quality and quantity exercises tremendously influence on quality assurance in the university system.

1.2 Internal Measures of Quality Assurance in Universities

Internal quality assurance mechanisms, refers to the internal policies and measures of a university or program for ensuring that it's fulfilling its purposes as well as the standards that apply to higher education in general or the profession or discipline in particular (IIEP, 2006). Development and utilization of effective internal quality assurance measures are crucial to successful university education everywhere in the world. Consequently, this underscores the reason why universities design and implement various internal quality assurance measures to ensure that certain agreed standards of performance are being met. On the other

hand, Dill (2007) argues that internal quality assurance refers to those policies and practices whereby academic institutions monitor and improve the quality of their education provision. This type of quality assurance is more formative in nature and likely to lead to continual quality improvement efforts and the development of quality culture in institutions (Wiclund et al., 2003). According to Kahsay (2012), aspects that are focused on in internal quality assurance are academic content, teaching-learning process, student assessment and resources (staffing, facilities and services).

This study assessed higher education quality assurance at the institutional level. Given the large number of universities in Kenya, it was not possible to delve into the specifics of each institution in detail. Therefore, the conclusions and recommendations given here are only intended to act as a guide and would have to be adapted to suit the specific situation of each institution.

Within institutions of higher learning, self assessment and academic audits are gradually being adopted to supplement traditional quality assurance methods for instance use of external examiners. Institutions readily accept self assessment because it empowers them and their staff to take charge of quality of their performance without the pressure that is usually associated with an external review. Self assessment also helps institutions to identify their own strengths and weaknesses while generating awareness of key performance indicators. The capacity building function of self-assessment is particularly important in the countries of Sub-Saharan Africa where capacity remains very weak. In some institutions like University of Dar Salaam, Tanzania, these processes existed long even before the establishment of national Quality Assurance agencies (Materu, 2007). However, Materu notes that expertise in conducting self evaluation is limited within Africa.

Quality assurance within institutions of higher learning takes place thought the teaching and learning process. It includes screening of candidates for admission, staff recruitment and promotion procedures, curriculum reviews, teaching and learning facilities, quality of research, policy development and management mechanisms, students' evaluation of teaching staff, external examiners for students' work, academic reviews, and audits.

Although little information is available in the public domain on the effectiveness of these methods, anecdotal information gathered by Materu (2007) revealed that implementation of some of these processes is weak due to financial constraints, failure to keep up with new approaches to teaching and learning and increased workload resulting from unmatched student numbers. In Tanzania for instance, a quality assurance panel set up by the University of Dar es Salaam recommended a reduction in the frequency of external examiner visits from once per year to once in two or three years. As a replacement, regular tracer studies were recommended to obtain feedback from the labor market (Mihyo, 2006).

Ofojebe, Nwogbo and Nonso (2008) studied internal measures used for quality assurance in public and private universities in the south eastern geopolitical zone of Nigeria. This study established that internal measures for quality assurance were of three broad categories — student intake measures, evaluation of students' learning experience, and teacher quality measures.

Institutional academic reviews are a more recent mechanism for quality in most institutions of higher learning. A study by Materu (2007) in 14 countries across Africa found evidence of institutional academic reviews in less than 20 % of the 52 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. An academic review provides an opportunity for an institution to: review an academic program or unit's mission and goals; evaluate the quality of the academic program, its faculty and students; establish priorities to develop its curriculum and to improve quality; determine the financial and technical resources required to support the university's and the unit's essential goals and objectives; make recommendations for the action by the program, the administration and others.

1.3 Challenges Facing Internal Quality Assurance in Universities

Inadequate numbers of academic staff with knowledge and experience in conducting self evaluations and peer review; strain on senior academic staff in institutions of higher learning as they have to support both their own internal quality systems as well as external quality assurance processes of their national agencies. This problem exists in virtually all countries even in economically advanced countries like South Africa (Materu, 2007). Assuring the quality of distance learning and new modes of delivery remains a challenge. Although all the agencies reviewed have the responsibility over distance learning, none has yet conducted accreditation in these areas.

