ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN ETHIOPIA

BY

TSEGAYE W/GIORGIS

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
EDUCATION RESEARCH CENTER LIBRARY

JULY 2008
ADDIS ABABA

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN ETHIOPIA

BY

TSEGAYE W/GIORGIS

JULY 2008
ADDIS ABABA

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN ETHIOPIA

BY

TSEGAYE W/GIORGIS

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Addis Ababa University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Educational Policy and Planning

JULY 2008
ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN ETHIOPIA

By

TSEGAYE W/GIORGIS

Approved by the Board of Examiners

Yekunoamlak Alemu (PhD) _____
Chairman, Department of Graduate Committee

_____ Signature

Seyoum Teferra (Prof.) _____
Advisor

_____ Signature

Amare Asgedom (PhD) _____
External Examiner

_____ Signature

Melaku Yitam _____
Internal Examiner

_____ Signature

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I am glad to express my wholehearted gratitude to my advisor, Prof. Seyoum Teferra, who tirelessly gave me invaluable, constructive and enlightened comments and suggestions without which my work would have been fruitless.

I am indebted to thank the **Ethiopian Teachers' Association** for its financial support provided as grant which in fact significantly contributed to finalize the research work.

I would also like to extend very special thanks to Prof. Habtamu Wondimu and Dr. Wossenu Yimam for their professional support during this research period.

Moreover, my sincere thanks go to the respondents in the sample Private Higher Education Institutions and the officials of HERQA for their unreserved concern in providing the data required for the research.

Last, but not least, I would like to extend very sincere and special thanks to my family members, intimate friends, and colleagues who have been encouraging me in one way or another that contributed to my achievement.

2.3 Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education 27
2.3.1 Approaches of Quality Assurance System 27
2.3.1.1 Internal Quality Assurance System 28
2.3.1.1.1 Internal Quality Assurance at an Institutional Level 29
2.3.1.1.2 Internal Quality Assurance at Program Level 29
2.3.2 Accreditation in Higher Education 30
2.3.2.1 Standards and Criteria for Accreditation 31
2.3.2.2 Accreditation Practices at a Global Scale 32
2.3.2.3 Accreditation Practices in Ethiopia 34

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES 37
3.1 Methodology 37
3.2 Source of Data 37
3.3 Sample of Population and Sampling Techniques 37
3.4 Data Gathering Instruments 41
3.5 Data Analysis Tools 41

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA 42
4.1 Characteristics of Respondents 43
4.2 Issues on Program Quality 45
4.3 Issues on Institution Quality 64
4.4 Issues on Government Support to PrHEIs 74
4.5 Issues on HERQA'S Progress 77
4.6 Perceptions on Implementation Challenges in PrHEIs 81

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 83
5.1 Summary 83
5.2 Conclusion 88
5.3 Recommendations 90
Bibliography 95
Appendices 99

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Summary of Sampling 40
Table 2: Respondents by Sex, Age, Qualification, Academic Rank and Service Year 43
Table 3: Adequacy Level of Program Objectives, Contents, Specification and Organization..... 47
Table 4: Quality of Concern for Learning Strategy, Students' Performance Assessment and Student Support 50
Table 5: Adequacy Level of Quality Academic Staff, Support Staff and Students 53
Table 6: Adequacy Level of Facilities and Infrastructure 56
Table 7: Level of Quality Assurance, Student Evaluation and Curriculum Design 58
Table 8: Extent of Staff Development Activities 61
Table 9: Extent of Feedback from Stakeholders and Output Level 62
Table 10: Issues on Clarity of Mission Statements, Policy Plan, Management System and Funding Status 65
Table 11: Adequacy Level of Human Resource 68
Table 12: Adequacy Level of Educational Activities, Achievements, and Stakeholder Satisfaction 70
Table 13: Degree of Quality of Research Activities and Contribution to Society 71
Table 14: Extent of Quality Subject Benchmarking 73
Table 15: Level of Government Support to PrHEIs 75
Table 16: Tabular Summary on Problems of PrHEIs..... 82

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Questionnaire of Instructors in Private Higher Education Institutions

Appendix B: Questionnaire of Department Heads in Private Higher Education Institutions

Appendix C: Interview Package of Officials in Private Higher Education Institutions

Appendix D: Interview Package of Officials in HERQA

Appendix E: Observation Checklist

Appendix F: Problems of Private Higher Education Institutions Appealed to Government

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AAU	=	Association of African Universities
CHE	=	Commission for Higher Education
CNAA	=	Council for National Academic Awards
EQA	=	External Quality Assurance
ESDP	=	Education sector Development Program
FDRE	=	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
HE	=	Higher Education
HEI	=	Higher Education Institution
HERQA	=	Higher Education Relevance and Quality Agency
HESC	=	Higher Education Strategy Council
ICT	=	Information Communication Technology
IIEP	=	International Institute of Education planning
IQA	=	Internal Quality Assurance
ISO	=	International standard Organization
IUCEA	=	Inter University Council to East Africa
MDG	=	Millennium Development Goals
MOE	=	Ministry of Education
MOI	=	Ministry of Information
NAAC	=	National Assessment and Accreditation council
PrHE	=	Private Higher Education
PrHEI	=	Private Higher Education Institution
PrHEIs	=	Private Higher Education Institutions
SMUC	=	Saint Mary's University College
TFHES	=	Task Force on Higher Education and Society
TQM	=	Total Quality Management
UNESCO	=	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
USA	=	United States of America

ABSTRACT

This study was concerned with implementation of quality assurance and accreditation system in private higher education institutions in Ethiopia being delimited to nine institutions found in Addis Ababa, and to identify the outcome as well as the problems encountered in translating it into practice. It was also aimed at suggesting alternative solutions. In order to achieve this end, the descriptive survey approach was employed. Questionnaires were distributed to instructors and department heads in the nine private higher education institutions, and interviews were conducted with officials of the same institutions and that of HERQA on the issue under consideration. The data obtained were, then, analyzed using various statistical techniques such as percentages and chi-square tests.

The findings of the study suggested that, in most cases, certain variables which were assumed to be program quality indicators like objectives, contents, organization, and didactic concept of a program were considered to be significantly adequate. However, other components of program quality such as staff quality, student quality, facilities and infrastructure, quality assurance system, student evaluation mechanisms, curriculum design, staff development activities, feedback from stakeholders, and out put quality were found to be very low. Apart from this, the fact that some of the expected institution quality indicators like clarity of mission statements, policy plan, funding status, educational activities, and human resources in aggregate stipulations were regarded as adequate. Other variables for instance, institutional achievement, management system, stakeholder satisfaction, research activities, contribution to society, and subject benchmarking were found to be significantly low in many private higher education institutions. In line with this, the data obtained revealed that the implementation status of the sole regulatory organ of quality assurance and accreditation system (i.e., HERQA) was also found to be weak in general. On top of that, government support to the institutions in the private sector in areas of access to incentives, provision of short-term training, provision of technical support, and fostering public-private partnership was extremely low.

To this effect, the implementation practice of quality assurance and accreditation system in many private higher education institutions in Ethiopia has been seriously impaired in contrary to the expected policy directions. Thus, it is recommended that all concerned bodies (private institutions, the regulatory body –HERQA, and the government) have to take immediate measures. Accordingly, private higher education institutions should develop mechanisms so as to have adequate resources qualitatively and quantitatively pertinent to quality assurance and accreditation. Researches have to be conducted in such a way that the principles of quality of program as well as institution in the higher education system of the private sector would be translated into practice. HERQA should also strengthen its overall capacity in the area of discharging the expected duties and responsibilities and it should be empowered to "stand on its legs". Moreover, the government should support private higher education institutions in terms of incentives, training, and the like based on the policy directions on the issue under consideration.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH

This chapter presents the introductory components of the study such as background, statement of the problem, objectives, significance, delimitation, limitations, definition of terms, and organization of the study.

1. 1 Background of the Study

An education system of a country is basically determined by its social, economic, cultural, and democratic development. Education requires an appropriate direction to bring about the desired overall national development by improving its quality. The role of higher education here is much greater. In support of this, Ashcroft (2003:7) indicates that the higher social and economic purposes of higher education are, the higher there will be freedom to question and protect democracy, transfer of new knowledge and development practices and creation of today's and tomorrow's professionals.

The term "Higher Education" generally is all about programs of study, training or for research at the post-secondary level provided by universities or other educational establishments that are approved as institutions of higher education by the competent state authorities, and/or through recognized accreditation system (UNESCO, 1997:1). "Private Higher Education" on its part is related with the provision of post secondary level education by the private sector and it varies in terms of classification such as those that fit for imparting higher education, recognized for awarding degrees/diplomas/certificates. Another classification relates to the sources of fund whereby funds privately managed and publicly funded or privately managed and privately funded (Dessalegn, 2004: 31).

It is quite evident that higher education had been left only for a very small portion of the population. But these days it has become available to a much broader population. Since the last ten years, most governments have been

allowed and emerged for the growth of PrHEIs. As a result, many PrHEIs have proliferated in Africa, Asia, and many European transition economies. As an example, the higher education system expansion in the United Kingdom as cited in Yohannes (2007:1), comparing the rate of university entering young people, was only 4 per cent in 1962 with that of 44 per cent in 2004. The same author further cites that the South African higher education expansion to have reached 33 per cent currently from 15 per cent in 1995.

In Ethiopia like many other parts of the world, HE establishment and expansion has been centrally dominated with the burden in the hands of government during the last two regimes. This has greatly impeded the development of HE system. Accordingly, it has not contributing to national development: or "poverty alleviation" (Amare, 2005:41). To this effect, the institutions have been inefficiently managed, ill facilitated, inequitably distributed and, thus, became of poor quality. However, since 1991, establishing and expanding HE as a prime responsibility of the government has become fading out. That is, it has been felt that both the public and private sectors could meaningfully share the responsibility for addressing the age-old challenges of the country's HE system. This has brought the role of private sector in the provision of HE into the front. As a result, currently there are over forty-three accredited PrHEIs in Ethiopia offering degree programs (HERQA, 2007:11).

In line with this, the five-year program-action-plan of the Education Sector Development Program (ESDP III) (MoE 2005: 39) of Ethiopia indicates that the annual intake capacity of higher education institution is much higher currently and it is planned to reach one-hundred-eleven thousands in the twenty-one government universities and fifty thousands in the private higher education institutions by the year 2010. Owing to this, higher education expansion is getting much higher currently both in governmental and private institutions in the country. As an illustration on the above, the undergraduate degree enrolment in the sector has increased significantly in the last consecutive five years. That is, **58,026** in 2002/03, **98,404** in 2003/04, **138,159** in 2004/05,

173,901 in 2005/06 and **203,399** in 2006/07 (MoE, 2008: 53). It can be seen from this that the enrolment progress has reached 33 per cent on the average

Thus, quality assurance system is of paramount importance in higher education system. Supporting this view, Damme (2004: 134) explains that the importance of quality assurance and accreditation movement revolves around some factors. First, there are concerns about a decline of academic standards against the background of expansion in higher education. Second, the key stakeholders, businesses, professionals, and employers started to lose confidence in the traditional academic quality management capacities in higher education institutions. Third, budget restrictions and fiscal crises led to declining government funding per student and pressure to increase efficiency in public expenditure. Fourth, institutions were expected to meet the demands of an increasingly "evaluative state" for public accountability. Fifth, the higher education environment became competitive with growing mobility of students, increased mobility of professionals and academics, and the pressure of private institutes. Hence, quality assurance and accreditation are believed to be the crucial elements of regulation in the mushrooming trade-oriented international higher education market.

In line with this, Tesfaye (2007:54) indicates that Ethiopia is currently engaged in HE reform which introduced new elements; that is, cost sharing schemes in HE, and the expansion of Private HE. For this, two key agencies have been set up to guide and oversee the sector (HERQA and HESC). There is a necessity to set standards and to assure the quality of education on offer. HERQA is mandated to promote public confidence that the quality of provision and standards of awards in HE are being safeguarded and enhanced.

It is clear that quality of education plays an essential role in the overall development of a country. But poor quality education affects the whole system of national development. In the absence of standardized measure of higher education students, it is a great challenge to determine the status of

educational quality within Ethiopia's higher education institutions. It is evident that private higher education sector in Ethiopia is mushrooming under the government's policy support. Hence, the enrolment in this sector is expected to reach 40 per cent in the coming two years with the aim of contributing to the government to redirect public funds to other social development issues (HERQA, 2007:11). However, this expansion requires much care to ensure the desirable outcome like knowledgeable and skilled graduates without compromising quality.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

It is obvious that competition for admission in government institutions is very high in Ethiopian higher education system currently. Those who do not get admission to these institutions seek admission in PrHEIs. To this end, PrHEIs are supposed to be "open-door" ones. They are chosen as the second option, after the seekers feel they are incompetent to be admitted in government HEIs. This on its part demands an investigation for its status of quality.

It is described in the report of World Bank (2004:xi) that three factors suggest that levels of education quality may be declining. First, expenditure per student has contracted over the past decade. Second, the proportion of senior academic staff with doctoral degrees has been weakening within the system. Consequently, the short term generation of sufficient numbers of academic staff, trained at the necessary levels, may be the single most difficult challenge currently faced by the higher education expansion and reform program. Third, rapid enrolment expansion is inevitably bringing progressively less qualified students into the system; currently efforts are being made to double the size of undergraduate, student numbers, and to carry out an even greater expansion of graduate training, run the risk of lowering quality further unless major quality assurance efforts are incorporated into the expansion process.

Quality assurance for its very nature in education is multidimensional as well as controversial. It can be analyzed in terms of the quality of inputs, process and out-put of the education system. However, the current trends of quality assurance and accreditation system in Ethiopian PrHEIs reveal that emphasis is being made only on the input aspect. The prevailing situation indicates that PrHEIs are subject to pre-accreditation permit when the institution exhibits some expected input resources roughly. Here, it is an uncovered issue that no thorough investigation takes place regularly to check whether or not the exhibited resources prior to the pre-accreditation offer would be in place. Even worse accreditation/reaccredidation is offered in no more different manner than it was during the pre-accreditation. Here, what is going on in "process" as well as "output" levels seems to be overlooked.

Therefore, this research made attempts to assess the major implementation problems of quality assurance and accreditation system in private higher education institutions by answering the following **basic questions**.

1. To what extent do private higher education institutions work towards meeting the basic higher education quality standards at programs level?
2. To what degree do private higher education institutions work towards meeting the basic higher education quality standards at an institution level?
3. What do the regulatory roles of HERQA look like with private higher education institutions concerning quality assurance and accreditation?
4. What support does the government provide to Private Higher Education Institutions?
5. What are the major problems of private higher education institutions in terms of quality assurance and accreditation system?
6. What measures should be taken in order to overcome these problems?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The **general objective** of this study was to assess the implementation of quality assurance and accreditation in PrHEIs and to identify the outcomes as well as the problems encountered in translating it into practice.

The following were the **specific objectives** of the research under study:

- To identify major implementation problems of private higher education institutions in meeting the fundamental higher education quality standards at program as well as institution levels.
- To assess the extent of the regulatory body's (HERQA) roles in implementing quality assurance and accreditation system in private higher education institutions.
- To suggest strategies for addressing the gaps in the quality assurance and accreditation system.

1.4 Significance of the Study

It is evident that improving higher education system under very limited resource is one of the major problems of educational planners and decision makers. Unless there is relatively adequate resource availability, the widespread expansion in higher education becomes a serious problem in terms of quality education. This study was, therefore, believed to have the following significance.

- Assists planners, policy makers and practitioners in higher education institutions to make SOWT (Strength-Opportunity-Weakness-Threat) analysis in areas of quality assurance and accreditation.
- Initiates other researchers to study the problem deeply in order to give opportunities for students to secure better quality of education.
- Sheds light on the implementation problems faced by private higher education institutions and that of HERQA.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

It is quite evident that quality of education is a very sensitive issue in any aspect of life. Attempts towards quality assurance in education are multidimensional as well as controversial. They can be analyzed from the quality of the input, process, or out put of the education system. There should be some sort of mechanism that maintains and enhances these in harmony. However, this researcher believed that assessing the implementation of all these aspects of quality higher education could not be manageable. Therefore, this study focuses on the aspects of quality of "program" as well as "institution" at an input level. This is mainly because the current quality assurance and accreditation trends seem that emphasis is being made merely on the input level.

Moreover, the study was delimited to accredited PrHEIs. The reason for the researcher's focus on the private higher education institutions was that they were recent phenomena and accreditation system was obviously the concern of the sector during the research period. It was further delimited to nine out of the forty-three private higher education institutions offering degree programs (as cited in HERQA, 2007:11). This was mainly because of two reasons. First, treating all could not be manageable for the researcher at this stage. Secondly, all the forty-three were not found to have similar level of institutional setup due to their varied experience duration in the system; and considering all together might lead to wrong generalizations. As a result, the main reason for taking the nine institutions mentioned in Table 1 was that they were considered to have relatively long service in the higher education system compared to the currently operating PrHEIs. They also have diversified programs unlike the remaining institutions functioning in the sector. Apart from this, since the vast majority of the institutions were operating in the same area (as indicated by Ayenew, 2005: 6), the study location was based in Addis Ababa.

Thus, the major implementing problems in the process of quality assurance and accreditation in private higher education were emphasized in the research. What is more, HERQA's mechanisms to carry out its mission and strategies to maintain and enhance quality assurance and accreditation system were treated accordingly.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

Some of the PrHEIs were found to be reluctant to provide information to the researcher making excuses simply giving extended appointments but no avail. Besides, many respondents were not willing to fill out the questionnaires. Some even did not return within the expected time. The main reason for this was found to be that some respondents were overloaded with the teaching task in more than one institution. There were still cases where the researcher was questioned for informant-pay for which he was not capable enough. This was in fact unusual phenomenon in which any sort of information for research purpose of this kind could have been based on monetory gains. Nevertheless, the researcher tried his best to overcome these challenges and managed to carry out the study.

1.7 Definition of Terms

'Accreditation' refers to the establishment of the status, legitimacy or appropriateness of an institution, program or module of study (Harvey, 2006:6)

'Higher Education': means education offered to students who attend programs after they have completed secondary education (FDRE, 2003: 2236)

'Private Higher Education Institution' refers to higher education institution in Ethiopia providing higher education service and established

by one or more individual owners or by non-profit making associations or founded as cooperative society or commercial association (FDRE, 2003: 2236)

'Quality Assurance' refers to the determination of standards; appreciate methods and quality requirements by an expert body with three primary modes assessment, audit and accreditation. Quality assurance in higher education focuses on external examination, course validation, professional commitment, and peer review and examination results (Knight and Peter, 1996:2)

'Standard' refers to academic standards of compliance and service criterion by which private higher education institutions are judged/ evaluated for programs and for using pre-accreditation and accreditation. Standards measure ability to meet specified levels of academic attainment in relation to teaching and learning, this refers to the ability of students to fulfill the requirement of the program of study (Knight and Peter, 1996:14)

'Subject benchmarking' is a method of self-evaluation aimed at improving the quality of student learning in higher education institutions by providing a set of reference points (benchmarks) related to the key features of a program that can be used to compare against with what the institutions are doing and the actual student performance (HERQA, 2006: 4).

1.8 Organization of the Study

This research paper consists of five chapters. The first chapter contains the problem and its approach, and the second one treats review of related literature. The third chapter deals with research methodology and procedures followed by the fourth chapter which discusses analysis and interpretation of the collected data. The last chapter presents summary, conclusions and recommendations of the research report.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This part discusses relevant evidences from literature related to quality assurance and accreditation in HE system. The overall discussion is organized in some logical manner treating an overview of Higher Education (HE) and the conceptual framework of quality assurance in HE system in brief. Following that the practice of quality assurance and accreditation system is presented.