To solve the above mentioned challenges, Materu (2007) proposes the following solutions: capacity building efforts should be directed to building a culture of quality within higher education institutions; staff should be trained in self-evaluation and peer reviewing. Involvement of peer reviewers from other institutions within or outside the country in self-assessment exercises; partnership with foreign institutions and quality assurance agencies with sound quality assurance experience can help to supplement local capacity in the short-term and also bring in relevant experience from other regions; technical assistance to develop quality standard especially as regards regulation of e-learning and cross-border delivery of tertiary education since expertise in this area is limited in Africa, external assistance may be required; governments and national agencies are advised to consider reviewing tertiary education funding policies such that allocation of public resources to tertiary institutions is linked to quality factors as a strategy for encouraging institutions to undertake quality improvements.

2.0 Research Design and Methodology

The study applied a descriptive survey design. According to Orodho (2009) a descriptive survey design is a method of gathering data from respondents under settings which have not been controlled or manipulated in any way. This design was suitable for the study since the researcher aimed at gathering respondents' opinions without manipulating any variables by way of experimentation.

The target population was all the 70 public and private universities in the republic. A target population refers to the number of real hypothetical set of people, objects or events to which the researcher wishes to generalize their findings (Borg & Gall, 1989). Out of this population, a total of 21 universities (8 public and 13 private) were purposefully sampled to take part in the study. The latter were more because they are more in the population. This sample represented 30 % of universities in Kenya. On the other hand, respondents were sampled randomly. They comprised of 210 members of university academic staff from various faculties.

The researcher engaged the services of 21 research assistants who were responsible for administering instruments in the sampled institutions. The main research instrument was a questionnaire. According to Bryman (2008) a questionnaire is the most suitable tool to use in circumstances where respondents are scattered in a population and also when there is need to safeguard their anonymity. Since the study involved many respondents from different universities, a questionnaire was perceived to be the most suitable tool to use. The tool had closed ended items which were intended to limit respondents to specific choices that were pre-determined by the researcher.

Before the actual study was conducted, the researcher tested the validity and reliability of the instruments by carrying out a pilot study in one university which was not included in the final study. Validity refers to the extent to which theory and practical evidence supports the interpretation of test scores (Nachmias, 1996). In this study, the researcher validated his research instruments in terms of content and face validity. Validation of questionnaire items was done by seeking expert opinion from two Kenyatta University lecturers namely,Dr. Violet Wawire and Dr. Salome Nyamburawho are specialists in educational research. They advised on the appropriate length of the questions, suitability of language used and also the

comprehensiveness of the content of the questions. The researcher adopted their recommendations to improve the validity of the instruments.

Reliability of the instruments was ascertained during piloting. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), reliability is a measure of the degree to which an instrument used in research gives consistent results after a repeated trial. This exercise involved administering the questionnaires twice within a span of two weeks and doing a correlation of results. Responses given from the two sets of questionnaires were coded and fed into the SPSS version 20 computer software for correlation. Using Pearson's Product Moment formulae, a correlation coefficient was computed in order to establish the degree to which the content of the questionnaire was consistent in eliciting similar results. The instruments were found to be reliable because they yielded a correlation-coefficient of 0.83. According to Gay (2003), when a correlation coefficient of between 0.7 and 0.8 is established, the research instrument is usually considered to be reliable.

Data analysis began by identifying and discarding all incomplete or ambiguous responses. After this, data was grouped according to the study objectives for analysis. Quantitative data from the questionnaire was coded into categories based on the study objectives and fed into SPSS computer software version 20 which analyzed it using percentages and frequencies. Data was presented in frequency tables.

3.0 Findings

The following were the findings, starting with the demographic characteristics of the study participants.