2.1 An Overview of Higher Education

In this section the general background of HE is treated including an overview on concepts, status at a global scale, trends in Private Higher Education (PrHE) internationally, and HE trends in Ethiopia.

2.1.1 The Concept of Higher Education

According to IUCEA (2007:16) the term "higher education" refers to the advanced level of education beyond a full course of secondary education. However, the concept of HE varies from country to country due to duration of the programs and quality of HE itself. In support of this, Mekasha (2005:111) states that HE is by definition a time for specialized study to qualify the individual for professional activity or for employment in higher positions in business, industry and government.

2.1.2 The Status of Higher Education System at a Global Scale

At a global scale, vast increase in HE population necessitated the practice of pluralism in educational decision making and broadening of the policy-making

On the other hand, expansion of HE has emerged as pursuant to the need for innovations in the sector. Affirming this, Annaki (2002:116) states that the sharp population growth, the increased demand for HE, the rapid emergence of ICT society are all contributory factors to the innovations in this sector in most countries of the world. In addition, the general driving forces that necessitate the introduction of change in HE at a global scale are mainly two: the economic imperative and accountability which has increased in the effective use of the resources within education itself (Mekasha, 2005:166)

According to Saint (1992:16), the HE enrolment in Africa increased considerably during the 1970s and 1980s mainly at the undergraduate level. The increase in demand for HE in Africa occurred for a number of reasons. First, more primary children had completed their primary and secondary schooling and were seeking further education (TFHES, 2000:16). Secondly, to some extent there was an increase in income which meant that more families were able to send their children to university (Asse-Lumumba and others, 2002: 33). Thirdly, as Saint (1992:4) forwards, "Reduced access to land enhanced the value of education as a viable alternative to land ownership in household strategies."

Furthermore, several trends are currently shaping the development of HE in East African Region. Among the most potent of these forces are privatization, expansion, standardization, and technological development. Besides, market principles that have been embraced in many parts of the world are equally at play in shaping the developments of HE in the region (IUCEA, 2007: 17)

The major purposes of HE include the following three points. These are; freedom to question taken for granted assumptions and through this process the protection of democracy, creation and transfer of knowledge and development of new practices, and the creation of today's and tomorrow's notion of professionalism (Aschroft, 2003:7).

One of the studies conducted a decade ago summarized the status of African HEIs as follows.

> First, they are relatively new and weakly established institutions. Second, enrolment ratios are extremely low (2.4 per cent) in comparison with the rest of the world. Third, early curriculum links to religious studies and administrative need prompted development of the humanities and the social sciences, applied technology, business related skills and research capacities. Finally, African Higher Education Institutions are still closely to European or North American institutions, which influence curricula and the organization of resources. They are not yet fully adapted African circumstances (World Bank, 1997: 2)

HEIs are essential in modern knowledge- based economies and societies, since they train the personnel that operate the key institutions of society, generate knowledge and translate it into new applications and products and preserve cultural heritage (Desalegn, 2006:112). Accordingly, HE plays an important role in poverty alleviation. Reports of the World Bank (2004:9) indicate four ways for this. First, it contributes directly to economic growth generated by its influence on nation's productivity and international competitiveness. Second, it contributes through distribution and empowerment. Third, it strengthens the entire education sector. Fourth, it contributes to the MDG.

2.1.3 The Status of Private Higher Education

Private Higher Education Institutions (PrHEIs) are important elements of HE system to be flourishing in developing countries today. They can respond effectively and flexibly to changing demands of students and the changing labor market conditions. Furthermore, private provision of HE increases educational opportunities at a little or no direct public cost especially in countries where public institutions are very selective. Governments should encourage the development of PrHEIs to complement public institutions as a means of managing the cost of expanding HE enrolments, increasing the diversity of training programs and broadening social participation in HE. In

strengthening this point, the World Bank (1994:34-36) reports that in a number of countries, the majority of students are enrolled in PrHEIs; for example 86 per cent in Philippines, 75 per cent in Korea, 70 per cent in Japan, 65 per cent in Belgium, 60 per cent in Indonesia, Colombia, Brazil and Bangladesh. In these countries access to HE has been substantially broadened without imposing unsustainable financial burden on the government budget.

According to another report of the World Bank (2004:12), in at least fifteen countries of the world (*i.e., Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Philippines, and Venezuela*) PrHEIs constitute 50 per cent or more enrollments and in fourteen countries (*i.e., Argentina, Armenia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Jordan, Malaysia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Russia, Thailand, USA*) it accounts for 25 per cent to 50 per cent of the total enrollments.

Nowadays, there is an escalating demand to PrHE in Africa. According to IUCEA (2007:16), in East African Region it has witnessed for a significant growth and expansion in the last two decades marked by an exponential increase in students' enrolment and the proliferation of PrHEIs. For instance, now Kenya has six public and over seventeen private universities with an enrolment of about fifty-thousand students but it had only one public university in 1963. In Uganda there was only one university in 1970 but there were twenty seven (four public and twenty three private) universities with over one-hundred-twenty-thousand students' enrolment in 2005. In Tanzania, there was one university in 1970 and now there are nine public and over eighteen private university institutions with enrolment of over eighteen thousand in 1997 and over twenty-thousand in 2000. This clearly indicates that PrHEIs are mushrooming in every nation today.

In line with this, Thraver (2004:71) indicates four approaches of reasons for the growth of PrHEIs in many African countries. First, there is excess in the social demand for HE in which the public ones could not meet. Second, the discourse of access to HE within a context of a decrease in state sponsored HE systems. Third, the needs of specific groups in the society. And finally, the influence of market ideology on HE.

A case study conducted in six African countries (Nigeria, Ghana, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda) on the recent state of PrHEIs (as cited in Thraver, 2004: 83) reveals that eventhough the private sector has arisen out of the need for more and different education, the size of the sector was still small. The institutional types are varied having a strong tendency towards a religious affiliation. However, this is being challenged by a secular-business focus. Furthermore, the pool for staffing is rather small with much reliance on academics from the public sector. The main funding sources are fees and transnational sponsorship. The managerial structures of the PrHEIs are also varied, in some countries such as Kenya, showing a systematic tendency, in contrast to that of a more personalized tendency as in the case with Ghana. To this end, regulation ranges from being fairly tight and rigid, to more relaxed.

In spite of these progresses, still other study reports (World Bank, 2004:11) revealed that PrHEIs face various obstacles in their efforts to grow and expand their services. One is lack of clarity regarding the import tax exemption they are reportedly entitled for the importation of instructional materials, chiefly books. Some have been required by customs officials to purchase business import license.

2.1.4 The Status of Higher Education System in Ethiopia

The Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia (MoE 1994:3) tries to redress the overall economic, social and political development of the country to get in

touch with the long overdue needs of the society. The policy includes overall and specific objectives and implementation strategies from Kindergarten to higher education. Accordingly, it focuses on quality, equity, access and relevance. It also emphasizes on the development of problem solving capacity and culture in the context of education curriculum, structure and approach.

According to SMUC (2006: xi), the present status of the Ethiopian HE system is characterized by a number of issues. This includes the increasing enrolment of students at all levels of education, the increased and diversified types of studies and providers, the increasing number of graduates every year, the increasing demand for relevance and quality of curricula and programs, and the need for effective quality and relevance assurance mechanisms. In line with this, MoE has recently been trying to increase the intake capacity of HEIs both at graduate and post-graduate levels. Private universities and colleges have also begun flourishing in the capital and in the regional cities as well. The Education and Training Policy is also aiming at providing skilled and productive labor force that contribute to the national economic development (MoI, 2005:5)

As far as the HE legislation is concerned, the council of people's representatives of the FDRE enacted a landmark HE legislation in 2003 striving for quality manpower. According to the HE proclamation (FDRE, 2003:2237), HE should produce skilled manpower in quantity and quality that will serve the country in different professions. Moreover, it aims at expanding HE services that are free from any discrimination on grounds of race, religion, sex and politics and lay down problem solving educational and institutional system that enables to utilize potential resources of the country and conduct study and research. Furthermore, it is indicated in the ESDP III (MoE, 2005: 40) that fields of study will be opened related to demand driven and anticipated demand.

According to Mekasha (2005:113) the HE proclamation provides provisions of Law as to establish HEIs at various levels: institute, college, University College,

and university. The proclamation grants autonomy for these HEIs in matters such as administrative, financial and academic. The bill clearly stipulates the criteria of establishment of these institutions, their education programs and the nature of curriculum and their powers and duties. According to this bill, the government, the private individual investors, cooperatives, commercial enterprises and non-profit organizations may offer HE. It is stated in the proclamation that HEIs run by religious organizations whose objectives and curriculum are religious shall not be obliged by the decrees.

Regarding commitment to HE expansion in Ethiopia, the World Bank report (World Bank 2004: 6) indicates that the government of Ethiopia recognizes that human capacity development at levels is one of their most important development objectives. The ministry of capacity building has allotted USD 100 million for two years currently to strengthening the skills of civil servants, semi-skilled workers, and private sector entities through skill development partnerships. Expansion and improvement of university level training is seen as a critical component of the overall capacity transformation in the country.

2.2 Conceptual Framework of Quality Assurance in Higher Education

This part discusses the conceptual framework of quality and quality assurance in HE system. First, the concept of quality in general and quality education in particular is presented. Then, the issues of quality assurance system in an international scale and that of Ethiopian are treated.

2.2.1 The Concept of Quality

According to many authors in the field (IUCEA, 2007:30; Smouth, 2002:11), it is evident that there is no general consensus on the concept of quality. However, several authors define quality differently. Ellis (1993:4) on his part defines as "... the standard that must be met to achieve specified purposes to the

satisfaction of customers." Mosha (in Ayalew, 2002:67) also defines quality as "...it is the level of excellence in performance which can be measured by establishing an acceptable criteria and standards of good performance."

However, an objective definition of quality does not exist, because quality is in the eyes of the beholder, just like beauty. That is, who ever asks whether something has quality has certain concept in mind and certain expectation. For Smouth (2002:11) a statement about quality implies a relative measure in that quality may be high or low or unacceptable and the term has come to embrace a series of quite distinct concepts. These concepts have evolved to suit the different contexts in which statements of quality are made differently: quality as excellence, quality as perfection, quality as value for money, ISO approach to quality (i.e *quality is the production of goods and services that meet the demand and standards*), quality as customer satisfaction, quality as fitness for purpose, and quality as transformation.

Apart from this, the concept of quality as described by Ayalew (2002:66) can be encompassed in the following four areas: quality equals high standards, quality equals zero defects, quality is fitness for purpose, and quality is relative worth. Thus, it is sound to say that quality is a complex concept. Taking into account that each player has his/her own ideas about quality, all can agree to find a definition of quality that fits most of the ideas and expectations of the stakeholders. So, quality is a matter of negotiating between the stakeholders.

2.2.2 The Concept of Quality in Higher Education System

As shown above quality, in general, is a difficult concept. Quality in HE seems, therefore, much more confusing because it is not always clear what 'product' and who the 'client' is. In the discussion on quality in HE, Green (in IUCEA, 2007:30) makes a distinction between: quality as excellence, quality as fitness

for purpose, quality as a threshold, quality as an added value, quality as value for money, and quality as satisfaction of the client.

According to the evidences in literatures (UNESCO, 2006:16), there are reasons for the difficulties that the notion of quality encounters with regard to HE. First, there is no consensus on the exact objectives of HE. Second, it is to grasp the interaction of inputs and through puts, and what exactly determines the out puts. Third, provision of courses in HEIs are more diverse being characterized by approaches considering quality as exceptional, or controlling to standards, as fitness for purpose, as effectiveness in achieving institutional goals and meeting customers' implied needs.

In quality HE, it is not only resource that brings about quality, but it is the interaction of resources and performance. In support of this, Guskin (as cited in Assefa, 2002:44) describes "Although the preparation of faculty members and character of institutional facilities are important resources for students' learning, it is far clear that there is a straight-line relationship between them and the fact of student learning"

Quality procedures are increasingly found to be in the service sector. The total quality control concerns extend to the quality of the service delivered to customers as measured by such indicators as the facial expressions of staff and the context of verbal interaction with customers. The analogy between the service sector and HE is, however, inexact because, as manufacturing industry routine tasks are being broken down into identifiable, controllable and simple components. Applied to HE, this could account for an efficient teamwork for course management and delivery. For example, time tabling-but it could be used to analyze the content of what is taught and learned (Harries, 1990:34)

Emphasizing on some pertinent conditions for quality in HE, Ayalew (2002: 67) states that HEIs are not separate islands but their performances are subject to

being influenced by their environment in relation to the following points. First, *political conditions* which influence positively or negatively the performances of HEIs. Second, *economic conditions* in connection with resources execution of HE. Third, *population expansion* with evidence that as population increases demand for education increases. Fourth, *cultural conditions* where perception of community to educated personnel may have indirect influence on quality of education. Fifth, *globalization* in that HEIs are expected to create links with international institutions.

It is evident that as the number of public and PrHEIs and programs are increasing, students and their families expect to have reliable and meaningful information about the quality of educational services delivered. Employers and others who rely on educational services and credentials also need to have basic information that HEIs have complied with and met certain measurable standards of quality like accreditation status, standards of good performance and so on. Therefore, HE is expected to develop and use quality indicators that show the role it plays in society and students' lives. In line with this, Romer (in Assefa, 2002:45) states "...the public will not tolerate institutions that cannot demonstrate quality in their work".

In industries, there are models whose criteria and assessment processes help organizations identify, understand and manage the factors that determine their success. It helps to find the strengths and weakness of an organization. For HE it would be helpful if the quality aspects, criteria and standards were visualized in a coherent model. Industrial models cannot directly be applied to HE. As it is rightly expressed in IUCEA (2007:39), in contrast to industries, HE has a multiple client system and a multiple product system. This helps to discover strengths and weaknesses and shows of a holistic view of quality. In relation to this, it is further stated here that the quality model for HE can be used internally by the institution to analyze its quality and externally by an accreditation body for checking the quality.

Apart from this, there are internal factors that affect the quality of HE. These factors are categorized by Ayalew (2002: 69-75) into seven. First, *program and curriculum quality* which can be viewed in terms of relevance and content validity. Second, *teachers' competency* with favorable conditions including adequate salary, residence, less load, material support for research, opportunity for career development, democratic leadership, full academic right and the like. Third, *learning capacity and attitudes of students.* Fourth, *infrastructure quality* involving classrooms, hall, study rooms, dormitories, offices, toilets, water and light systems. Fifth, *teaching-learning materials* that include books, scientific journals, equipped libraries, and laboratories. Sixth, l*eadership* with emphasis on plan and program, visionary, committed approach. Seventh, *teaching- learning process* being viewed in terms of teachers' preparation, teaching methodology and assessment mechanisms.

Among other contributing factors to poor quality education in HE as described by the World Bank (2002:59) is the lack of full time qualified teachers. For example, in Latin America the share of professors with Ph.D teaching in public universities is less than 6 per cent, and share with Master's degree is less than 26 per cent. More than 60 per cent of the teachers in the public sector work part time. In PrHEIs, the proportion is as high as 86 per cent. In Philippines only 7 per cent of professors teaching in HEIs hold PhDs and 26 per cent have Master's degrees. Consequently, expansion and diversification of HE systems has often led to internal brain-drain because low paid professors at public HEIs seek second and third jobs in extramural positions such as teaching at better paying PrHEIs.

In relation to problems of academic freedom in HEIs, Zeleza (2004:48) states that African intellectuals have been fighting against intolerance on two fronts: institutionally against the authoritarian State and intellectually against dominating Western paradigms. One of the consequences of this was disastrous brain-drain from the universities to other sectors at home or

institutions abroad. Accordingly, the problems of academic freedom remained under the old style of political repression until recently in Egypt, Ethiopia and Zimbabwe. What is worse in the last 10 years or 50 was that HEIs have been destroyed by wars in almost all African regions. For instance, in Rwanda, Burundi and the Congo in central Africa, Somalia in East Africa, and Liberia and Sierra Leone in West Africa (Zeleza, 2004:49-50)

HE sector has been recording increase in the range of academic and practical programs offered. The public universities in particular have had more diversified programs in science and technology than that of the private ones. The challenges to deliver quality education by HEIs have continued to prevail in spite of the shortage of experienced staff, inadequacy of funds, and poor physical infrastructure (IUCEA, 2007:19)

Even worse, in developing countries, many HEIs operate with overcrowded and deteriorating physical facilities, limited and obsolete library resources, insufficient equipment and instructional materials, outdated curricula, unqualified teaching staff, poorly prepared secondary school completers and absence of academic rigor and systematic evaluation of performance (World Bank, 2002:58)

2.2.3 Need for Quality Assurance in Higher Education System

According to Ellis (1993:5-6), the essence of quality assurance in HE system refers to the entire process where by standards are maintained. It, thus, subsumes quality control and quality management. The former is the process where by the product or service or any part of the process associated with its production or delivery, is checked against a predetermined standard and rejected or recycled if below standard. This is a more complicated notion of quality control than mere rejection of the substandard and begins to shade into the use of feedback as part of quality management. This refers to the total process whereby a particular organization is managed to achieve, and hence be

able to assure quality. If this management of quality is to be effective, all aspects of the organization must be covered and all staff involved, which is termed as TQM. Thus, there can be quality audit which deals with checking that someone is doing what he says he is doing. It would require a further step to say the organization was aiming to do the wrong thing in the first place. Such an evaluation moves into the area of quality assessment, which is judging the standards reached by the organization against external criteria. Thus, an external examiner in the present system audits a course's own procedures to check whether the examining system is operating as planned, but also assesses quality in the sense that the standards reacted by the students on the course are compared with those obtaining generally in the HE system.

Apart from this, Mihailescu (2004:43) puts accreditation and quality assurance in Central Europe; standards at the basis of quality evaluation and accreditation cover the educational process itself and the efficiency of higher education. It is quite evident that if the higher education institution has a proper infrastructure, well equipped library and laboratories, computer networks and a reasonable number of qualified teachers, then it can meet quality standards for being accredited. By the same token, the quality assurance processes in the developed world for teaching and researches have been designed to perform various bureaucratic, political and developmental functions. According to Ashcroft's (2005:45) explanation, these quality assurance and accreditation processes include process to ensure minimum standards, to measure volume, to rank excellence and to secure improvement.

Most countries do agree that the quality of education has been deteriorating and internal inefficiencies exist. Educational stereotyping is not conceived as a quality problem and hence strategies to revise curriculum and other educational materials are have not been the attention which they deserve (Meena, 2002:178). Here, related to the issue of quality is the aspect of relevance. This author further states that tertiary education in Africa does not seem to be

offering knowledge and skills directed to the solution of the African problems and particularly problems of poverty and technological backwardness.

When countries expand HE haphazardly to meet the increasing social demand, there is a high risk of graduate unemployment. In line with this, the World Bank report (2002:60) indicates that graduate unemployment in Nigeria was 22 per cent recently and that was 35 per cent in Sri lanka a couple of years ago. Again in many countries, the match between graduates profile and labor market demand is most apparent among graduates in the social sciences and humanities. It is also mentioned here that the Republic of Yemen has over supply of liberal arts graduates, and their skills do not meet the needs of the economy. Hence, HEIs often lack adequate labor market information to guide prospective students, parents and employers. Problems of quality and relevance are not confined to traditional HEIs. Even in countries that have diversified the structure of HE, relevance can become a serious issue in the absence of close linkage between HEIs and the labor market. As an example, it is mentioned that Jordan has actively encouraged the development of public and private HEIs. However, the status of quality and relevance of these institutions have become so problematic that the country experienced a decline in enrolment from forty-one thousand in 1991 to twenty-three thousand in 1996.

According to IUCEA (2007:25), on the other hand, the quantitative expansion of HE in East Africa in the past two decades has raised serious concern over the issue of ensuring quality of HE in the region. Policy makers have been bothered with how the ever mushrooming public and private HEIs could be made to maintain standards amidst intense completion and acute shortage of financial and human resources needed for offering HE. These concerns have led to creation of regional statutory bodies that have been established in three East African countries (Uganda, Tanzania and Kenya)

2.2.4 Need for Quality Assurance in Ethiopian Higher Education

With regard to the need for quality assurance system, there are three points of information combined to raise the possibility that educational quality is presently at risk. First, it is always difficult to maintain quality standards in the midst of rapid enrolment expansion. Second, the current levels of spending per student on academic experience are quite low. Third, the proportion of academic staff with higher academic titles is declining (World Bank, 2004:57). This indicates that there is great need to maintain and enhance quality of higher education.

A brief survey of the literature in the area (as cited in Mekasha, 2005:121) indicates that the focus of educational debate has changed across times. In the 1980's quality education was high on the agenda of educational debates. But for some time in the mid- 90's, educational quality has not been as such a priority in educational discussions. But the turn of the 21st century seems to have given a far more serious emphasis for educational quality than any other times in educational history of Ethiopia. There are three major factors as agents in securing Ethiopian HE quality and relevance in the 21st century. These are curriculum, quality of teaching and pedagogical effectiveness and method of work in an interrelated manner.

In support of this, it is indicated in the Higher Education Relevance and Quality Assurance (HERQA) Publication Series (HERQA, 2007:5) that the teaching-learning and research work need to meet the required quality standards. Nevertheless, quality assurance/enhancement mechanism in Ethiopian higher education system has been either extremely weak or non-existent. To address such challenges the higher education proclamation of 2003 provided for the establishment of an autonomous legal body that caters for assurance and enhancement of quality and relevance in the higher education system in Ethiopia. To this end, HERQA started its operations in 2003 with the major

objective of assuring and enhancing quality and relevance of programs and instructions of higher education in Ethiopia.

As far as quality issue in HE reform in the Ethiopian context is concerned, in the Ethiopia's Education sector Development program II (MoE, 2002:33) the overall strategy is to provide good quality HE in larger numbers with minimal dependence on public resources in the longer term. Thus, in its main aim, the reform program links the issues of quality, the context of expansion and greater market awareness (Ascroft, 2003:3)

In the absence of standardized testing of HE students, it is extremely difficult to determine the current level of educational quality within the Ethiopia's HE system. According to reports of World Bank (2004:57), however, there are three points of information combined to raise the possibility that educational quality may presently be at risk. First, it is always difficult for any nation to maintain quality standards in the midst of rapid enrolment expansion; the Ethiopian's HE system is currently in the midst of rapid expansion. Second, the current level of spending per student on academic expenses is quite low from both regional and international perspective, varying from USD 550 to USD1158 within the system. Third, the proportion of academic staff with PhD degrees has been declining and will probably decline further as rapid enrolment expansion proceeds.

As far as government's commitment to quality care is concerned, it is indicated in ESDP III (MoE, 2005:39) that PrHEIs are subject to secure benefits from government in the implementation period of the plan in the areas of: (1) facilitation of access to incentives, (2) provision of short term training provided to public HEIs, (3) provision of technical support, (4) joint experience sharing modalities, and (5) fostering public-private partnership.

2.3 Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Education

This part treats the quality assurance and accreditation issues in HE system at a global scale generally and that of Ethiopian particularly.

2 .3.1 Approaches of Quality Assurance System

As far as approaches to quality assurance are concerned, Ellis (1993:3) argues that "...quality is some what ambiguous term since it has connotations of both standards and excellence." Thus, to talk the quality of HE might refer to high or low standards whereas reference to quality of HE implies excellence. The association of quality assurance with excellence may be misleading. Standards of some kind are essentials for quality assurance. In its simplest form, quality in HE would be that which satisfies the primary customer, the students. This notion is expressed more formally by the British Standards Institute. "Quality is the totality of features and characteristics of a product or service that bear on its ability to satisfy stated or implied needs."

As it is expressed in the documents of UNESCO (2006:5), HE systems and policies in different countries are diverse in this complex and diverse world with linguistic, political, economic and cultural diversities. Consequently, quality assurance practices are diverse in many different combinations in order to serve different purposes.

Countries differ in their approaches to quality assurance system. Some have steps to strengthen quality by introducing new reporting requirements or other mechanisms of management control. In support of this, World Bank report (2000:61) forwards some evidences. That is, some transition and developing countries have developed accreditation systems while others have established evaluation committees or agencies that carry out external services. In many cases, independent bodies have been established while the most common set up is a single national agency; for example, in Colombia and Mexico separate agencies are responsible for different institutions, regions, purposes and types

of academic programs. Such variations in the approaches to quality assurance bodies reflect political and cultural preferences within each country, differences in government leadership, and the varying stages of development of HE sector. Quality assurance system in HE has an internal and external elements. This is clearly identified in IUCEA (2007:46). On the one hand, the internal quality assurance (IQA) refers to quality that is primarily the responsibility of HE institution itself. Although the government has a special responsibility regarding quality assurance in many countries, it is the HEI that is responsible for providing and assuring quality. It is up to the institution to decide on a best model that fits its best. At least the IQA system is required to cover the Deming cycle: PDCA (Plan, Do, Check and Act). On the other hand, external quality assurance (EQA) and accreditation should be considered, where accreditation is important accountability instrument with which quality based on evaluation of past performance indicating that certain minimum requirements are met.

2.3.1.1 Internal Quality Assurance System

This refers to an internal quality assurance system aiming at setting up, maintaining and improving the quality and standards of teaching scholarship (student learning experience), research and service to community. The over all objective is to continuously promote and improve the quality of the programs, their model of delivery and their support facilities etc. (IUCEA, 2007:46). This is conducted at institutional and at program levels.

Quality assurance systems relate to institutions and programs. They address different functions. The available document of UNESCO (2006:14) presents these functions differently. First, opening initial assessment (i.e licensing). Second, supervision. Third, accreditation. Fourth, professional certification. Fifth, public information.

2.3.1.1.1 Internal Quality Assurance at an Institutional Level

An institutional quality assurance is defined by Campbell (2007:47) as "an in depth analysis and assessment of the quality and relevance of programs and of teaching and learning environment"

In this regard, World Bank report (2004:65) report expresses quality assurance at the institutional level as "effective institutional academic reviews are more desirable if they are organized and carried out by the institutions themselves on a regular basis rather than run from out side the institution." Academic reviews should be based on careful self-studies of each unit, program or faculty with a written assessment and report. A peer review of these findings and mechanisms to ensure quality improvement at each college and university and help the institutions prepare for periodic national accreditation reviews.

The quality of HE is basically made at the level of its core activities teaching/ learning, research and/or the contribution to society and the community. The self assessment is followed by a strengths-weakness analysis, mission statements, policy plan, management, human resources, funding, educational activities research, contribution to society, achievements, stakeholder satisfaction, quality assurance and (inter)national benchmarking (IUCEA, 2007:90)

2.3.1.1.2 Internal Quality Assurance at a Program Level

An important tool in the field of quality assurance is a critical self-assessment, also called self evaluation which can be done at the level of the IQA system, the institution as a whole, teaching and learning, research and community outreach. The demand for self assessment is that quality has to be examined in a structural manner, within a well defined framework (IUCEA, 2007:53).

According to IUCEA (2007: 59) self-assessment can be conducted by analyzing various program issues. These include; expected learning out comes, the

program specifications, program content (curriculum), the organization of the program, didactic concept and teaching/ learning strategy, student assessment, staff quality, student quality, quality of support staff, facilities and infrastructure, quality assurance of the teaching learning, student evaluation, curriculum design, staff development activities, feedback to stakeholders, the output and stakeholder satisfaction.

2.3.2 Accreditation in Higher Education

It is difficult to define accreditation because there are so many concepts and ideas in it. A generally accepted definition looking around in Europe is "a formal decision, based on evaluation of past performance, indicating that certain standards, certain minimum requirements are met (IUCEA, 2007:118). Apart from this Harvey (2006:6) defines accreditation as "the establishment of the status, legitimacy or appropriateness of an institution, program or module of study." Although different definitions are used, there are some common characteristics. First, accreditation is a formal decision. Second, accreditation is based on the assessment of HEI or its core activities. Third, accreditation is based on the assessment of at least some minimum requirements. Fourth, accreditation leads to a Yes or No conditional decision. Fifth, accreditation might have consequences concerning recognition, funding, student and etc.

On the whole, accreditation in HE is a process that gives public recognition to institutions that meet certain minimum standards. It requires for an institution to fulfill criteria such as provision of sound organizational setup, faculty qualifications, physical facilities, library, information resources to sustain educational objectives, approved admission policies, etc. Accreditation, therefore, gives public confidence for an institution and also protects the public by insuring the fulfillment of certain standards (Yibrah, 2007: 74).

2.3.2.1 Standards and Criteria for Accreditation

With regard to this, Misganaw (2006:173) makes a list of self- evaluation criteria and European Association for quality assurance in HE. These are, policy and procedures monitoring and periodic review, quality of teaching staff, learning resources and student support, information systems, and employers' role.

According to Mekasha (2005:123), accreditation in education is the recognition given by an association or agency to institutions that satisfy specific standards of educational quality. It provides standards of excellence that help encourage educational institutions to improve their programs. It also assists prospective students in identifying quality institutions, facilities, and the transfer of students from one institution to another, establishes criteria for certification in professions such as Law and Medicine and provides public accountability for an institution's educational quality.

As has been reported in the World Bank (2004:63), the major requirements from HEIs for accreditation includes: mission statement, legal status, governance structure, sufficient number of teaching staff, degree program enrolling students, audited financial statement, and statement of course offerings.

Apart from this, it is clear that a yardstick or benchmark is needed for assessing quality. Obviously an objective benchmark does not exist. This means that one must look for criteria and standards in the framework of accreditation. In other cases, employers formulate standards. In these cases, there are no pre-formulated requirements. It is up to the HEI to decide up on standards. A criterion may be seen as specific aspect, decisive for the quality. Whereas, a standard gives the level of criterion which will be described as it must be adequate. In the case of self-assessment by the HEI, it has to find out what adequate means. This can be done by a HEI carrying out a comparison between itself and others that are in the same situation, for instance, benchmarking. In

the case of accreditation or external quality assessment, it is left to the group of expertise to decide if something is adequate or not. The quest for quality is not an easy one, especially since there is no absolute or objective quality. Nevertheless, HE is expected to assure and demonstrate its quality and to have its quality assessed by outsiders (IUCEA, 2007:38).

2.3.2.2 Accreditation Practices at a Global Scale

As far as need for accreditation is concerned, UNESCO (2006:39) describes that within the context of globalization, international trade agreements and increased mobility of professionals and students, national higher education systems diversified to include private higher education. There is, thus, an increasing need for standardization to enhance the readability of credentials. This has led to a growing number of EQA systems evolving towards or starting to embrace an accreditation function. That is why accreditation has become, to date, the most popular form of EQA.

According to the report of Word Bank (2002:61), the scope of responsibilities given to quality assurance system has varied widely. Scotland and England, for instance, have procedures for monitoring teaching effectiveness, while china is focusing on high quality management processes. Some countries, such as Chile, have established systems for licensing new institutions and certifying educational credentials. Others have directed their efforts toward rewarding research productivity to either individual scholars (as in Mexico) or to the entire academic departments (as in the UK). There is also wide variation in the extent to which quality assurance agencies have managed to address issues related to student transfer and to study abroad. Countries and agencies also differ in their concerns arising from the expansion of new modes of educational delivery including video-based education, interactive transmission to remote sites and most recently internet based learning.

Accreditation agencies in the USA review the quality of education at all levels (Garten, 1994, as cited in Mekasha, 2005:123). These agencies establish basic standards designed to reflect the qualities of a sound educational program. The agencies then develop procedures to determine whether educational programs and institutions meet these standards. Again, most control over education rests with the various state governments. Each state has different laws and objectives for education, but the states generally permit schools and colleges to operate with considerable independence and autonomy. To maintain consistent standards of education, the US Department of Education officially recognizes private accrediting agencies that it considers reliable in developing those standards and determining educational quality.

Most countries like India rely primarily on governmental agencies to monitor the quality of education provided by their schools and colleges. As mentioned by Mekasha (2005:123), in India where there are over 350 universities, 15 thousand colleges and 101 million HE students. One can easily imagine how important accreditation is. That is why a council called NAAC accountable to the Indian government has been set up in 1994. In Canada, private educational associations increasingly work with provincial governmental authorities to periodically assess the quality in educational institutions.

The Hungarian accreditation system has been indicated in the UNESCO training module for quality assurance in HE, (UNESCO, 2006:25), for its objectives were initially geared to the principle assurance of minimum quality standards in particular at the program level. Where disciplinary committees have established, minimum requirements for the accreditation is compulsory process that aims in the improvement of quality. Institutions are to prepare self- study report, which is followed by a visiting team that evaluation studies conducted at the other specific levels, and critics of the system believe that the quality improvement function should have precedence. The current intention is to help institutions develop and assess their own quality management procedures as part of the accreditation process.

According to IUCEA (2007:118), a commission for HE in Kenya was established in 1985 to regulate growth and access to quality HE for Kenyans. It was mandated initially to work in such broad areas like: accreditation in universities, planning, budgeting and financing for universities, standardization-equation-recognition of degrees and qualifications obtained from abroad, and coordination of education and training offered in post-secondary training institutions for HE admission. This commission (CHE) has also developed guidelines for use in evaluating the proposals to establish PrHEIs. First, the HEIs rules include the standards for physical facilities. Second, guidelines for preparing a proposal draft charters and draft bills. Third, guidelines for developing curriculum. Fourth, standards for libraries. These guidelines have enabled the commission to accrediting the PrHEIs and to enforce high academic standards in these institutions to the extent that they have become pace setters in many areas of HE

Moreover, the HERQA's mandate has been planned by ESDP III (MoE, 2005:40) stating that it will be strengthened to develop standards and support mechanisms to ensure quality and relevance of programs delivered in both public and private institutions; benchmarks would be set to monitor progress and meeting of standards. With regard to ensuring minimum standards, Ashcroft (2005:46) indicates that processes to measure standards are the cornerstone of higher education quality systems through out the world. In most systems such processes are considered to ensure the quality of education and educational services provided by higher education institution.

2.3.2.3 Accreditation Practices in Ethiopia

As has been discussed so far in various countries of the world, accreditation in HE system is also necessary in Ethiopia. According to Mekasha (2005:124) the reasons for this are as follows. First and for most, Ethiopia needs some sort of accreditation for all forms of HE in the country if one genuinely strives for ensuring the quality of HE. Second, the policy of accreditation is expected to be

extremely liberal in the sense that it accommodates all sections of the community including the private sector and the international community. Third, accreditation should start now.

In line with this, Mekasha (2005:114) states that the HE bill (proclamation) has provisions with regard to accreditation and PrHEIs at various levels and various statuses. Fulfilling the criteria set by the concerned body, institutions may apply to MoE for pre-accreditation permits. It is not, however, clearly put in the proclamation as to how to carry out accreditation procedures of the public institutions except that it is stated in the same accreditation procedures may apply to government higher education institutions as well. The proclamation does not provide adequate legal provisions for the private sector to be engaged in the accreditation of educational institutions. In fact, it seems that the PrHEIs are required to do much in the name of the accreditation while the little or none is required of the government institutions to do the same. Again in the name of the accreditation it seems that the government is involving too much with the internal affairs of the private institutions. Only one agency (HERQA) is to carry out the complex and heavy task of accreditation of all the HEIs of the country.

The assurance of quality education of HEIs is to be maintained through a continuous process of the institutions themselves and verified by HERQA institutional quality audits. Accordingly, Guesh (2007:17) forwards procedures of self evaluation as follows. First, establishing a team for the self-evaluation. Second, compiling and communicating a time table for the self evaluation. Third, gathering and analyzing information for self evaluation. Fourth, reporting the self evaluation. Fifth, making use of the self-evaluation.

As pointed out in available documents, there are ten areas of focus for IQA in the Ethiopian HE system. These are:

> (1) vision-mission, and educational goals, (2) governance and management system, (3) infrastructure and learning resources, (4) academic and support staff, (5) student admission and support service, (6) program relevance and curriculum, (7) teaching, learning

and assessment, (8) student progression and graduate outcomes,(9) research and outreach activities, and (10) internal quality assurance (Yohanees, 2007:13; Guesh, 2007: 18).

Based on these points of emphasis, the PrHEIs are expected to carry out self-assessment of their programs currently.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This chapter deals with research design and methodology. It consists of methodology, source of the data, sample population and sampling techniques, data collection instruments, and data analysis tools.

3.1. Methodology

This study focused on the assessment of quality assurance system by private higher education institutions and HERQA. To this end, descriptive survey method was employed. This is because it was believed to be an appropriate one to describe the current implementation of quality assurance and accreditation system in PrHEIs in Ethiopia. Moreover, HERQA's regulatory mechanisms on the other part were found to be assessed better through this method of study.

3.2. Source of Data

Data were collected using primary data collecting instruments from the subjects through research questionnaire and interview. Using secondary data source the researcher employed data from reports of research studies reported in books or journals or from available reports and documents of various government offices, non-government offices and private higher education institutions themselves.

3.3. Sample and Sampling Techniques

As far as the sample selection and sampling technique are concerned, the subjects of the study were the teaching staff and the academic department heads of PrHEIs. This was because they were considered to be the major

implementing agents of quality higher education based on the required standards. It was also a corporate responsibility for these organs to exert their maximum effort towards quality assurance system. For this, techniques of proportionate stratified sampling (for instructors) and purposive sampling (for department heads) were employed.

The reason for choosing stratified sampling was that it is the method involving dividing the population in homogeneous strata and then selecting using simple random sampling technique from each of the stratum as described by scholars in the field (Ahuja, 2002: 169;Parkash, 2005: 123). The reason for selecting purposive sampling was based on the views indicated in literature (in Ahuja ,2005:179) in that the researcher's judgment about some appropriate characteristics were required from similar members thought to be relevant to the research of this kind.

Accordingly, for the instructors' sample, 30 per cent were considered as respondents being taken from each stratum by the same proportion. The major rationale for this was that the practice of PrHE is a recent phenomenon (as indicated in Ayenew, 2006:61) and expecting a reliable data from all the teaching staff regardless of experience would be difficult. This is because institutional setup was highly varied. Staff retaining capacity could also be different from institution to institution. To this end, the researcher considered respondents who had served relatively longer time, and these would be about 30 per cent.

On the other hand, the department heads who were thought to provide adequate information were included based on their service period. In other words, fresh assignees were not involved. This is because they might not have adequate awareness in the issue under consideration.

The management staff from the PrHEIs as well as senior experts in HERQA were the other subjects of the study selected through purposive sampling. The reason for selection of HERQA's experts was that it is the agency's responsibility to play a primary role in the overall care for quality higher education based on the required standards and benchmarks set ahead.