3.1. Demographic information

Table 3.1: Gender of academic staff

GENDER	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
MALE	136	64 %
FEMALE	74	35 %
TOTAL	**210**	**100**

The statistics above show that the study sampled participants from both genders. This was necessary to avoid gender biases.

Table 3.2: Academic rank of respondents

ACADEMIC RANK	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Professor	6	2.85 %
Associate professor	11	5.23 %
Senior lecturer	62	29.52 %
Lecturer	88	41.90 %
Assistant lecturer/ Tutorial fellow	43	20.47 %
TOTAL	**210**	**100 %**

As presented above, the study had a mix of faculty by rank. This ensured that findings were not biased towards any particular faculty rank.

Table 3.3: Years worked in current work station

YEARS WORKED	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Below 2 years	38	18.09 %
3 - 5 years	51	24.28 %
Above 6 years	121	57.61 %
TOTAL	**58**	**100 %**

The findings above show that most of the respondents had worked in their current stations for over six years. This means that they had a lot of experience on use of internal measures of quality assurance, hence providing richer information essential for this study.

3.2: Responses of university academic staff on mechanisms of ensuring quality in student intake

Table 3.4: Measures of ensuring quality in student intake

N= 210	FREQUENCY			PERCENTAGE (%)		
Variables	Yes	No	Not sure	Yes	No	Not sure
1. Lecturers are actively involved in constructing pre-entry examinations for prospective students.	2	207	1	0.95	98.57	0.47
2. Lecturers are involved in the moderation of pre-entry examinations.	2	207	1	0.95	98.57	0.47
3. All lecturers in respective departments are involved in invigilating pre-entry examinations.	2	207	1	0.95	98.57	0.47
4. There is provision of adequate examination halls and sitting arrangements during pre-entry exams.	2	207	1	0.95	98.57	0.47
5. Students are thoroughly vetted before sitting for pre-entry examinations in order to avoid impersonation.	2	207	1	0.95	98.57	0.47
6. Preventing pre-entry examination students from entering examination halls with electronic devices e.g. mobile phones, tables and laptops.	2	207	1	0.95	98.57	0.47
7. Vetting application letters to ensure that only students who meet the minimum admission requirements of a course are admitted.	123	76	11	58.57	36.19	5.23
8. Verification of students' KCSE certificates/result slips to ensure authenticity.	115	65	30	54.76	30.95	14.28

3.3 Discussion

Findings show that most universities do not offer pre-entry examinations before students are admitted for various courses. Consequently, it's in few institutions that quality checks associated with this stage are done. Such measures include setting, moderation and invigilating pre-entry examinations, vetting students' identification documents before they sit for pre-entry exams, providing adequate sitting space when students sit for pre-entry examinations, preventing students from entering examination halls with electronic devices etc. This implies that in circumstances where students cheat in national examinations such as Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) and eventually qualify for university, such students will end up pursuing courses which they are not qualified to undertake in the first place. Besides this, the study established that 58.57 % of respondents said that they usually vet application letters of prospective students in order to ensure that only qualified students are admitted. However, the fact that slightly over a third of respondents said that this is not usually done raises a number of questions on quality assurance at this stage. Related to this, 54.76 % of respondents said that KCSE certificates/result slips of prospective students are thoroughly scrutinized to ensure that they are authentic. However, 30.95 % said that this is not done in their institutions. This breach opens the window for unscrupulous people to enroll in these institutions and subsequently water down quality.

3.3. Responses of university academic staff on measures of ensuring quality in evaluation of students' learning experiences

Table 3.5: Measures of ensuring quality in evaluation of student learning

N= 210	FREQUENCY			PERCENTAGE (%)		
Variables	Yes	No	Not sure	Yes	No	Not sure
1. Communicating assessment criteria to students at the start of every course.	168	32	10	80	15.23	4.76
	168	32	10	80	15.23	4.76

2. Providing students with opportunities to evaluate learning experiences at the end of every semester.	152	36	22	72.38	17.14	10.47
3. Administration of take home assignments to students.	152	36	22	72.38	17.14	10.47
4. Administration of tests to students.	147	42	21	70	20	10
5. Administering group assignments to students.						
6. Ensuring that there is appropriate match between learning objectives and various assessment techniques.	136	23	51	64.76	10.95	24.28
7. Provision of immediate feedback on assessments given to students.	76	132	2	36.19	62.85	0.95
8. Revising with students returned assignment scripts before sitting for end of semester examinations.	71	125	14	33.80	59.52	6.66
9. Making provision for students to peer evaluate their learning experiences.	12	136	62	5.71	64.76	29.52
10. Making provision for students to evaluate their own learning experiences (self evaluation).	16	164	30	7.61	78.09	14.28
11. Providing enough invigilators when administering end of semester examinations.	86	96	28	40.95	45.71	13.33
12. Vetting identification documents (student ID, national ID, examination card) before students are allowed to sit for end of semester examinations in order to stamp out cases of impersonation.	86	96	28	40.95	45.71	13.33

3.4 Discussion

The study established that there exist various internal measures used to ensure that there is quality in the evaluation of students' learning experiences. In more than three quarters of the institutions, students are usually familiarized with the assessment criteria of each course at the start of every semester. This is important as it makes them prepared for learning. It was in only few institutions that this was not done. At the end of every semester, a majority of students are given an opportunity to evaluate the learning experiences they had with lecturers. This provides timely feedback to lecturers and subsequently helps them enhance the quality of their teaching. In spite of this, a small percentage said that this is not regularly done in their institutions whereas 4.76 % gave a not sure response. Almost three quarters of respondents said that take home assignments are administered in order to give students an opportunity to do library research and therefore grasp the course content better. Less than a quarter gave a contrary opinion whereas a very small percentage was not sure about this. Similar results were replicated with regard to administration of tests. Group assignments provide an opportunity for students to exchange academic ideas and therefore enrich their knowledge. Because of this, 70 % of respondents said that this is regularly done during teaching whereas slightly below a quarter of respondents gave a contrary opinion. Those who were not sure were also very few. Almost two thirds of respondents said that there is an appropriate match between learning objectives and various assessment techniques. This is good in quality teaching and learning because it ensures that there is fair assessment of students. Small percentages either gave contrary opinions or were no sure. Provision of immediate feedback is crucial in quality learning. Almost two thirds said that this was not regularly done in their institutions whereas 36.19 % said that it is usually done. Very few were not sure on this. In most of the institutions, lecturers do not revise marked assignment scripts with students. This means that students sit for end of semester examinations without knowledge of how they scored in their assignments, something that affects the quality of course content mastery. It was a paltry 33.80 % of participants that said that such revision is done whereas less than ten percent were not sure. Peer evaluation as a strategy of providing students with an opportunity to gauge how well their peers have understood course content is not adequately applied in most institutions. This affects the quality of teaching and learning negatively. The same case applies to self evaluation. The study found out that most lecturers do not provide students with an opportunity to evaluate their own learning experiences, hence

denying individual students an opportunity to seek help in areas of weakness. It was less than 10 % of lecturers who regularly did this when teaching whereas 14.28 % were not sure. Provision of enough invigilators in examination halls is a quality check that guards against cheating. However, the study established that this was only taken seriously in less than half of the institutions surveyed. The same applies to vetting of students' identification documents before they are allowed to sit for end of semester examinations (student ID, examination cards, national ID). Only 40.95 % of respondents affirmed that these documents are thoroughly verified whereas 45.71 % disagreed — an implication that in some institutions cases of impersonation may go on unnoticed since examinees are not thoroughly vetted before being allowed into examination halls.