Among the forty-three degree offering PrHEIs (as cited in HERQA, 2007:11), nine were selected through purposive sampling technique. The rationale behind this was that all the forty-three were considered not to be of equal level of overall institutional set up in terms of stay duration in the system and programs diversity, establishment of QA unit, and level of conducting IQA. In other words, the researcher believed that meeting standards of quality in a newly established institution might not be the same as those with longer service since the quality assurance system is never subject to an-overnight implementation issue but it is rather a continuous process. Thus, among the relatively well organized institutions in the sector, nine (over 20 per cent) were regarded as samples as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Sampling

No	Sample institution	Fulltime Academic Staff				Justification for sample institution selection
		Instructors*		Dept Heads		
		Total	Sample	Total	Sample	
1	Unity University College	73	22	10	7	• Long experience • Programs diversity • Established QA unit • Conducted IQA
2	St. Mary University College	44	13	8	8	• Long experience • Programs diversity • Established QA unit • Conducted IQA
3	Alpha University College	27	8	8	6	• Long experience • Programs diversity • Established QA unit • IQA in progress
4	Admas University College	26	8	4	4	• Long experience • Programs diversity • Established QA unit • IQA in progress
5	Africa Beza College	16	4	4	3	• Long experience • Programs diversity • Established QA unit
6	City University College	18	5	3	2	• Long experience • Programs diversity • Established QA unit
7	Addis College	18	8	4	3	• Long experience • Technology Programs • Established QA unit
8	Medco-biomedical College	19	6	3	3	• Long experience • Has Medical Programs
9	Micro-link Information Tech College	24	8	5	3	• Long experience • Programs diversity • Established QA unit
		265	**79**	**49**	**39**	

** Teaching only in regular degree programs*

Source: **The Sample PrHEIs**

3.4. Data Gathering Instruments

The main data gathering instrument to be used was **questionnaire**. The reason for this was that it helps to secure information on opinions and attitudes in a structured framework from respondents. Essentially, there were two sets of questionnaires and these were dispatched to the groups of respondents in the sample PrHEIs. Apart from this, being all issues similar, five-itemed questions were included in the department heads' part to see as to how government supports PrHEIs as per its plans indicated in ESDP III (MoE, 2005: 39). The major purpose of expecting this from the department heads was that they were believed to be more familiar with policy directives than the instructors engaged merely in the teaching duties.

Interview was another instrument used for gathering data from higher officials of PrHEIs and that of HERQA. A structured format was developed because it was thought to be convenient for scheduling purpose as the sample institutions were quite many.

Document analysis was also additional instrument to gather data. Furthermore, a checklist was employed to gather data and make **observation** to education facilities in the PrHEIs.

3.5. Data Analysis Tools

As far as the method of data analysis is concerned, after the data were gathered, they were tallied, organized, and analyzed by using different statistical techniques. Percentages and chi-square tests were employed to analyze various characteristics of the sample problem. Finally, summary of the findings, conclusion and recommendations were drawn based on the analysis of the data.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of the data collected from the sample population. To this effect, a total of 118 copies of questionnaire were distributed to 79 instructors and 39 department heads of sample PrHEIs. Out of these, 70 (88.6 per cent) and 34 (87.2 per cent) respectively were filled out and returned. The rate of return of questionnaires was 88.1per cent which can be taken as high for a survey study of this kind. Interview was also conducted with higher bodies of the institutions and the officials of HERQA. Besides, data were gathered through observation checklist to consolidate the study.

The data collected through interview and observation checklist were also qualitatively described in words in order to give answer for the basic research questions set in this study. All the major data collected were then tabulated and arranged in tables. Based on the responses obtained, analysis and interpretation of the data are presented following each table.

So as to evaluate the overall implementation practice of quality assurance and accreditation system in PrHEIs, respondents were requested to rate using a five point Likert type scale: Highly inadequate (**1**), Inadequate (**2**), Average (**3**), Adequate (**4**), and Highly adequate (**5**). Here, the whole analysis considered the five-scale in three categories combining the upper and lower two extremes for conclusion purpose.

Following that, it was also further exposed to higher statistical analysis using a Chi-square test of significant difference between opinions of the two groups of respondents, i.e., instructors and department heads, at 0.05 level of significance.

4.1 Characteristics of Respondents

Some questions on personal backgrounds were posed to the respondents. Thus, the characteristics of the respondents have been summarized in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Respondents by Sex, Age, Qualification, Academic Rank and Service Year

No	Item	Respondents					
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total	
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
1	**Sex**						
	(a) Male	57	81.4	32	94.1	89	85.6
	(b) Female	13	18.6	2	5.9	15	14.4
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**
2	**Age**						
	(a) 20-35	56	80.0	21	61.8	77	74.0
	(b) 36-45	13	18.6	10	29.4	23	22.1
	(c) ≥46	1	1.4	3	8.8	4	3.8
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**
3	**Qualification**						
	(a) BA/BSc	42	60.0	18	52.9	60	57.7
	(b) MA/MSc	27	38.6	12	35.3	39	37.5
	(C) PhD	1	1.4	4	11.8	5	4.8
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**
4	**Academic Rank**						
	(a) Graduate Assistant	37	52.9	1	2.9	38	36.5
	(b) Assistant Lecturer	23	32.9	28	82.4	51	49.0
	(c) Lecturer	9	12.9	1	2.9	10	9.6
	(d) Assistant Professor	1	1.4	4	11.8	5	4.8
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**
5	**Service year**						
	(a) ≤ 1	14	20.0	4	11.8	18	17.3
	(b) 2-3	21	30.0	15	44.1	36	34.8
	(c) 4-5	25	35.7	4	11.8	29	27.9
	(d) ≥ 6	10	14.3	11	32.4	21	20.2
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**

As can be seen from item 1 of Table 2, among the respondents, 57 (81.4 per cent) instructors and 32 (94.1 per cent) department heads were males. The

remaining respondents from instructors and department heads were females, that is 13(18.6 per cent) and 2(5.9 per cent) respectively. This clearly indicates that the number of males exceeded that of females.

From this, one can deduce that female participation in the teaching task as well as academic management responsibilities is very low as compared to their counterparts. This implies that there would be a need to exert a great effort by education system to scale up women participation in the academic territory of HE system.

In item 2 of Table 2, 56(80.0 per cent) of the instructors and 21(61. 8 per cent) of the department heads were grouped in 20-35 years of age category. The instructors and department heads on the age category of 36-45 were 13 (18.6 per cent) and 10 (29.4 per cent) respectively. Meanwhile the age category of 46 and above consists of only 1 (1.4 per cent) instructor and 3(8.8 per cent) department heads.

This shows that over half of the instructors group as well as department heads were found to be youngsters. In other words, the academic staff in many PrHEIs seemed to be young implying that there were less experienced staff. The reason for this, as commented by some of the respondents in the open-ended questions, could be low retaining schemes, poor incentives or poor management system in general.

With regard to educational qualification of the respondents, item 3 of Table 2 depicts that 42 (60.0 per cent) instructors and 18(52.9 per cent) department heads were BA/BSc holders whereas 27 (38.6 per cent) instructors and 12(35.3 per cent) department heads were MA/ MSc graduates. On the other hand, those with PhD level were found to be only 1 (1.4 per cent) for instructors and 4(11.8 per cent) for department heads.

Hence, it has been seen that the academic qualification of the majority of the respondents were categorized into the Bachelor's level to teach and run

academic responsibilities in many PrHEIs in contrary to the ESDP III (MoE, 2005:39) which stated the government's intention to scale up HE academic staff profile in the sector in the current period.

In relation to academic rank position, item 4 of Table 2 clearly shows that among the respondents, 37 (52.9 per cent) instructors and 1 (2.9 per cent) department head were graduate assistants, and 23 (32.9 per cent) instructors and 28 (82.4 per cent) department heads were categorized as assistant lecturers. However, 9 (12.9 per cent) instructors and 1(2.9 per cent) department head were found to reach the lecturer rank. Again, 1(1.4 per cent) instructor and 4(11.8 per cent) department heads were PhD holders, and were considered as assistant professors by rank. Hence, the vast majority of the total respondents (i.e., 85.5 per cent) were below lecturer level in terms of academic rank. This clearly indicates that a well structured academic rank policy in many of the PrHEIs was either non-existent or was being poorly managed.

On the other hand, item 5 of Table 2 indicates that among the respondents 14(20.0 per cent) instructors and 4(11.8 per cent) department heads have served for one year or less whereas 21(30.0 per cent) instructors and 15 (44.1 per cent) department heads have served for two to three years in their respective institutions. Meanwhile, 25 (35.7 per cent) instructors and 11(32.4 per cent) department heads have served the institution for more than five years. The major reason for the few years of service could be the recent establishment period of the institutions in the sector as rightly pointed out by Ayenew (2005:61). Another reason for this could be employment agreement instability due to poor organizational set up in many PrHEIs as can be inferred from the interview and commentary items of the questionnaires.

4.2 Issues on Program Quality

This part of the data incorporates the expected criteria for quality programs in HE quality assurance system as described in the following series of tables.

Accordingly, the degree of adequacy of quality program variables has been treated in each table being categorized in terms of their relative similarity.

In item 1 of Table 3 below, the respondents were required to rate for adequacy level of the indicated components of program goals and objectives such as learning outcomes, life long learning, knowledge coverage and stakeholder-reflection.

With regard to this, it is shown that 26(37.1 per cent) and 16(47.1 per cent) of instructors and department heads respectively acknowledged that goals and objectives were adequate as expected. Quite similarly 13(18.6 per cent) instructors and 9(26.5) department heads revealed that the adequacy of goals and objectives for expected learning outcomes in the institutions were on an average adequacy level. Here, this accord was opposed by 2(2.9 per cent) instructors to be inadequate. However, as can be seen from the total proportion of the respondents (61.6 per cent) confirmed that the adequacy level of goals and objectives for learning outcomes in many PrHEIs were as per the expected adequacy level.

From this it is possible to understand that many PrHEIs have been running with reasonably adequate level of designed goals and objectives for expected learning outcomes.

The test of chi-square with P-value 0.307 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance shows that there was no statistically significant difference among the opinion responses of the two groups of respondents.

Table 3: Adequacy Level of Program Objectives, Contents, Specification, and Organization

No	Item	Respondents						X^2	P-value
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total			
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent		
1	**Goals and objectives**							3.605	0.307
	a) Highly inadequate	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	b) Inadequate	2	2.9	-	-	2	2.0		
	c) Average	29	25.6	9	26.5	38	36.5		
	d) Adequate	26	37.1	16	47.1	42	40.4		
	e) Highly adequate	13	18.6	9	26.5	22	21.2		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
2	**Program content**							3.745	0.442
	a) Highly inadequate	1	1.4	-	-	1	1.0		
	b) Inadequate	4	5.7	-	-	4	3.8		
	c) Average	26	37.1	11	32.4	37	35.6		
	d) Adequate	29	41.4	15	44.1	44	42.3		
	e) Highly adequate	10	14.3	8	23.5	18	17.3		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
3	**Program specification**							3.501	0.478
	a) Highly inadequate	1	1.4	-	-	1	1.0		
	b) Inadequate	2	2.9	-	-	2	1.9		
	c) Average	25	35.7	8	23.5	33	31.7		
	d) Adequate	25	35.7	15	44.1	40	38.5		
	e) Highly adequate	17	24.3	11	32.4	28	26.9		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
4	**Program organization**							4.587	0.332
	a) Highly inadequate	2	2.9	1	2.9	3	2.9		
	b) Inadequate	11	15.7	1	2.9	12	11.5		
	c) Average	14	20.0	6	17.6	20	19.2		
	d) Adequate	28	40.0	19	55.9	47	45.2		
	e) Highly adequate	15	21.4	7	20.6	22	21.2		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.**		

Item 2 of Table 3 was all about program content with related components; i.e., balance between general and specific skills, vision and mission of the institution, and clear learning outcomes. Here, the respondents were requested to rate the degree of adequacy. Accordingly, 29(41.4 per cent) instructors and 15(44.1 per cent) department heads almost similarly rated as adequate and 10(14.3 per cent) instructors and 8(23.5 per cent) department heads evaluated

as highly adequate. The rest 26(37.1 per cent) of the instructors and 11(32.4 per cent) of the department heads considered the case as average, except 4(5.7 per cent) and 1 (1.4 per cent) instructor who rated as inadequate and highly inadequate respectively.

From the above, it is possible to understand that the adequacy level of program content in many PrHEIs was found to be quite satisfactory as expected based on the agreement by a total proportion of 59.6 per cent of respondents considering the issue to be adequate. On the other hand, about 40 per cent of the total respondents considered the program content as below adequacy level.

The result of the statistical test depicts that by the chi-square test with the P-value of 0.442 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance. It could then be concluded that there was no statistically significant difference among the opinions of two groups in perceiving adequacy level of program content in many PrHEIs.

The third item of Table 3 deals with program specification. Hence, the respondents were asked to show their opinions on use of program specification, learning outcome specification, in association with issues of the stakeholders. Consequently, 17(24.3 per cent) instructors and 11(32.4 per cent) department heads viewed the case as highly adequate. Apart from this, 25 (35.7 per cent) instructors and 8(23.5per cent) department heads considered it as an average level. However, 2(2.9 per cent) and 1(1.4 per cent) instructors rated as in adequate and highly inadequate respectively.

From the data observed above, it is possible to infer that there was an adequate degree of program specification towards quality learning outcomes as rightly portrayed by a total proportion of 65.4 per cent of respondents who considered as above average.

A chi - square test of significance at 0.05 level of significance was made and resulted in a P-value of 0.478. Since this value is greater than 0.05 level of significance, it would be sound to conclude that there was no statistically significant difference among the response opinions of the two groups of respondents.

The last item of Table 3, (i.e., item 4), is all about program organization. This was meant to incorporate curricular issues such as course integration, breadth and depth, course type, and up-to-datedness. As can be indicated, 28 (40.0 per cent) instructors and 19 (55, per cent) department heads replied as adequate. Besides, 15(21.4 per cent) instructors and 7(20.6per cent) department heads regarded as highly adequate, but 14 (20.0 per cent) instructors and 6(17.6 per cent) department heads considered it as average. The rest 12 (11.5 per cent) and 3(2.9 per cent) of the total respondents rated it as inadequate and highly inadequate respectively.

Consequently, it can be seen that there was program organization adequacy to some significant degree, as revealed by a total of 66.4 per cent of the respondents replying to the item above "Average". Thus, it is possible to say the degree of adequacy of program organization in many PrHEIs was found to be quite satisfactory.

A chi-square test of significance was made to see if there was significant difference in perceiving the issue. Since the associated P-value 0.332 was found to be greater than 0.05 level of significance, it is possible to conclude that there was no statistically significant difference in the perception of the two groups of respondents regarding the issue under consideration.

Table 4: Quality of Teaching-learning strategy, Student Performance Assessment and Student Support

No	Item	Respondents						X^2	P-value
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total			
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent		
1	**Concern for teaching learning strategy**							1.888	0.756
	a) Highly inadequate	1	1.4	-	-	1	1.0		
	b) Inadequate	7	10.0	2	5.9	9	8.7		
	c) Average	24	34.3	12	35.3	36	34.6		
	d) Adequate	29	41.4	13	38.2	42	40.4		
	e) Highly adequate	9	12.9	7	20.6	16	15.4		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
2	**Student performance Assessment**							1.350	0.853
	a) Highly inadequate	1	1.4	1	2.9	2	1.9		
	b) Inadequate	3	4.3	1	2.9	4	3.8		
	c) Average	23	32.9	8	23.5	31	29.8		
	d) Adequate	29	41.4	16	47.1	45	43.3		
	e) Highly adequate	14	20	8	23.5	22	21.2		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
3	**Student support**							2.875	0.579
	a) Highly inadequate	6	8.6	1	2.9	7	6.7		
	b) Inadequate	11	15.7	4	11.8	15	14.4		
	c) Average	9	23.6	10	29.4	35	33.7		
	d) Adequate	19	27.1	13	38.2	32	30.8		
	e) Highly adequate	9	12.9	6	17.6	15	14.4		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		

Item 1 in Table 4 treats opinions on the major components of teaching learning strategies such as clarity, stimulation of active learning, facilitation of learning to learn and so on. Accordingly, 29 (41.4per cent) instructors and 13(38.2per cent) department heads ranked as adequate. Besides, 9 (12.9 per cent) instructors and 7(20.6 per cent) department heads evaluated as highly adequate. Apart from this, almost similar proportion of the two groups rated as average for this item, i.e. 24(34.3 per cent) instructors and 12 (35.3 per cent) department heads. However, the above opinions were strongly objected by 9.7 per cent of the respondents who rated it as inadequate, 7(10.0 per cent)

instructors and 2 (5.9 percent) department heads rated as inadequate, and 1(1.4 percent) instructor considered as highly inadequate.

This shows that the extent of adequacy of teaching-learning strategy in many PrHEIs was not bad at the program level as supported by opinions of over half of the respondents (i.e., 55.8 per cent) in general.

The test of chi-square with P-Value of 0.756 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance shows that there was no statistically significant difference among the opinion responses of the two groups.

As can be observed from Table 4 item 2, 29 (41.4 per cent) instructors and 16 (47.1per cent) department heads ranked as adequate, and 14 (20.0 per cent) instructors and 8 (23.5 per cent) department heads replied as highly adequate. Apart from this, 23 (32.9 per cent) instructors and 8(23.5 per cent) department heads replied as average. But, 3.8 per cent and 1.9 per cent of the total respondents similarly opposed the opinions of the rest by rating the item to be inadequate and highly inadequate respectively.

Meanwhile, some opinions gathered via open-ended questions revealed that there were poor mechanisms for students' performance assessment. It is, therefore, possible to infer that the adequacy of assessment of students' performance in PrHEIs was significantly below expected degree of adequacy.

A chi-square test of significance at 0.05 level of significance was made and resulted in a P-value 0.853 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance. It would then be sound to conclude that there was no statistically significant difference among the responses of the two groups of respondents.

With regard to item 3 of the same table, 19(27.1per cent) instructors and 13(38.2per cent) department heads regarded student support service as

adequate. Besides, 9(12.9per cent) instructors and 6(17.6per cent) department heads evaluated it as highly adequate. Average was also rated by 9(23.6per cent) instructors and 10(29.4per cent) department heads. However, this item was ranked as inadequate and highly inadequate by a significant proportion of both groups totally, i.e. 14.4per cent for the former and 6.7per cent for the latter.

Opinions obtained through commentary questions from instructors have also strengthened this low level of adequacy of student support service. For instance, it was pointed out that there was no conducive physical and material environment at a satisfactory level. There was no a well planned coaching schemes for first year students and this could result in undesirable effects on teaching learning process.

One can understand from this, the student support service in many PrHEIs was below the expected adequacy level based on the opinions of the total proportion of the respondents (i.e., 54.8 per cent) and that of the comments forwarded by different respondents through the open-ended questions in the questionnaire.

A chi-square test of significance was done to see if there was significant difference in the perception of the issue raised in the item, since the associated P-value 0.579 is found to be much greater than 0.05 level of significance, we can conclude that there was no statistically significant difference in opinions of the responding groups.

Table 5 Adequacy Level of Quality of Academic Staff, Support staff and Students

No	Item	Respondents						X^2	P-value
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total			
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent		
1	**Academic Staff Quality**							2.657	0.647
	a) Highly inadequate	2	2.9	-	-	2	1.9		
	b) Inadequate	3	2.0	-	-	3	2.9		
	c) Average	19	27.1	11	32.4	30	29.8		
	d) Adequate	32	45.7	16	47.1	48	46.2		
	e) Highly adequate	14	20.0	7	20.6	21	20.0		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
2	**Support Staff Quality**							5.733	0.220
	a) Highly inadequate	5	1.1	-	-	5	4.8		
	b) Inadequate	8	11.4	3	8.8	11	10.6		
	c) Average	23	32.9	11	32.4	34	32.7		
	d) Adequate	20	28.6	16	47.1	36	34.6		
	e) Highly adequate	14	20.0	4	11.8	18	17.3		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
3	**Student Quality**							3.103	0.541
	a) Highly inadequate	6	8.6	2	5.9	8	7.7		
	b) Inadequate	15	21.4	5	14.7	20	19.2		
	c) Average	18	25.7	7	20.6	25	24.0		
	d) Adequate	19	27.1	15	44.1	34	32.7		
	e) Highly adequate	12	17.1	5	14.7	17	16.3		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		

In item 1 of Table 5, quality of academic staff was presented in terms of degree of adequacy. Hence, 32(45.7per cent) instructors and 16(47.1per cent) department heads responded to the item as adequate and 14(20.0 per cent) instructors and 7(20.0per cent) department heads said highly adequate. However, 19(27.1per cent) instructors and 11(32.4per cent) department heads replied as average. The remaining 3(2.0per cent) and 2(2.9per cent) instructors opposed the above opinions by rating as inadequate and highly inadequate respectively for the item. Besides, over one third of the total respondents (i.e., 33.6 per cent) confirmed that the degree of academic staff quality in the PrHEIs was less than the expected adequacy level.

The possible reason for this could be associated with low level of academic qualification and experience. As an illustration, the obtained data concerning the respondents' characteristics in Table1 items 3 and 5 (i.e., qualification and service year respectively) showed that the extent of adequacy of academic staff quality seemed to be low. That is, 18(52.9 per cent) respondents from instructors and 42(60.0 per cent) from department heads were found to be first degree holders. And yet the teaching task in the degree programs were being run by those great proportion of less qualified staff. This is on the contrary to the HERQA's minimum standard for accreditation that requires three Master's and two Bachelor's degree holders for each program during accreditation (HERQA, 2007:13). This expectation indicates that second degree holders should be more than 50 per cent for each program. For academic staff, the other item treated that totally about 52 per cent of the respondents had served the institutions for below three years.

In addition, opinions gathered through open-ended questions could also indicate that there was a high degree of academic staff turnover in many PrHEIs with the major reason of poor management system as a whole as indicated by the comments of the respondents.

From the above data, it is possible to infer that although the majority of the respondents replied to the item above-average for the adequacy of academic staff quality, the prevailing fact and responses of the total proportion (i.e., 33.6 per cent) of the respondents confirmed that the adequacy of the staff quality in many PrHEIs was found to be low to a significant degree. Moreover, based on the crosschecking data gathered through interviews from various sources, PrHEIs were not in a position to secure a desirably adequate quality of academic staff. The main reason for this as commented by the respondents is that many PrHEIs do not have trustworthy staff retaining mechanisms. For instance, poor management, lack of transparency, nepotism, low-cost orientation by hiring less qualified staff, and little or no benefit packages for staff.

A chi-square test with P-value of 0.617 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the response opinions of the two responding groups in this regard.

Item 2 of the same table, Table 5, is all about quality of support staff. Here, the respondents were asked to rate its level of adequacy. Accordingly 20(28.6 per cent) instructors and 16(47.1per cent) department heads considered it as highly adequate. But 23(28.6 per cent) instructors and 11(32.4 per cent) department heads replied as average. The remaining 8(11.4 per cent) instructors and 3(8.8per cent) department heads said Inadequate. Some 5 (7.5 per cent) instructors also rated as highly inadequate.

From the above data, it could be possible to deduce that although 51.9 per cent of the total respondents considered the level of adequacy of support staff, nearly half (48.1 per cent) of the total respondents confirmed that there was low level of adequacy in this regard. This low level of adequacy of support staff quality is held up by supplementary facts obtained through responses of the open ended questions. Thus, it would be logical to say that support staff quality adequacy in PrHEIs was low.

The chi-square test with P-value of 0.220 being greater than 0.05 level of significance shows that there was no statistically significant difference in the opinion response of the two groups of respondents.

Adequacy of student quality is treated in item 3 of Table 5. Hence the components such as entrance selection, in-take policy, credit point system and study load were supposed to be incorporated in student quality generally. Accordingly, 19(27.1per cent) instructors and 15(44.1per cent) department heads regarded it as adequate, 12(17.1per cent) instructors and 5(14.7per cent) department heads rated it as highly adequate. Apart from this, 18(25.7 per cent) instructors and 7(20.6 per cent) department heads replied as average

being followed by 15(21.4 per cent) instructors and 5(14.7 per cent) department heads who considered it as inadequate. Six(8.6 per cent) instructors and 2(5.9 per cent) department heads also rated it as highly inadequate.

Thus, a total of about half of the respondents ranked it as below adequacy level of student quality. In addition, responses obtained through open ended questions significantly revealed that there was no adequately clear in-take policy in the country and this system related system resulted in low quality students' performance.

From the above facts it is possible to presume that the adequacy level of student quality in PrHEIs was low. By and large, this could possibly emanate from poor entrance selection and the intake policy.

A chi-square test with P-value of 0.541 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance reveals that there was no statistically significant difference in opinions of the two groups in the issue under consideration.

Table 6: Adequacy Level Facilities and Infrastructure

No	Item	Respondents						X^2	P-value
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total			
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent		
	Facilities and infrastructure							2.940	0.568
	a) Highly inadequate	4	5.7	1	2.9	5	4.8		
	b) Inadequate	6	5.4	2	2.6	8	7.7		
	c) Average	27	38.6	9	26.5	36	34.6		
	d) Adequate	20	28.6	14	41.2	34	32.7		
	e) Highly adequate	13	18.6	8	23.5	21	20.2		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		

For the item in Table 6, 20 (28.6 per cent) instructors and 14 (41.2 per cent) department heads rated as adequate, and 13(18.6 per cent) instructors and 8(23.5 per cent) department heads evaluated it as highly adequate. Whereas, 27 (38.6 per cent) instructors and 9 (26.5per cent) department heads considered it to be moderately adequate. On the other hand, a total of 7.7 per cent and 4.8 per cent of both respondents rated it as inadequate and highly inadequate respectively.

In support of the opinions of those who replied as average and below i.e., nearly about half of the respondents (47.1 per cent); additional information was secured through the observation checklist by the researcher. Nearly all of the PrHEIs did not have play grounds, internet services, building facilities, research center, clinic services, and toilet systems in an adequate degree. Some opinions in the open-ended questions also shared this idea significantly. Thus, based on the above data, it is possible to conclude that many PrHEIs did not have facilities and infrastructures to a reliable degree of adequacy.

A chi- square test was made to see whether or not there was significant opinion difference among the two groups of respondents. Since the associated P-value 0.568 was found to be greater than 0.05 level of significance, there was no statistically significant difference in the views of the two groups of respondents concerning adequacy level of facilities and infrastructure.

In item 1 of Table 7, similar proportion of instructors and department heads i.e., 35. 7 per cent and 35.3 per cent respectively viewed quality assurance with its components of evaluation assessment and revision of curriculum as adequate. Likewise, the same proportion (i.e., 8.7 per cent) of each group of respondents considered this as highly adequate.

However, the above opinion was opposed by over half of both groups of respondents (55.7 per cent totally) to be average and below. That is, 16 (22.9

per cent) instructors and 13(38.2 per cent) department heads rated as Average, but 18(25.7 per cent) instructors and 5(14.7 per cent) department heads rated as inadequate. Apart from this, opinions obtained through interview from HERQA experts concerning the issue confirmed that their degree of involvement in this regard was minimal. The reasons as indicated in relation to this were two fold. First, quality assurance system itself was in its young stage; and secondly, there was manpower shortage on the HERQA'S side to provide quality assurance support at a program level.

Table 7: Level of Quality Assurance, Student Evaluation, and Curriculum Design.

No	Item	Respondents						X^2	P-value
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total			
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent		
1	**Quality Assurance**							3.898	0.420
	a) Highly inadequate	5	7.1	1	2.9	6	5.8		
	b) Inadequate	18	25.7	5	14.7	23	22.1		
	c) Average	16	22.9	13	38.2	29	27.9		
	d) Adequate	25	35.7	12	35.3	37	35.6		
	e) Highly adequate	6	8.6	3	8.8	9	8.7		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
2	**Student Evaluation**							13.222*	0.010
	a) Highly inadequate	1	1.4	2	5.9	3	2.9		
	b) Inadequate	13	18.6	1	4.6	14	13.5		
	c) Average	34	48.6	11	32.4	45	43.3		
	d) Adequate	15	21.4	17	50.0	32	30.8		
	e) Highly adequate	7	10.0	3	8.8	10	9.6		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
3	**Curriculum Design**							5.142	0.273
	a) Highly inadequate	11	15.7	3	8.8	14	13.5		
	b) Inadequate	23	32.9	6	17.6	29	27.9		
	c) Average	17	20.9	14	41.2	31	29.8		
	d) Adequate	16	22.9	9	26.5	25	24.0		
	e) Highly adequate	3	4.3	2	5.9	5	4.8		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		

**P < 0.05 significant level at $\alpha = 0.05$*

According to the obtained data, institutions with a better organizational set up have already established quality assurance unit. For instance, with the exception of one (see Table 1), all the sample institutions have already established the unit in their institutions. However, there was no considerable achievement exhibited in the area of quality assurance system particularly at a program level except the relatively well organized institutions such as St. Mary University College, Unity University College and Alpha University College. The first two institutions have already made self- assessment (IQA) and presented a report to the external assessment body, HERQA.

From the above, it is possible to infer that the degree of quality assurance system at program level in many of the PrHEIs was significantly low.

The chi- square test at 0.05 level of significance with P-value 0.420 being by far greater than the level of significance showed that there was no statistically significant difference in opinions about quality assurance degree of adequacy.

Item 2 of Table 7, is about students' evaluation where 34(48.6 per cent) instructors and 11(32.4) department heads rated as average, 13(18.6 per cent) instructors and 1(4.6 per cent) department head considered it as inadequate, and 1(1.4 per cent) instructor and 2(5.9 per cent) department heads replied as highly inadequate. On the other hand, 15(21.4 per cent) instructors and 17(50.0 per cent) department heads ranked as adequate, and 7(10.0 per cent) instructors and 3(8.8 per cent) department heads rated as highly adequate.

What makes a difference here is that although a total proportion of 58.8 per cent of department heads replied as adequate and high, a total of 68.6 per cent of instructors' group regarded the adequacy of student evaluation at a program level to be below the expected adequacy level. In support of this, opinions obtained through open-ended questions revealed that the degree of adequacy of student evaluation schemes at a program level was low. Some issues raised

as examples were that there were no clearly designed systems for students to evaluate the curriculum.

Here, the majority of the department heads regarded students' evaluation as adequate as expected while the majority of the instructors considered it as below the expected adequacy level. The possible reason for the difference could be the degree of close relationship with students. That is, instructors are obviously closer to students than the officials (department heads). To this end, it is possible to generalize that students' evaluation at program level in many PrHEIs was low.

A chi-square test of significance was made to see if there was significant difference in the perception of the respondents regarding degree of involvement of students' evaluation on curricular issues. Since the associated P-value is 0.010 which is by far less than 0.05 level of significance, we conclude that there was statistically significant difference in the perception of the two groups of respondents regarding the issue under consideration.

In item 3 of Table 7, the respondents were required to rate their opinions on curriculum designing issue which involves elements such as: staff, students and future employers. Accordingly, 16(22.9 per cent) instructors and 9(26.5 per cent) department heads replied as adequate; and only 3(4.3 per cent) instructors and 2(5.9 per cent) department heads rated as highly adequate. Meanwhile, 17(20.9 per cent) instructors and 14(41.2 per cent) department heads considered as average. More significantly, however, 23(32.9 per cent) and 11(15.7 per cent) of the instructors respectively objected the above opinions by rating inadequate and highly inadequate. By the same token, 6(17.6 per cent) and 3(8.8 per cent) of the department heads rated as inadequate and highly inadequate respectively. According to the vast majority of the respondents (i.e., 71.2 per cent) who regarded as average and below, it is,

therefore, possible to conclude that there was low adequacy degree of curriculum design quality in many PrHEIs.

The chi-square test with P-value of 0.273 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance reveals that there was no statistically significant difference in opinions of the two groups of respondents.

Table 8: Extent of Staff Development Activities

No	Item	Respondents						X^2	P-value
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total			
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent		
	Staff Development Activities							3.830	0.429
	a) Highly inadequate	10	14.3	2	5.9	12	11.5		
	b) Inadequate	16	22.9	5	14.7	21	20.2		
	c) Average	23	32.9	13	38.2	36	34.6		
	d) Adequate	14	20.0	11	32.4	25	24.0		
	e) Highly adequate	7	10.0	3	8.8	10	9.6		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		

In the single item of Table 8, 14(20.0 per cent) instructors and 11(32.4 per cent) department heads replied as adequate and 7(10.0 per cent) instructors and 3(8.8 per cent) department heads rated as highly adequate. However, 23(32.9 per cent) instructors and 13(32.4 per cent) department heads considered as average, and 16(22.9 per cent) instructors and 5(14.7 per cent) department heads replied as inadequate being followed by 10(14.3 per cent) instructors and 2(5.9 per cent) department heads who evaluated as highly inadequate.

Thus, 79.4 per cent of the department heads considered the issue to be adequate as expected including average. On the contrary, from the other group of instructors, 70.1 per cent viewed staff development activities as below the adequate level.

In support of those who regarded the adequacy of staff development activities as average and below, the results of interview and open-ended commentary questions could end-up with similar opinions. The institutions did not have an adequate degree of retaining academic staff. As a result, there were frequent turnover. There was also no adequate support to academic progress. Regarding this, Item 4 of Table 2 also depicts that there were only 36.5 per cent of the respondents who were in the academic rank of lecturer. The rest were below this rank. This could portray that many PrHEIs did not have staff development activities to a remarkable degree of adequacy.

The chi-square test with P-value 0.429 being greater than 0.05 level of significance indicates that there was no statistically significant difference in opinions in this regard.

Table 9: Extent of Feedback from Stakeholders and Output Level

No	Item	Respondents						X^2	P-value
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total			
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent		
1	**Feedback from Stakeholders**							9.531 *	0.049
	a) Highly inadequate	11	15.7	1	2.9	12	11.5		
	b) Inadequate	14	20.0	5	14.7	19	18.3		
	c) Average	26	37.1	10	29.4	36	34.6		
	d) Adequate	13	18.6	15	44.1	28	26.9		
	e) Highly adequate	6	8.6	3	8.8	9	8.7		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
2	**Output Level Quality**							5.174	0.270
	a) Highly inadequate	3	4.3	2	5.9	5	4.8		
	b) Inadequate	13	18.6	1	2.9	14	13.5		
	c) Average	21	30.0	12	35.3	33	31.7		
	d) Adequate	25	35.7	13	38.2	38	36.5		
	e) Highly adequate	8	11.4	6	17.6	14	13.5		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		

**P < 0.05 significant level at $\alpha = 0.05$*

Item 1 of Table 9 is all about adequacy of feed back from stakeholders with some elaborating components of labor market and alumni. Accordingly, 13(18.6 per cent) instructors and 15(44.1 per cent) department heads replied as adequate, and 6(8.6 per cent) instructors and 3(8.8 per cent) of department heads rated as highly adequate. However, 26(37.1 per cent) instructors and 10(29.4 per cent) department heads with similar proportion ranked as average. Apart from this, 14(20.0 per cent) instructors and 5(14.7 per cent) department heads rated as inadequate, and 11(15.7 per cent) instructors and 1(2.9 per cent) department heads considered as highly inadequate.

As a result, there was a significant opinion difference in that a total proportion of department heads (82.3 per cent) viewed the issue as adequate. However, this opinion was opposed by the other group of respondents with the proportion of 72.8 per cent by rating the item as average and below.

Hence, adequacy degree of the stakeholders' involvement through feedback at program level in PrHEIs could be generalized as significantly below from the expected degree of adequacy based on the total proportion of both groups of the respondents (64.4 per cent)

A chi- square test of significance was done to see if there was significant difference in considering the issue raised in the item. Although the associated P-value of 0.049 which is slightly less than 0.05 level of significance indicates that there is statistically significant difference, it is difficult to conclude so. This is because there is no significant gap between the p-value and the 0.05 level of significance.

In item 2 of Table 9, the respondents were required to rate their perception on the degree of adequacy of program output with the assumed components; like pass rate and graduate satisfaction. To this end, 25(35.7 per cent) instructors and 13(38.2 per cent) department heads replied as adequate, and 8(11.4 per

cent) instructors and 6(17.6 per cent) department heads considered as highly adequate. However, these views were opposed by 21(30.0 per cent) instructors and 12(35.3 per cent) department heads by rating as average, 13(18.6 per cent) instructors and 1(2.9 per cent) department heads by rating as inadequate and 3(4.3 per cent) instructors and 2(5.9 per cent) department heads ranked as highly inadequate.

From this, it is possible to infer that the adequacy extent of quality out put of the programs of PrHEIs are below the expected adequacy level as supported by the opinions of the total proportion of the instructor respondents (i, e 52.9 per cent) .

The chi- square test with P- value of 0.270 being greater than 0.05 significance level, did not indicate statistically significant difference in opinion responses of the two groups of the respondents on output adequacy.

4.3 Issues on Institution Quality

In this section all the data gathered incorporate the assumed variables of 'quality institution' for quality assurance system in HE.

In item 1 of Table 10, the clarity of mission statement was meant to incorporate clearly formulated statements being publicly known and being inline with academic context. Accordingly, 22(31.4 per cent) instructors and 15(44.1 per cent) department heads evaluated as adequate, and 18(25.7 per cent) instructors and 11(32.4 per cent) department heads replied as highly adequate. On the other hand, 20(28.6 per cent) instructors and 5(14.7 per cent) ranked as average, 6(8.6 per cent) instructors and 2(5.9 per cent) department heads rated as inadequate, and 4(5.7 per cent) instructors and 1(2.9 per cent) department heads replied as highly inadequate. Consequently, both groups of respondents agreed with no significantly observable difference that the total respondents (i.e. 63.5 per cent) considered the issue here as adequate as expected.

From the above facts, one can understand that adequacy of mission statement concern in PrHEIs was significantly of a better level relatively. A chi- square test with P-value 0.432 which is much greater than 0.05 level of significance pointed out that there was no statistically significant difference in opinions of the groups under the consideration.

Table 10: Issues on Quality of Mission statements, Policy plan, Management system and Funding status.

No	Item	Respondents						X^2	P-value
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total			
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent		
1	**Mission Statement**							3.809	0.432
	a) Highly inadequate	4	5.7	1	2.9	5	4.8		
	b) Inadequate	6	8.6	2	5.9	8	7.7		
	c) Average	20	28.6	5	14.7	25	24.0		
	d) Adequate	22	31.4	15	44.1	37	35.6		
	e) Highly adequate	18	25.7	11	32.4	29	27.9		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
2	**Policy Plan**							3.237	0.519
	a) Highly inadequate	3	4.3	2	5.9	5	4.8		
	b) Inadequate	6	8.6	5	14.7	11	10.6		
	c) Average	18	25.7	4	11.8	22	21.2		
	d) Adequate	23	32.9	13	38.2	36	34.6		
	e) Highly adequate	20	28.6	10	29.4	30	28.8		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
3	**Management System**							7.701	0.103
	a) Highly inadequate	6	8.6	2	5.9	8	7.7		
	b) Inadequate	7	10.0	1	2.9	8	7.7		
	c) Average	18	25.7	3	8.8	21	20.2		
	d) Adequate	20	28.6	16	47.1	36	34.6		
	e) Highly adequate	19	27.1	12	35.3	31	29.8		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
4	**Funding Status**							1.537	0.820
	a) Highly inadequate	5	7.1	1	2.9	6	5.8		
	b) Inadequate	6	8.6	2	5.9	8	7.7		
	c) Average	24	34.3	11	32.4	35	33.7		
	d) Adequate	25	35.7	13	38.2	38	36.5		
	e) Highly adequate	10	14.3	7	20.6	17	16.3		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.**		

Item 2 of Table 10 is all about the policy plan for its clarity in line with the mission statement .Hence, 23(30.9 per cent) instructors and 13 (38.2 per cent) department heads replied as adequate , and 20 (28.6 per cent) instructors and 10(29.4 per cent) department heads rated as highly adequate. But the above opinions were not confirmed by 18 (25.7 per cent) instructors and 4(11.8 per cent) department heads who rated it as average, 6(8.6percent) and 5(14.7 percent) department heads rated as adequate, and 3(4.3percent) instructors and 2(5.9 percent) department heads considered as highly inadequate.