3.5 Responses of university academic staff on measures of ensuring lecturers' quality

Table 3.6: Measures of ensuring quality in lecturer quality

N= 210	FREQUENCY			PERCENTAGE (%)		
Variables	Agree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Disagree	Not sure
1. Subjecting applicants to oral interviews before they are appointed as members of academic staff.	148	36	26	70.47	17.14	12.38
2. Subjecting applicants to written interviews before being appointed as members of academic staff.	26	137	47	12.38	65.23	22.38
3. Orienting new members of academic staff before they formally start work.	160	23	27	76.19	10.95	12.85
4. Encouraging lecturers to regularly carry out research.	160	27	23	76.19	12.85	10.95
5. Offering research grants to lecturers to carry out research.	76	111	23	36.19	52.85	10.95
6. Sponsoring lecturers to attend seminars/conferences locally and internationally.	72	109	29	34.28	51.90	13.80
7. Supporting lecturers financially to publish their researches.	59	22	129	28.09	10.47	61.42
8. Providing in service and capacity building training in pedagogy to lecturers.	59	22	129	28.09	10.47	61.42
9. Creating avenues for peer review of teaching effectiveness.	62	132	16	29.52	62.85	7.6
10. Making provisions for students to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of lecturers.	113	61	36	53.80	29.04	17.14
11. Analyzing and communicating the outcome of students' evaluation of teaching effectiveness to lecturers.	102	96	12	48.57	45.71	5.71
12. Using feedback on students' evaluation of lecturers' effectiveness to organize for capacity building workshops to address areas of weakness.	83	86	41	39.52	40.95	19.52

3.6 Discussion

The study established that there existed various internal measures of ensuring lecturer quality. A majority of respondents affirmed that before one is hired as a member of teaching staff, an applicant is first subjected to an oral interview to interrogate their academic qualifications, work experience and personal attributes. However, when it comes to subjecting interviewees to written interviews, two thirds of respondents said that this is not commonplace in their institutions whereas almost a quarter of them gave a not sure response. For quality purposes, it's good to subject interviewees to both types of interviews. Slightly over three

quarters of respondents said that newly recruited members of academic staff are taken through an orientation process before they formally start work. This is good for quality purposes as it makes them familiar with the curriculum, course syllabus, and even the nature of the administrative hierarchy of an institution. Besides this, it was established that this measure is not observed in some institutions ─ a breach of quality assurance. Similar results were replicated when it came to encouraging members of academic staff to regularly carry out research. Research is crucial in quality higher education as it ensures that lectures have current knowledge in their disciplines. The study established that most institutions do not offer grants to academic staff in order to enable them carry out research. This affects quality negatively. When it comes to giving financial support to lecturers for them to publish research findings, a majority said that this is not done in their respective institutions, something that affects quality negatively. It was in few institutions (34.28 %) that this was regularly done. Few institutions provide in-service and capacity building courses in pedagogy to lecturers. This implies that some lecturers may not be at par with others as regards to instructional pedagogy, something that raises a number of questions on quality assurance in these institutions. The same was also echoed with regard to providing avenues for peer review of teaching effectiveness. On the other hand, the study established that slightly more than half of respondents said that students are given an opportunity to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of their lecturers at the end of every semester. This is important as it gives feedback to universities' internal quality assurance departments for necessary action. However, the fact that almost a third of respondents gave contrary opinion means that this is not regularly done in some institutions, hence affecting quality assurance negatively. After students assess their lecturers, it is important for this information to be analyzed and be communicated to individual lecturers so as to ensure that they make any necessary improvements. Slightly less than half of respondents said that this is done in their institutions whereas 45 % gave a contrary opinion. Failure to communicate this feedback to individual lecturers affects quality negatively since areas of weakness can't be rectified. Lastly, 39.52 % said that feedback on students' evaluation of lecturers' effectiveness is used to organize for capacity building courses for lecturers whereas 40.95 % disagreed. These findings generally imply that in some institutions, internal quality assurance processes are not conclusive.