This could show that although the majority of both groups of respondents (63.4 per cent) totally considered the issue to be adequate, the remaining 36.6 per cent of both respondents significantly confirmed that the level of adequacy of policy plan issue in many PrHIs was below the expected degree of adequacy.

A chi-square test with P-value of 0.519 which is far greater than 0.05 level of significance shows that there is statistically insignificant difference in opinions of the two groups.

In item 3 of Table 10, 20 (28.6 per cent) instructors and 16(47.1 per cent) department heads rated as adequate and 19(27.1 per cent) instructors and 12(35.3 per cent) department heads replied as highly adequate. On the other hand, 18(25.7per cent) instructors and 3(8.8 per cent) department heads replied as average, 7(10.0 per cent) instructors and 1(2.9 per cent) department heads rated as inadequate, and 6(8.6.per cent) instructors and 2(5.9 per cent) department heads considered as highly inadequate.

From this, one can understand that although a total of the respondents (64.4 per cent) agreed on quality management system adequacy, the minority (i.e., 35.6 per cent} of the total respondents' proportion have opposed confirming by their views in the issue to be below the expected degree of adequacy.

In addition to this, opinions gathered through the open ended questions significantly revealed this fact. Among the views, the prominent ones include: low degree of clear management system, low extent of transparency and accountability concern, poor staff retaining mechanisms, and ill-treatment to staff.

From the above data, it is sound to infer that management system in PrHEIs could significantly lack the expected degree of quality adequacy. A chi-square test with P-value 0.103 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance shows that there was no statistically significant difference in opinions of the two groups of respondents.

In item 4 of Table 10, the respondents were required to rate the degree of adequacy of funding system. Accordingly, 25 (35.7 per cent) instructors and 13(38.2 per cent) department heads regarded as adequate and 10(14.3 per cent) instructors and 7 (20.6 per cent) department heads ranked as highly adequate. However, these opinions were opposed by 24(34.3 per cent) instructors and 11(32.4 percent) department heads by rating as average, 6(8.6 percent) instructors and 2(5.9 percent) department heads by rating as inadequate, and 5(7.1 per cent) instructors and 1(2.9 percent) department heads considering as highly inadequate.

From this, one can see that over half of the total respondents' (i.e., 56.7 per cent) confirmed that the adequacy of funds was at the expected degree, but financial management system was below the expected degree of adequacy in many PrHEIs.

A chi-square test with the P-value 0.820 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance shows that there was no statistically significant difference in response to opinions of the two groups.

Table 11: Adequacy Level of Human Resource

No	Item	Respondents						X^2	P-value
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total			
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent		
	Human Resource								
	a) Highly inadequate	5	7.1	_	_	5	5.0		
	b) Inadequate	9	12.9	3	3.9	12	11.5		
	c) Average	21	30	7	20.6	28	26.9	5.22	0.265
	d) Adequate	23	32.9	16	47.1	39	37.5		
	e) Highly adequate	12	17.1	8	23.5	20	19.2		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		

The variable item in Table 11 is all about human resource with relevant elements; developing and retaining quality academics, providing training, establishing system for evaluation, and enhancing professional ethics. To this end, the respondents were required to rate the degree of quality adequacy in this regard.

Accordingly, 23(32.9per cent) instructors and 16(47.1per cent) department heads replied as adequate, 12(17.1per cent) instructors and 8(23.5per cent) department heads ranked as highly adequate. On the other hand, 21(30.0 per cent) instructors and 7(20.6per cent) department heads considered as average, 9(12.9 per cent) instructors and 3(3.9 per cent) department heads as inadequate, and 5(7.1) instructors as highly inadequate.

It is, therefore, possible to deduce that over half proportion of both groups of respondents' opinions (56.7 per cent) confirmed that the degree of human resource concern in many PrHEIs was found to be nearly to the expected level of adequacy. However, opinions gathered through open-ended questions revealed that it was significantly inadequate. According to some of the opinions, the concern of human resource in many PrHEIs was very low. There was low level concern for retaining, training, and evaluation mechanisms.

The test of chi-square with P-value 0.265 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance did not show any statistically significant difference in opinions on the human resource adequacy.

In Item 1 of Table 12, 26 (37.1per cent) instructors and 15 (44.1per cent) department heads considered educational activities as adequate, and 9 (12.9 per cent) instructors and 8(23.5 per cent) department heads as highly adequate. Meanwhile, 26 (37.1) instructors and 6 (17.6 per cent) department heads considered it as average , 5 (7.1per cent) instructors and 5 (14.7 per cent) department heads as inadequate , and 4 (5.7 per cent) instructors as highly inadequate . To this end, a total of 55.7 per cent opinions showed that the extent of adequacy of educational activity to be as per the expected level.

The chi- square test with P-value 0.091 which is a greater than 0.05 level of significance revealed that there was no statistically significant difference in opinions of the two groups.

In item 2 of Table 12, 21 (30.4 per cent) instructors and 12 (35.3 per cent) department heads showed their opinion by rating adequate for the adequacy level of overall institutional achievements. Again 5 (7.2 per cent) instructors and 6 (17.6 per cent) department heads rated highly adequate on the issue raised. On the other hand, 27 (39.1per cent) instructors and 8 (23.5 per cent) department heads rated average, 12 (17.4 per cent) instructors and 3 (8.8 per cent) department heads rated inadequate, and 4 (5.8 per cent) instructors and 5 (14.7 per cent) department heads rated highly inadequate.

The above data indicates that among the opinions of both groups of respondents 57.3 per cent confirmed that the adequacy degree of institutional achievement checking opportunity in most of the PrHEIs was below the expected adequacy level. A Chi - Square test with P-value 0.120 being greater than 0.05 level of significance shows that there was no statistically significant difference in opinions of the responding groups.

Table 12: Adequacy level of Quality of Educational Activities, Achievements, and Stakeholder Satisfaction

No	Item	Respondents						X^2	P-value
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total			
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent		
1	**Educational Activities**							8.008	0.091
	a) Highly inadequate	4	5.7	—	—	4	3.8		
	b) Inadequate	5	7.1	5	14.7	10	4.6		
	c) Average	26	37.1	6	17.6	32	30.8		
	d) Adequate	26	37.1	15	44.1	41	39.4		
	e) Highly adequate	9	12.9	8	23.5	17	16.3		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
2	**Achievements**							7.323	0.120
	a) Highly inadequate	4	5.8	5	14.7	9	8.7		
	b) Inadequate	12	17.4	3	8.8	15	14.6		
	c) Average	27	39.1	8	23.5	35	34.0		
	d) Adequate	21	30.4	12	35.3	33	32.0		
	e) Highly adequate	5	7.2	6	17.6	11	10.7		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
3	**Stakeholder Satisfaction**							0.271	0.992
	a) Highly inadequate	7	10.0	3	8.8	10	9.6		
	b) Inadequate	10	14.3	6	17.6	16	15.4		
	c) Average	24	34.3	12	35.3	36	34.6		
	d) Adequate	22	31.4	10	29.4	32	30.8		
	e) Highly adequate	7	10.0	3	8.8	10	9.6		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		

In item 3 of Table 12, Stakeholder satisfaction was considered as institution quality variable. Thus, the adequacy level of structural methodology for obtaining feed back from stakeholders was the prominent component. Accordingly, 22 (31.4) instructors and 10 (29.4 per cent) department heads rated it as adequate, and 7 (10.0 per cent) instructors and 3 (8.8 per cent) department heads considered it as highly adequate. Conversely, 24 (34.3 per cent) instructors and 12 (35.3 per cent) department heads ranked as average, 10 (14.3 per cent) instructors and 6 (17.6 per cent) department heads replied

as inadequate and 7 (10.0 per cent) instructors and 3 (8.8 per cent) department heads rated it as highly inadequate.

As a result of the above, 57.3 per cent of the total proportion of both respondents considered that the adequacy of methodology for obtaining stakeholders satisfaction was below the expected level of adequacy.

A Chi- square test with P- value of 0.992 which is much greater than 0.05 level of significance showed that there was no statistically significant difference in opinions of the two groups.

Table 13: Degree of Quality of Research Activities and Contribution to Society.

No	Item	Respondents						X^2	P-value
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total			
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent		
1	**Research Activities**							5.643	0.227
	a) Highly inadequate	14	20.0	7	20.6	21	20.2		
	b) Inadequate	15	21.4	2	5.9	17	16.3		
	c) Average	14	20.0	12	35.3	26	25.0		
	d) Adequate	22	31.4	10	29.4	32	30.8		
	e) Highly adequate	5	7.1	3	8.8	8	7.7		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		
2	**Contribution to Society**							7.098	0.131
	a) Highly inadequate	5	7.1	3	8.8	8	7.7		
	b) Inadequate	12	17.1	4	11.8	16	15.4		
	c) Average	32	45.6	9	26.5	41	39.4		
	d) Adequate	18	25.7	13	38.2	31	29.8		
	e) Highly adequate	3	4.3	5	14.7	8	7.7		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		

In item 1 of Table 13, 'Research' is treated with its relevant components: Policy establishment; designing principles, scholarly activities support, and

commitment to professional ethics. For this, the respondents were required to rate the adequacy level of the issue under consideration.

Accordingly, 22 (31.4 per cent) instructors and 10 (29.4 per cent) department heads rated adequate, and 5 (7.1per cent) instructors and 3 (8.8 per cent) department heads rated highly adequate. Meanwhile, 14 (20.0 per cent) instructors and 12 (35.3 per cent) department heads rated it as average,15(21.4 per cent) instructors and 2 (5.9 per cent) department heads considered it as inadequate and 14 (20.0 per cent) instructors and 7 (20.6 per cent) department heads ranked as highly inadequate.

When it is seen in its totality, 61.5per cent of both groups of respondents rated it as below adequate. Besides, opinions gathered via open-ended questions and interviews made with different organs supposed this low concern towards research activities in PrHEIs. This clearly leads to an obvious conclusion. That is, adequacy level of research activities concern in most of the PrHEIs was found to be very low. The major indicators for this could be lack of incentives for researchers, little or no favorable atmosphere, and assignments of too heavy teaching loads to "researchers".

The chi - square test with P - value 0.227 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance shows that there was no statistically significant difference in opinions of both groups of respondents.

In item 2 of Table 13, 18(25.7 per cent) instructors and 13(38.2 per cent) department heads responded adequate, and 3(4.3 per cent) instructors and 5 (14.7 per cent) department heads responded highly adequate. But 32(45.6 per cent) instructors and 9(26.5 per cent) department heads responded average,12 (17.1per cent) instructors and 4(11.8 per cent) department heads responded inadequate and 5(7.1 per cent) instructors and 3(8.8 per cent) department heads responded highly inadequate.

From this, one can see that a total of 62.5per cent of both respondents revealed that institutional contribution to the society and the community was below the expected level of adequacy.. Thus, it would be quite safe to conclude that there was low degree of adequacy of such a contribution in terms of clear guidelines for consultancy and for benefit to the society.

The test of chi-square was done to see whether there was difference between the groups on the level of statistical significance. But, the test with P-value 0.131 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance did not show any statistically significant difference.

Table 14: Extent of Quality of Subject-benchmarking

No	Item	Respondents						X^2	P-value
		Instructors (N=70)		Department Heads (N=34)		Total			
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent		
	Subject-benchmarking							2.436	0.656
	a) Highly inadequate	5	7.1	5	14.7	10	9.6		
	b) Inadequate	12	17.1	4	11.8	16	15.4		
	c) Average	21	30.0	12	35.3	33	31.7		
	d) Adequate	24	34.3	9	26.5	33	31.7		
	e) Highly adequate	8	11.4	4	11.8	12	11.5		
	Total	**70**	**100.0**	**34**	**100.0**	**104**	**100.0**		

The item in Table 14 is all about the subject benchmarking in its overall outcomes of self-assessment. Accordingly, 24(34.3 per cent) instructors and 9(26.5 per cent) department heads replied as adequate, and 8 (11.4 per cent) instructors and 4(11.8 per cent) department heads considered as highly adequate. However,21(30.0 per cent) instructors and 12(35.3per cent) department heads rated as average, 12 (17.1 per cent) instructors and 4 (11.8 per cent) department heads ranked as inadequate and 5(7.1per cent) instructors and 5(14.7per cent)department heads considered as highly inadequate.

From this, it can be seen that a total of 56.7 per cent of opinions of both groups of respondents regarded the issue of subject benchmarking as below adequacy level. Besides, Opinions from quality assurance departments of PrHEIs and that of HERQA experts revealed that the use of self assessment outcome was seen as a very low level of adequacy in PrHEIs. Based on the interviewees' opinions, the major reason for this was the pre-maturity stage of quality assurance system. According to these interviewees, it was a new phenomenon in that many institutions were established just recently.

A chi- square test with P-value 0.656 which is greater than 0.05 level of significance shows that there was no statistically significant difference in opinion of the two groups of respondents on the issue under treatment.

4.4 Issues on Government Support to PrHEIs

In this part, the department heads of PrHEIs were purposely considered as respondents to indicate their views by rating government support to PrHEIs as high, moderate or low as indicated in the table below.

In item 1 of Table 15, respondents were asked as to how the PrHEIs get access to government incentives. Accordingly, 8(23.5 per cent) considered this at a moderate level whereas 26(76.5 per cent) strongly objected the opinion and responded that access to incentives was low. Besides, a relatively significant number of higher officials of PrHEIs viewed the issue of access to incentives mainly as low. Despite the fact that some of the interviewees pointed out that the government has permitted tax-free educational materials, many respondents reported that there was no incentive at all.

According to the respondents' opinions gathered through commentary questions as well as interviews, many PrHEIs were found to be complaining in

this regard. That is, they do not have land to have their own buildings. Owing to this, they have been compelled to run education activities in expensive rented houses which were not initially planned for education purpose. This would result in poor achievement in terms of institutional objectives generally. To this end, it could be fair to conclude that government support to PrHEIs is low in terms of access to incentives. (See Appendix "F" for complaints of PrHEIs to government)

Table 15 : Level of Government Support to PrHEIs.

No	Item	Respondents (N=34)					
		High		Moderate		Low	
		N	Per cent	N	Per cent	N	Per cent
1	Access to incentives	-	-	8	23.5	26	76.5
2	Provision of technical support	-	-	14	41.2	20	58.8
3	Provision of short term training	-	-	9	26.5	25	73.5
4	Joint experience sharing modalities	-	-	19	55.9	15	44.1
5	Fostering public private partnership	-	-	11	32.4	23	67.6

Item 2 of Table 15 was all about provision of technical support. Hence, 14(41.2 per cent) of the respondents said that technical support provided to PrHEIs was moderate. Other respondents, 20(58.8 per cent), however, responded to this item as it was low. Interview opinions obtained from officials of PrHEIs in this regard revealed that there were some sort of technical support being given to PrHEIs in terms of supervision, expertise issues in some technical aspects, and the like. On top of that, data obtained from HERQA officials strengthens these opinions. It is then possible to deduce from this that government support to

PrHEIs in relation to technical support provision was below the expected level seeking much more attention.

The third item of Table 15 deals with provision of short term training. About one-fourth of the respondents i.e., 9(26.5 per cent) said moderate, and the majority, 25(73.5 per cent) replied that it was low. This indicates that there was a very low degree of government support to PrHEIs in terms of training.

In item 4 of Table 15, over half i.e., 19(55.9 per cent) of the respondents ranked it as moderate on the issue of joint experience sharing modalities. The rest 15(44.1 per cent) still believed that it was low. Moreover, data gathered via interview from officials of PrHEIs confirmed that the issue of joint experience sharing scheme need to be strengthened for the common good, but no avail. HERQA's officials on their part, however, viewed that there has been these modalities to some extent though it was at too early stage of implementation, and the current progress has been considered to be promising.

In the item 5 of the same table, 23(67.6 per cent) of the respondents rated as low for fostering public-private partnership as a support to PrHEIs. But, 11(32.4 per cent) ranked it as moderate. Thus it is possible to deduce that public-private partnership fostering issue on the government part is found to be minimal.

On the whole, as far as government support to PrHEIs is concerned, the above facts in the items indicated that the majority of the respondents confirmed that it was low in aggregate terms. Besides, no respondent rated any of the items as High. Therefore, it would be sound to conclude that PrHEIs have not been supported by the government in areas of quality assurance and accreditation in contrary to the policy directions.

4.5 Issues on HERQA's Progress

This part treats the overall progress of HERQA in the area of quality assurance and accreditation system in PrHEIs. Accordingly, all the information gathered from officials and experts of HERQA through structured interview is analyzed. Cross-checking information secured from officials of PrHEIs was also entertained on the issue under consideration.

The first question posed to HERQA's officials was aimed at assessing the adequacy level of resources to carry out duties and responsibilities of quality assurance and accreditation which they are supposed to carry out. Hence, all of the respondents agreed that the adequacy level of skilled manpower was very low. Due to this, they could not provide the expected services to a significant degree of adequacy especially in the fields of health and technology. This has also been supported by opinions of officials in PrHEIs. It is expected that HERQA should have adequate number of experts for translating the theory of quality assurance and accreditation system into practice

With regard to materials and facilities, the respondents confirmed that there was no as such serious shortage in this regard except problems of vehicles. They said that they did not have adequate number of cars so as to carry out quality assurance and accreditation duties across the country. Besides, they have relatively well furnished offices and resource-centre including conference facilities at some desirable level of adequacy.

The respondents of HERQA were also asked as to how they would assure the standards of quality in PrHEIs in the levels of input, process and output. Accordingly, the responses provided include the following pertinent ones. In an input level in the context of quality assurance auditing, documents submitted by PrHEIs were being evaluated prior to field visit. During the field visit, HERQA's experts go together with external assessors-depending on the

programs to see curriculum, classroom, library, computer centers, offices, student services, registrar office and guidelines with relevant documents. Then, the agency assures through its publications and website materials, through workshops at the initial stage, and through formal and informal consultation

In process level what HERQA has been doing was insisting institutions to report on progress and teaching methods to be seen during the field visit. However, they said that they were sometimes conducting a sudden visit to check the implementation. Although, it was yet to commence to its full implementation level, there were also some practices of pilot quality audit and plan of action to conduct the actual audit. Nevertheless, there was no any practical attempt to assure standards of quality HE at an output level.

In relation to the question 'To what extent do the quality assurance and accreditation requirements have foundation of laws, administrative rules and procedures?", the respondents confirmed that it had been carried out in accordance with HE proclamation Nº 351/2005. For the procedures, there has been a series of published documents and administrative rules and guide lines drafted by management board of HERQA. However, opinions of the officials in PrHEI were found to claim the rules and regulations of the agency to be ever-changing and vague.

As far as HERQA's support to PrHEIs is concerned, the respondents of HERQA revealed that there were a lot of contributory supportive schemes. The pertinent ones were; consultation to offer quality education: prepare checklist so as to comply with guidelines of the agency, to establish quality assurance office, specific and general workshops, briefing visit prior to external accreditation and providing, summary of comments obtained from external assessors to be informed.

In spite of the above views of experts of HERQA, opinions of many respondents in PrHEIs strongly opposed on the following valuable points. HERQA was not performing its duties on the basis of factual information, its guidelines were inconsistent and vague, no clear-cut measurement, no fairness, low preparation, low commitment, quality control only on input bases for employing double standard by accrediting only PrHEIs.

With respect to the frequency of reviews for accreditation/reaccredidation, the respondents said that it would take place in three years time, but a sudden visit would happen if any odd information is received. Here, an institution would be subject to serve only for one-year with pre-accreditation. On the contrary, respondents of the institutions commented that there were extended holdups in processing accreditation and re-accreditation.