4.0 Conclusion

Although internal quality assurance mechanisms exist in universities, most of them are flawed. In student intake for instance, it is quite baffling that in some universities students are issued with admission letters without first of all vetting their qualification certificates. This implies that at times unqualified students may gain entry into these institutions, hence watering down quality. The fact that pre-entry examinations are not mandatory in almost all the institutions studied means that in instances where students cheat in form four examinations and eventually attain the minimum university entry grades, these people end up studying courses they are not qualified to undertake in the first place. Things are not any better in other stages of quality assurance such as evaluation of students' learning experiences and teaching staff's quality. In some universities, once students evaluate their lecturers at the end of the semester, the matter ends there. The reports are not analyzed and feedback communicated to individual lecturers. Besides this, few institutions use feedback generated from these reports to organize capacity building workshops for lecturers. Lastly, in staff recruitment, the study found that in some universities, new recruits are not subjected to an elaborate orientation process in order to familiarize themselves with syllabi for various courses, the curriculum and even the administrative structures of the individual universities. These flaws affect the quality of education offered in these institutions. The following section provides an escape route by suggesting workable recommendations that can help address this problem.

5.0 Recommendations

Based on the study findings, the researcher makes the following recommendations:

i. All universities should subject prospective students to a uniform pre-entry examination before they are formally admitted.
ii. Members of university staff in charge of student admission should thoroughly vet and authenticate certificates of prospective students by confirming their authenticity from the issuing institutions.
iii. Reports generated from students' evaluation of lecturers should be analyzed thoroughly and be used to organize for capacity building courses for individual lecturers.
iv. Internal quality assurance departments in universities should be strengthened with more qualified staff and equipment.
v. Internal quality assurance departments in universities should be inspected regularly by the Commission of University Education and other relevant regulatory bodies to ensure that they are on track.
vi. Legal and administrative actions should be taken against institutions that flout internal quality assurance mechanisms.
vii. Capitation directed towards internal quality assurance in universities should be increased.
viii. New members of academic staff should be oriented before they formally start teaching.

References

Ajayi, I., A. and Akindutire, I., O. (2007). The Unresolved Issues of Quality Assurance in Nigerian Universities. *Journal of Sociology and Education in Africa, 6* (1), 43 ─ 50.

Borg, M. & Gall, G. (1989). *Educational Research: An Introduction.* New York: Longman Inc

CUE (2017). *Quality Audit of Universities in Kenya.* Nairobi: Commission of University Education.

Dill, D. (2007). *Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Practices and Issues.* Available online at: www.unc.edu/ppaq/docs/Encyclopedia_Final.pdf

Gay, R. (2003). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application7th Ed.*Columbus: Charles Merrill Publishing Co.

IIEP (2006). *Making Basic Choices for External Quality Assurance System.* Paris: IIEP Publications.

Kahsay, N., M. (2012). *Quality and Assurance in Ethiopian Higher Education: Critical Issues and Practical Implications.* Doctor of Philosophy Thesis. Netherlands: CHEPS/UT.

Materu, P. (2007). *Higher Education Quality Assurance in Sub-Saharan Africa: Status, Challenges, Opportunities and Promising Practices*. New York: World Bank.

Mugenda, A. & Mugenda, O. (2003). *Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* Nairobi: Acts Press.

Nachmias, F. (1996). *Research Methods in the Social Sciences.* New York: Hillsdale Inc.

Ofojebe, W., Nwogbo, V. N., Nonso, A., O. (2015). Comparative Analysis of the Use of Internal Measures for Quality Asssurance in Public and Private Universities in South East Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal, 11*, No. 7. p. 110 ─135.

Orodho, J. A. (2009). *Elements of Education and Social Science Research Methods.* Maseno: Kanezja Publishers.

SAUVCA (2002). *Quality Assurance in South African Universities.* Views from SAUVCA's National Quality Assurance Forum.