The other question posed to HERQA's staff aimed at knowing who would review both programs and institutions towards the academic programs on regular basis. A direct and precise response forwarded by all of the respondents was "the institutions". To this effect, the responses further explained, the quality audit function was to review the institution as a whole in accordance with the ten published focus areas (Yohannes 2007:13) incorporating reviews of the procedures employed by the institution to ensure that all aspects of program delivery were under written by quality.

Still the officials of HERQA were required to view on requirements of internal audit prior to accreditation. The clearly stated response by a senior official on this issue was "Not yet; in the future such requirements would be the pre-requisite for accreditation. For now, pre-accreditation permit would be given to institutions just before they begin registering students. This is based on the inputs put in place for the purpose. If an institution is ill-prepared, no pre-accreditation permit would be given to it." Besides, another respondent said that "Though the agency believes that accreditation should come after quality

audit, the current trend is not so. Accreditation is given by considering only the input criteria."

From this, it has been observed that PrHEIs were being expected to do the internal audit, prepare the self-evaluation document and ask for external auditing. In fact, this has been in its starting stage of implementation. Only very few PrHEIs have been on the progress of this issue. However, the current attempts in this procedure do not have any attachment with accreditation, except being a mere aspect of quality assurance system. This indicates that efforts are needed to connect audit with accreditation.

For the question that requires views on the achievements of the agency, the respondents forwarded that despite its short history for being recent phenomena, HERQA has been considered to have achieved some issues in connection with PrHEIs since its establishment. That is, among other things, the agency accredited more than forty-three private institutions, conducted the external quality audit support to two PrHEIs (Unity University College and St. Mary University College), conducted workshops involving different stakeholders, and published wide-range of materials in the areas of quality assurance and accreditation.

In relation to problems of implementing quality assurance and accreditation, the respondents revealed that there were problems in the agency. Among those problems the main ones were: lack of adequately trained manpower for accreditation purposes, inadequacy of external assessors in all areas of the programs, the number of institutions seeking services from agency are much higher than the number of experts allocated for the purpose. From this, one can see that quality assurance at external auditing level has not been manifested as the process is yet to engage substantively.

In line with this, one of the respondents in the agency also perceived the existing trends of accreditation through the agency as; "The term accreditation

exercised in Ethiopia and elsewhere is not the same. In Europe accreditation is to be followed by quality assurance. Here, there is plan to accredit after quality audit." From this; it is possible to deduce that the degree of implementation of accreditation system by HERQA has faced inadequacy problem of qualified manpower for the accreditation system as a whole.

4.6 Perceptions on Implementation Challenges in PrHEIs

In this part of the data presentation and analysis common problems of PrHEIs have been treated based on the data obtained from respondents of PrHEIs through the open-ended questions of the questionnaires distributed. Accordingly, the summary of the opinions has been presented in Table 16 below regardless of frequency count. These opinions have been categorized into internal and external. The internal ones have been further treated at both institution and program levels. The other category focused on external source of problems (i.e., HERQA) affecting the implementation of quality assurance and accreditation in PrHEIs.

In table 16 below, general comments forwarded by the respondents in PrHEIs revealed that there were internal and external problems that could hinder the institutions from the desirable implementation practices of quality assurance and accreditation. Thus, many institutions in the private sector in this regard were found to lack commitments towards implementation of quality assurance at both institution and program levels.

A number of problems have been indicated boldly by the respective practitioners and academics of the institutions. On the other hand, as has been exhibited in the same table, many PrHEIs were not being encouraged by the external regulating body, HERQA, in that they were facing challenges as pointed out by the opinions of respondents from the institutions' side.

Table 16: Tabular Summary on Problems of PrHEIs.

Source of problem	Quality Level	Type of Problem
Internal (Institutions)	Institution	▪ No transparency and accountability ▪ No clear-cut management system ▪ No participatory management system, ▪ Lack of qualified and experienced managers ▪ No organizational structure ▪ Owners' pressure on management system ▪ Profit orientation with no relevant service ▪ Poor staff development mechanisms. ▪ Little or no job security for staff. ▪ Lack of recreation schemes for staff ▪ Low degree of facilities and infrastructure
	Program	▪ Poor grading system resulting in grade-inflation ▪ Low level of orientation for new entrants ▪ Little difference: degree and diploma programs ▪ No screening mechanisms for new entrants. ▪ No research spirit among staff ▪ Lack of dedication for quality assurance system
External (HERQA)	---	▪ Lack of fairness working with institutions ▪ Favoritism, ▪ Less or no supervision to see what was going on. ▪ Inconsistent and vague accreditation regulations ▪ Low level of commitment from experts ▪ No experts in medical and technology fields ▪ Accreditation permit merely on input basis ▪ Holdups in accreditation permit procedures. ▪ Reluctance on taking measures on comments ▪ Focus on inputs not on process and output. ▪ Double standard on accrediting only PrHEIs. ▪ Subjectivity in accreditation.

It is, therefore, possible to notice that there were a lot of problems that could emanate from the institutions themselves on the one hand; and from that of HERQA on the other. This shows that the institutions were not showing commitment to translate the issues of quality assurance into practice in a desirable degree of implementation. Besides, HERQA could not be in a position to support the institutions as it was supposed to.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary of major findings, conclusions and recommendations.

5.1 Summary

The main purpose of this study was to evaluate the implementation of quality assurance and accreditation system in PrHEIs and to identify the outcome as well as the problems encountered in translating it into practice thereby. It was also aimed at suggesting alternative solutions.

To this end, from the analyzed and interpreted data, the following major summary of findings is drawn.

As far as characteristics of the respondents is concerned, there were 14.4 per cent females and 85.6 males being considered as respondents indicating a male dominating environment. Apart from this, overwhelming majority of the respondents' (i.e, 74.0 per cent) indicated that academic staff in many PrHEIs were youngsters in general. In relation to academic qualification, on the other hand, over half of the respondents (i.e 57.7 per cent) were found to be first degree holders. Again concerning the academic rank, respondents who have reached rank levels of lecturer and assistant professor were only 14.5per cent totally. Finally, the number of respondents who served in the PrHEIs up to three years (i.e., 52.1 per cent) exceeded those who served more than that.

According to the data obtained, program quality indicators such as goals and objectives, program contents, program specification, and program organization

in many PrHEIs were found to be relatively adequate to a significant level based on the opinions of the total proportion of 61.4 per cent, 59.6 per cent, 65.4 per cent and 66.4 per cent respectively.

Despite the fact that the adequacy of academic as well as support staff were considered to be adequate by 66.2 per cent and 51.9 per cent respectively, crosschecking opinions obtained through commentary questions revealed the opposite. On the other hand, students' quality was considered to be low based on the opinions of the total respondents, 51.0 per cent and the supporting comments of the open-ended questions.

In relation to adequacy of facilities and infrastructures, data gathered through questionnaire indicated that there was relatively a better degree of facilities and infrastructure in many PrHEIs as perceived by about half of the total respondents (i.e., 52.9 per cent). However, the remaining nearly half of the respondents significantly confirmed that the adequacy level of facilities and infrastructures in many PrHEIs was below the expected level of adequacy towards enhancing quality of HE. It was also confirmed by the researcher's observation checklist that the particulars such as play grounds, internet services, building facilities, research center, clinic services and toilet systems were inadequate in many PrHEIs.

Another aspect of 'program quality' treated was quality assurance incorporating evaluation and revision mechanisms as relevant components in this regard. This issue was considered to be below the expected adequacy level as perceived by 55.7 per cent of the respondents. Interview result (made with officials of HERQA and that of PrHEIs) also indicated that the degree of adequacy of quality assurance system concern in PrHEIs at a program level was significantly low. Apart from this, there was low level of curriculum revising schemes in many PrHEIs as perceived by 71.2 per cent of the total respondents.

Student evaluation was again the other issue to be taken into account for quality education at program level. Hence, the respondents' perception in this regard revealed that majority of the instructors (68.6 per cent) replied below adequacy level, whereas majority of the department heads considered this to be adequate to a significant level. Accordingly, it is observed that there was a significant level of opinion difference among the respondents. However, based on the over half of the respondents' (59.6 per cent) beliefs, generally there was low level of adequacy of student evaluation at a program level in many PrHEIs.

In relation to staff development activities, the data obtained revealed that the level of adequacy in PrHEIs was perceived differently by the two groups of respondents. Thus, majority of the department heads' group (i.e. 79.4 per cent) considered it to be adequate as expected, whereas majority of the instructors' group (i.e 70.1 per cent) regarded it as low level of adequacy. However, the total respondents' majority (i.e., 66.4 per cent) confirmed that the degree of staff development activity was found to be below the expected level of adequacy.

With respect to feedback from stakeholders, data secured from majority of the total respondents (i.e., 64.4per cent) indicated that it was under the desirable degree of adequacy for program quality. What makes a difference here is that there was a significant opinion difference between the two groups of respondents in that 82.3 per cent of the department heads considered as a relatively better level of adequacy. On the other hand, 72.8 per cent of the instructors considered it as below the desirable adequacy level. Moreover, a considerable proportion of the total respondents (i.e. 52.9 per cent) of the instructors group perceived the extent of quality output with its components such as pass rate and graduate satisfaction to be below the level of the expected adequacy.

According to the data obtained from majority of total proportion of the respondents (i.e. 87.5 per cent) the degree of clarity of mission statement adequacy as an indicator of institution quality was average and more than that. With regard to policy plan, again majority of the respondents (84.6 per cent) regarded it as adequate generally.

The majority of the respondents (i.e., 64.4 per cent) concerning management system as an indicator of institution quality believed that it was adequate. However, 35.6 per cent of the total respondents strongly opposed the availability of adequacy of quality management system in many PrHEIs. This opinion from the minority of the total respondents was also supported by comments forwarded in the open-ended questions. Among the views, the pertinet ones were low degree of clear management system, low extent of transparency and accountability, poor staff retaining schemes, and ill-treatment of staff.

In relation to adequacy of funds in PrHEIs so as to run quality education, it was considered as quite better by a total of nearly half of the respondents (i.e., 52.6 per cent) whereby the overall financial management system was regarded as low level of adequacy.

As far as human resource adequacy is concerned, component-issues such as developing and retaining high quality academics, providing training, establishing system for evaluation, and enhancing professional ethics were considered to be on a desirable adequacy level as pointed out by over half of the total respondents (i.e. 56.7 per cent). In addition, over half of the total respondents (i.e., 55.7 per cent) believed that the adequacy level of educational activities were on the expected adequacy degree.

In relation to intuitional achievement, majority of the total respondents (57.3 per cent) believed that the adequacy of the issue under consideration was below

the desirable adequacy level. This could be related to the similar opinions attached to the low adequacy of stakeholder satisfaction as perceived by 59.6 per cent of the total respondents.

According to a total of 61.5 per cent of the respondents, the concern for research activities in many PrHEIs was found to be low. Another issue raised in relation to this was that institutional contribution to society was also deemed to be low based on 62.5 per cent of the total respondents. The extent of subject benchmarking adequacy in PrHEIs was regarded as below the expected adequacy level by over half of the total respondents (i.e. 55.5 per cent)

With regard to government support to PrHEIs, respondents of HERQA deemed that government support in this regard was at a satisfactory adequacy level being accompanied by examples such as provision of workshops, short-term training, consultancy, accreditation and advisory comments as to how they could improve. On the contrary, majority of the respondents confirmed that the level of adequacy was low for support items such as; access to incentives, provision of technical support, provision of short term training, and fostering public-private partnership.

According to the information obtained from officials of HERQA, the adequacy level of the required human resource in the agency was found to be low. The required facilities were not on the adequacy level to run the activities of quality assurance and accreditation nationwide, especially no access to vehicular adequacy. The other resources in the agency were found to be quite adequate for running the tasks of present time. The opinion consensus of HERQA's respondents, on the other hand, pointed out that the quality assurance and accreditation practices being run in PrHEIs have got foundation of laws under proclamation No 351/2005, and administrative regulations and procedures were to be formulated by the agency. However, these could not escape the criticism of the other side (PrHEIs) for vagueness

Based on the data secured in relation to assuring the standards of quality in PrHEIs, HERQA's practice was found to be focusing only on an input level. For this, the Agency's experts visit the institutions based on evaluation of documents submitted by the respective institutions. Following that the experts together with external assessors depending on programs see the minimum input standards and decide on quality assurance. Apart from this, some insignificant level of attempts have been made to assure quality standards at a process level and almost no practical efforts have been exhibited assuring quality at an output level.

According to the data gathered through the general perceptions of the major respondents, PrHEIs have been facing a number of problems in program as well as institution quality areas internally and externally. The former was found to emanate generally from poor management system and the latter from low commitment on the HERQA's side.

5.2. Conclusion

Based on the major findings presented above, the following conclusions were deduced.

Based on the findings on the respondents' characteristics of academic background, academic activities in many PrHEIs were being run by less qualified and less experienced staff. This is on the contrary to the ESDP III plan (MoE, 2005: 39) that hoped to secure adequately qualified academic staff in HEIs. This would lead to a sound conclusion that the implementation practice of quality education in PrHEIs was low in terms of the requirement of the academic staff.

Although it was revealed that certain variables of program quality such as goals/objectives, program content, program specification, program organization, and concern for learning strategy were considered to be adequately addressed, majority of the respondents confirmed that program

quality components such as students' support, staff quality, students' background quality, facilities and infrastructure, quality assurance system, student evaluation, curriculum design, staff development activities, feedback from stakeholders, and out put quality were found to be below the expected degree of adequacy. To this end, many PrHEIs were found to lack the indicated components in their programs to a significant degree of adequacy. It is then sound to conclude that the extent of meeting quality standards at a program level in terms of the areas mentioned here was below the expected level of adequacy in PrHEIs.

Based on the findings, among the required components of quality institutions, some of the components were found to be relatively adequate. But other variables such as institutional achievement, management system, stakeholder satisfaction, research activities, contribution to the society, and subject benchmarking were found to be below the expected degree of adequacy level in the subject institutions. From this the obvious conclusion to be drawn is that the extent of implementation of quality standards in areas of the aforesaid 'institution quality' indicators in PrHEIs was significantly weak.

In relation to support of the Government, the finding revealed that there was low degree of access to incentives, provision of training schemes, provision of technical support, and fostering public-private partnership. This is against the plan of ESDP (MoE, 2005: 39). To this end, it is possible to conclude that the degree of government support to PrHEIs so as to implement the policy of quality assurance and the related accreditation was low.

The finding revealed that HERQA has been running its activities with very few experts and yet it has been shouldered a huge nationwide responsibility on the issues of quality assurance and accreditation. Besides, the agency has been focusing only on input level leaving aside the process and out put levels. Furthermore, the data obtained accordingly revealed that accreditation was

being given based solely on inputs availability. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that HERQA's implementation extent of quality assurance and accreditation with PrHEIs was weak in general.

On the basis of the findings, many PrHEIs have faced internal and external challenges. The internal challenges could emanate from the problems of intuitions themselves affecting the quality of the management system and the quality of programs generally. The external problem was indicated to stem from HERQA's low degree of commitment to encourage the institutions. It is, thus, possible to conclude that there were both internal and external problems in PrHEIs not to translate the expected quality assurance and accreditation issue into practice.

5. 3 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings drawn and conclusions deduced with regard to implementation practices of quality assurance and accreditation in PrHEIs, the following recommendations were forwarded in the hope that they would be implemented.

1. It was found out that the level of resources particularly in terms of adequacy of skilled manpower, facilities and infrastructure in PrHEIs was low. Consequently, the required quality standard at both programs and institution levels was found to be endangered. Therefore:

PrHEIs should seek for mechanisms to secure qualified manpower, especially the teaching staff. As a temporary solution joint employment schemes should be put in place without the restriction of release requirement from the other institution/organization until the labor market reaches its satisfactory level of output in this regard.

These institutions should also develop strategies as to how they could obtain adequate level of facilities depending on the programs they offer. Attempts to avail inputs adequacy should not focus merely on the purpose of securing accreditation, rather priority efforts concerning this should be exerted on quality assurance system on program as well as institution levels. "Service quality" should precede profit orientation; and this would result in a better image in the public domain.

Government should take into account limitations of resource capacity in PrHEIs and should show practical concern so as to safeguard quality care thereby consolidating public-private partnership. Hence, PrHEIs need to be provided with further training opportunities in graduate levels so as to alleviate qualified academic staff scarcity.

2. It has been shown that the overall management system in PrHEIs was poor. As has been indicated, this poor management would emanate from different sources of problem. Among others the main one was assignment of incompetent personnel with low or irrelevant qualification and low experience backgrounds. Thus, PrHEIs should develop mechanisms to improve management system as per the following points:

Managers expected to run academic responsibilities should not be assigned on the basis of favoritism. That is, persons who had been qualified in the relevant field, say educational planning and management, should be sought for. In line with this, academic staff retaining systems should be designed and put in place. For this, issues such as improvement of remunerations system, relative academic freedom, teaching load minimizing, trust building schemes for social security, avoidance of nepotism, and generally creating conducive working environment should be taken into account.

PrHEIs should look for qualified and competent supportive staff for any program the institution has been engaged; say library, laboratory, workshop, registrar office, student services, and any activity that would come under support-domain for teaching-learning process.

Design and implement on-job and/or in-service trainings, workshops, seminars, and any staff development schemes regularly so that dreams for quality education would be translated into reality.

3. It is evident that educational activities in any level in the sector without being supplemented by research would be crippled. When it comes to higher education, the concern for it would take a lion-share. To this effect, the findings revealed that the level of practices of research activities in many PrHEIs has been scanty. Therefore,

PrHEIs should design and employ research activities in the overall educational activities, in the areas of teaching-learning methodologies, curriculum development, assessment/evaluation mechanisms, grading systems, exit exams, quality assurance system and the like.

PrHEIs must not be considered as different entities. Their contribution towards nation building responsibilities must be recognized and supported in realistic requisites. Thus, government should support PrHEIs in conducting research by strengthening public-private partnership, providing funding access as incentives, designing trainings in the area, and arranging consultative workshops.

4. Priority concern should be given to any sort of undertakings related to 'quality service' rather than that of 'quantitative gains'. It was found out that the concern for quality assurance system was low on the side of PrHEIs and that

of the regulatory body (HERQA) on the other side. Moreover, government support to PrHEIs was also found to be minimal. Therefore:

PrHEIs should be committed to strengthen quality assurance system in their institutions. Unless all parties in the system; for instance management bodies, teaching staff, supportive staff, and students internalize the need for quality assurance, implementation would be a futile exercise. Hence, these institutions should work hard to do so by designing consolidation schemes as a top priority issue. The existing system of seeking for 'accreditation' prior to 'quality assurance' should be banned. This is because accreditation is just "a one moment event" whereas quality assurance is "a process" which requires much care. Hence, institutions should work hard to bring about desirable changes in quality care.

HERQA's degree of implementation in terms of its primary responsibilities of quality assurance and accreditation was found to be weak in general stipulations. That is, the agency was found to face challenges of shortage of qualified and well trained experts in the area, and shouldered the huge nationwide responsibility to run with a very few number of staff. On top of that the findings revealed that the expected degree of commitment for translating the issue into practice was low. Quality assurance system consolidation should precede accreditation. Aspects of looking at a mere input standards for accreditation should be changed, by exerting maximum efforts to process and output considerations, too. Thus, the agency should take this into account and work hard towards implementing quality assurance and accreditation as per the policy directions set ahead.

The Government should be committed for its plans set in the ESDP III (MoE 2005: 39) that gives hopes towards facilitation of quick access to incentives, provision of technical support and short-term training, joint experience sharing modalities, and fostering public-private partnership. These hopes should be

translated into practice in real stipulations so that the status of higher education quality in these institutions would change.

The Government should also pay particular attention to the existing systems of quality assurance and accreditation. Much more concern should be shown on quality care than ever before. For this, the existing policy in this regard should be revisited as to how it would make HERQA an independent agency for the case in point, or would empower it to execute the expected duties and responsibilities in full-fledged modalities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahuja, Ram (2002) **Research Methods** New Delhi: Rawat Publications.

Amare Asgedom (2005) "Higher Education in Pre-Revolution Ethiopia: Relevance and Academic Freedom" **The Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education** Vol. 2 No. 2, December 2005 AAU: IER.

Annaki, Mokhtar (2000) "Quality of Training and Research: Towards a Dynamic Process of Curricular Reform and Innovations in African Tertiary Institution" **Association of African Universities,** 10th General Conference Proceedings. Nairobi: AAU.

Appleton, James and Ralf Wolf (2004) "Standards Indicators in the processes of Accreditation ... "**Studies on Higher Education** UNESCO, ISGBIN

Assefa Berhane (2002) "Quality: A Higher Education Perspective" **IER FLAMBEAU** Vol 1 No 2 June 2002. IER, Addis Ababa University

Ashcroft, Kate (2003) "Emerging Models of Quality, Relevance and standards in Ethiopia's Higher Education", **Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education,** Vol. 23, No 2 Dec. 2003.

_____(2005) "Enhancing Moods of Quality, Relevance and Standard in Ethiopia's Higher Education Institutions" **Proceedings of the Third National Conference on Private Higher Education Institutions in Ethiopia,** St. Marry's University College, Addis Ababa.

Assie'-Lumumba and others (1991) "Economic Crises, State and Educational Reforms in Africa. The Case of Cote Divoire" **Educational Reform in International Contexts: Ideology, Economy, and the State** New York: Garland Publishing Inc.

Ayalew Shibeshi (2002) "የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ጥራት ፅንሰ ሐሳብ ዓለማቀፋዊ መስፈርቶችና ደረጃዎች" **Ethiopian Journal Of Education Researchers' Association** Vol 1 No 1, Jan 2002

Ayenew Tesera (2005) "The Role of public-partnership in promoting Quality of Education and Enhancing the Institutional Sustainability of Private Higher Education Institutions " **Proceedings of the Third National Conference on Private Higher Education Institutions in Ethiopia,** St. Marry College, Addis Ababa.

Campbell, Bob (2007) "Procedure for HEQA Institutional Quality Audits" **Presentation from the HERQA National Conference,** Addis Ababa, HERQA Publication Series 017, January 17, 2007 National Printing Press.

Damme, Dirk (2004) "Standards and Indicators in Intuitional and Program Accreditation in Higher Education ... **Studies on Higher Education,** UNESCO, ISBIN

Dessalegn Beyene(2004) "Status of the Accredited Private Higher Education Institutions in some Selected Regional States of Ethiopia" (Unpublished Master's Thesis) Addis Ababa University, College of Education, July, 2004

Dessalegn Chalchisa (2006) "Integrating Teaching and Research to Enhance the Quality of Education" **Journal of Education for Development**, Vol 1 No 1 September, 2006 AAU, College of Education

Ellis, Roger (1993) **Quality Assurance for University Teaching** . London: Open University Press

FDRE (2003) "Higher Education Proclamation", No 351/2003 Addis Ababa Negarit Gazeta

Guesh Hadgu (2007) "Institutional Self Evaluation" **Presentation from the HERQA National Conference,** Addis Ababa, HERQA Publication Series 017, January National Printing Press.

Harris, R. W. (1990) "The CNAA, Accreditation and Quality Assurance" **Higher Education Review**. Vol. 2 No.2 London: Warwick Printing Co Ltd.

Harvey, L (2006) "Analytic Quality Glossary, Quality Research International" ,http:/www.qualityresearchinternational.com/glossary/last updated Dec. 2006.

HERQA (2006) **Subject Benchmarking Guidelines** (Draft Proposal). Addis Ababa, HERQA Publications Series, No 008, May 2006.

____ (2007 **a**) **Presentation from the HERQA National Conference: Advancing Higher Education in Ethiopia,** Addis Ababa, HERQA Publication Series 017, National Printing Press.

____ (2007**b**) "Strategic Plan 2006 - 2009/10" **Higher Education Relevance and Quality Agency,** Addis Ababa, HERQA Publication Series 017,National Printing Press.

____ (2007**c**) "ለዲግሪ ፕሮግራም ስልጠና የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋም ስያሜ የደረጃ ብቃት መገምገሚያ የቅድመ ዕውቅናና የዕውቅና አሰጣጥ መመሪያ" (Unpublished) Addis Ababa

IUCEA (2007) "A Road Map to Quality" **Handbook for Quality Assurance in Higher Education**. Nairobi: Inter University Council to Africa, 4th Draft, 1st of March 2007.

Knight, Lee Harvey and Peter T. (1996) **Transforming Higher Education; The Society for Research into Higher Education,** Open University press.

Meena, R.(2002) "Women's Participation in Higher Levels of Learning in Africa" **Association of African Universities** 10th general conference proceedings Nairobi. May 2002

Mekasha Kassaye (2005) "Ensuring the Quality of Ethiopian Higher Education in the Face of the Challenges of the 21st century" **The Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education** Vol. 2 No. 2, December 2005 AAU: IER.

Mihailescu, Joan (2004)" The Quality Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Education in central and Eastern Europe" **Studies on Higher Education**; UNESCO, ISBIN.

Misganaw Solomon (2006) "The Practice of Ethiopian Private Higher Education Institutions in Assessing the Quality of Education. A Comparative Analysis" **Proceedings of the 4th National Conference on Private Higher Education Institutions in Ethiopia,** St. Marry University College, Addis Ababa.

MoE (1994) **Education and Training policy**, Addis Ababa, EMPDA

_____ (2002) **Education Sector Development Program II, ESDP II**, Addis Ababa, Ministry of Education

_____ (2005) **Education Sector Development Program III, ESDP III**, Addis Ababa, Ministry of Education

_____ (2008) **Educational Statistics Annual Abstract 2006/07** (unpublished) Issue No 14, February 2008., Addis Ababa, Ministry of Education

MoI (2005) "Investment Opportunities in Ethiopia" MoI Press and Audio Visual Department. Addis Ababa: February 2005

Parakash, Ravi (2005) **Method of Education Research** New Delhi: Ajay Verma

Saint, W. (1992) **Universities in Africa, Strategies for Stabilization and Revitalization** Washington: The World Bank.

Smouth, M. (2002) **Quality Assurance in South African Universities.** Johannesburg: SAUVCA

SMUC (2006) **Proceedings of the 4th National Conference on Private Higher Education Institutions in Ethiopia,** Addis Ababa. St. Marry's University College, August 2006

Tesfaye Teshome (2007) "Leadership and Management: Its implication in Quality Audit" **Presentation from the HERQA National Conference,** Addis Ababa, HERQA Publication Series 017, January National Printing Press.

TFHES (2000) **Higher Education in Developing Communities: Peril and Promise.** Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Thraver, Beverlgy (2004) "Private Higher Education in Africa: Six Country Case Studies" **African Universities in the 21st Century** V.1 Dakar: UNISA Press.

UNESCO (1997) "Recommendations Concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel: The General Conference" (Unpublished) Paris: 21 October to 12 November 1997.

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

World Bank (1994) **Higher Education: The Lessons of Experience** Washington, DC. A World Bank Publication.

_____ (1997): **Revitalizing Universities in Africa: Strategy and Guidelines**, Washington: The World Bank.

_____ (2000): **Higher Education Development Project**, Washington: The World Bank.

_____ (2002) **Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education**. Washington: The World Bank

_____ (2004) **Higher Education Development for Ethiopia: Pursing the Vision**, Working Paper Series No 65.

Yibrah Girmay (2007) "The Need for Expanding Postgraduates Study in Ethiopia: Demand Determination". **Presentation from the HERQA National Conference,** Addis Ababa, HERQA Publication Series 017, January National Printing Press.

Yohannes Woldetensae (2007) "Teaching Staff Profile in Ethiopian Public Universities: Expansion Challenges and Quality Assurance" **Forum for Social Studies Bulletin**. Vol., 5, No.2

Zeleza, P.T. (2004) " Neo-liberalism and Academic Freedom" **African Universities in the 21st Century** Vol 1. Dakar: UNISA Press.

Appendix A

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
College of Education
Department of Educational Planning and Management
(Educational Policy and Planning)

A Research Questionnaire for INSTRUCTORS in Private Higher Education Institutions

With this questionnaire the researcher intends to assess the implementation of quality assurance and accreditation system in private higher education institutions in Ethiopia and to forward possible recommendations on what should be done based on the findings. Hence, knowing that your responses will be used only for research purpose, you are kindly requested to fill in the questionnaire as accurately and frankly as you can. All the information collected from you will be confidential.

For genuinely doing so by devoting your time and exerting effort, the researcher really remains very grateful to you; meanwhile, he wishes to bring into your attention that outcome of this study will depend upon your responsible, sincere and timely response. It would be of great help, not to leave any question unanswered.

Best Regards,

NB

Please do not put your name.

1. Personal Data

Please read the following items and give your response by either putting a check mark (✓) in the boxes in front of the given choices or writing in full where necessary.

1.1 Your department _____

1.2 Your Position/Academic Rank _____

1.3 Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

1.4 Age: ☐ Below 20 ☐ 20-35 ☐ 36-45 ☐ 46 +

1.5 Educational Qualification ☐ PhD ☐ MA/MSc ☐ BA/BSc ☐ Diploma

1.6 Field of Study (Please write): _____

1.7 Terms of Employment: ☐ Fulltime ☐ Part-time ☐ Other(Specify)_____

1.8 Total number of your service years: _____

2. Questions on "Program Quality"

In this section the researcher is interested in your beliefs about what the **quality of academic programs** look like in Higher Education Institutions. Hence, in the following table are items that describe "**quality program**" in higher education. Please rate their degree of adequacy in your institution according to what is given below by putting a check mark (✓) under one of the scale numbers (1-5) that most closely represents your observations.

Responses: 1 = Highly inadequate 2 = Inadequate 3 = Average 4 = Adequate 5 = Highly adequate

No	In your department/Institution	Scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
2.1	**Goals and objectives; expected learning outcomes**					
	2.1.1 The program has clearly formulated learning outcomes					
	2.1.2 The program promotes learning to learn and life-long learning					
	2.1.3 The expected learning outcomes cover knowledge					
	2.1.4 The expected learning outcomes reflect the requirements of the stakeholders					
2.2	**Program content**					
	2.2.1 The program content shows a good balance between general and specific skills					
	2.2.2 The program reflects the vision and mission of the institution					
	2.2.3 The expected learning outcomes have been adequately translated into the program					
	2.2.4 The contribution made by each course to achieving the learning outcomes is clear					

2.3	*Program specification(for intended learning outcomes)* 2.3.1 The institution uses program specifications	1	2	3	4	5
	2.3.2 The program specification shows the expected learning outcomes					
	2.3.3 The program specification is informative for the stakeholders					
2.4	**Program organization** 2.4.1 The curriculum is coherent and all courses have been integrated					
	2.4.2 The curriculum shows breadth and depth					
	2.4.3 The curriculum clearly shows the level of course type					
	2.4.4 The curriculum is up-to-date					
2.5	**Concern for teaching/learning strategy** 2.5.1 The staff have a clear teaching-learning strategy					
	2.5.2 The teaching/learning strategy enables students to acquire and manipulate knowledge					
	2.5.3 The teaching/learning strategy is student oriented and stimulates quality learning					
	2.5.4 The curriculum stimulates active learning and facilitates learning to learn					
2.6	**Assessment of students' performance** 2.6.1 Student assessment considers student entrance, student progress and exit tests					
	2.6.2 Student assessment uses a variety of methods					
	2.6.3 The assessments reflect expected learning outcomes					
	2.6.4 The assessment arrangements cover the objectives of the curriculum					
	2.6.5 The standards applied in the assessment are consistent					
2.7	**Academic Staff quality** 2.7.1 The staff are competent to fulfill the requirements					
	2.7.2 The staff are sufficient to deliver the curriculum adequately					
	2.7.3 Recruitment and promotion are based on academic merits					
	2.7.4 The roles and relationship of staff members are well defined and understood.					
	2.7.5 Duties allocated are appropriate to their competencies					
	2.7.6 Time management systems are designed to support the quality of teaching and learning					
	2.7.7 Accountability of the staff members is well regulated					
	2.7.8 Social benefits are planned and well implemented.					
	2.7.9 There is an efficient appraisal system					
2.8	**Quality of the support staff** 2.8.1 There are adequate support staff for the libraries					
	2.8.2 There are adequate support staff for the laboratories					
	2.8.3 There are adequate support staff for computer facilities					
	2.8.4There are adequate support staff for the student services					
2.9	**Student quality** 2.9.1 The selection of entering students is adequate					
	2.9.2 There is an adequate intake policy					
	2.9.3 There is an adequate credit points system					
	2.9.4 The actual study load is in line with the calculated load					
2.10	**Student support** 2.10.1 There is an adequate student progress system					
	2.10.2 Students get adequate feedback on their performance					
	2.10.2 Coaching for first-year students is adequate					
	2.10.3 The physical and material environment for the student is satisfactory					
	2.10.4 The social and psychological environment for the student is satisfactory					
2.11	**Facilities and infrastructure** 2.11.1 The lecture hall facilities are adequate					
	2.11.2 The library is adequate and up-to-date					
	2.11.3 The laboratories are adequate					
	2.11.4 The computer facilities are adequate					
2.12	**Quality Assurance** 2.12.1 The curriculum is regularly evaluated					
	2.12.2 Revision of the curriculum takes place at reasonable time periods					
	2.12.3 Quality assurance of the curriculum is adequate					

		1	2	3	4	5
	2.12.4 Quality assurance of the assessments/examinations is adequate					
2.13	**Student evaluation**					
	2.13.1 Curricula are subject to structured student evaluation					
	2.13.2 Student feedback is used for improvement					
2.14	**Curriculum design**					
	2.14.1 The curriculum was developed as a joint enterprise by all the staff members					
	2.14.2 Students are involved in the curriculum design					
	2.14.3 The employers are involved in the curriculum design					
2.15	**Staff development activities**					
	2.15.1 There is a clear vision on the needs for staff development					
	2.15.2 The staff development activities are adequate to the needs					
2.16	**Feedback from stakeholders**					
	2.16.1 There is adequate structural feedback from the labor market(employers)					
	2.16.2 There is adequate structural feedback from the alumni					
2.17	**Output**					
	2.17.1 The pass rate is satisfactory					
	2.17.2 The level of the graduates is satisfactory					

3. Questions on "Quality of Institutions"

In this section the researcher is interested in your beliefs about what the **quality of institutions** look like in Higher Education system. Hence, in the following table are items that describe "**quality of institutions**" in higher education. Please rate their degree of adequacy in your institution according to what is given below by putting a check mark (✓) under one of the scale numbers (1-5) that most closely represents your observations.

Responses: 1 = Highly inadequate 2 = Inadequate 3 = Average 4 = Adequate 5 = Highly adequate

No	Item	Scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
3.1	**Clarity of mission statement**					
	3.1.1 The institution has a clearly formulated mission statement					
	3.1.2 The mission statement is publicly known					
	3.1.3 The mission statement is in line with the academic context					
3.2	**The policy plan**					
	3.2.1 The institution has a clear policy in line with the mission statement.					
	3.2.2 The institution has strategic plan in line with the mission statement					
3.3	**Management**					
	3.3.1 The institution has a clear management structure					
3.4	**Human resources**					
	3.4.1 The institution develops and retains high-quality academics and support staff					
	3.4.2 The institution develops body of knowledge possessed by its staff					
	3.4.3 The institution provides training to develop the potential of its staff					
	3.4.4 The institution sets up a system of evaluation					
	3.4.5 The institution establishes an activity plan and evaluates its activities.					
	3.4.6 The institution enhances professional ethics of its students and academics					

3.5	**Funding** 3.5.1 The institution has adequate funding to achieve the goals.	1	2	3	4	5
	3.5.2 The institution has adequate financial management system					
3.6	**Educational activities** 3.6.1 The institution evaluates its programs regularly					
	3.6.1 The institution adds the evaluation outcomes to get the general overview of the quality					
3.7	***Research*** 3.7.1 The institution establishes and implements research policies					
	3.7.2 The institution has designed guiding principles to conduct research and development					
	3.7.3 The institution supports scholarly activities					
	3.7.4 The institution is committed to professional standards of scholarly research ethics.					
	3.7.5 The researchers have familiarized themselves with the contents of research policies.					
	3.7.6 The institution has a clear research policy					
	3.7.7 The institution has a clear code of conduct for research, including a code of ethics.					
3.8	**The contribution to society and the community** 3.8.1 The institution has clear guidelines on consultancy					
	3.8.2 The institution has clear guidelines on the contribution to society					
3.9	**Achievements** 3.9.1 The institution has opportunities to check achievements					
3.10	**Stakeholder satisfaction** 3.10.1 The institution has a structured method for obtaining feedback from stakeholders					
3.11	**Subject benchmarking** 3.11.1 The institution uses the outcomes of the self-assessment.					

4. Your Observation/Suggestion

As an academician and practitioner, what other problems do you think are there in the implementation process of quality assurance system with private HE institutions?

4.1 Problems related to policy issues in association with the MoE regulatory body (HERQA) in terms of quality assurance and accreditation

a)_____

b)_____

c)_____

4.2 Problems related to institutions (overall management aspects)

a)_____

b)_____

c)_____

4.3 As a solution what do you recommend?

a)_____

b)_____

c)_____

Appendix B

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
College of Education
Department of Educational Planning and Management
(Educational Policy and Planning)

A Research Questionnaire for Department Heads in Private Higher Education Institutions

With this questionnaire the researcher intends to assess the implementation of quality assurance and accreditation system in private higher education institutions in Ethiopia and to forward possible recommendations on what should be done based on the findings. Hence, knowing that your responses will be used only for research purpose, you are kindly requested to fill in the questionnaire as accurately and frankly as you can. All the information collected from you will be confidential.

For genuinely doing so by devoting your time and exerting effort, the researcher really remains very grateful to you; meanwhile, he wishes to bring into your attention that outcome of this study will depend upon your responsible, sincere and timely response. It would be of great help, not to leave any question unanswered.

Best Regards,

NB

Please do not put your name.

2. Personal Data

Please read the following items and give your response by either putting a check mark (✓) in the boxes in front of the given choices or writing in full where necessary.

1.1 Your department _____

1.2 Your Position/Academic Rank _____

1.3 Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

1.4 Age: ☐ Below 20 ☐ 20-35 ☐ 36-45 ☐ 46 +

1.5 Educational Qualification ☐ PhD ☐ MA/MSc ☐ BA/BSc ☐ Diploma

1.6 Field of Study (Please write): _____

1.7 Terms of Employment: ☐ Fulltime ☐ Part-time ☐ Other(Specify)_____

1.8 Total number of your service years: _____

3. Questions on "Program Quality"

In this section the researcher is interested in your beliefs about what the **quality of academic programs** look like in Higher Education Institutions. Hence, in the following table are items that describe "**quality program**" in higher education. Please rate their degree of adequacy in your institution according to what is given below by putting a check mark (✓) under one of the scale numbers (1-5) that most closely represents your observations.

Responses: 1 = Highly inadequate 2 = Inadequate 3 = Average 4 = Adequate 5 = Highly adequate

No	In your department/Institution	Scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
2.1	Goals and objectives; expected learning outcomes					
	2.1.1 The program has clearly formulated learning outcomes					
	2.1.2 The program promotes learning to learn and life-long learning					
	2.1.3 The expected learning outcomes cover knowledge					
	2.1.4 The expected learning outcomes reflect the requirements of the stakeholders					
2.2	Program content					
	2.2.1 The program content shows a good balance between general and specific skills					
	2.2.2 The program reflects the vision and mission of the institution					
	2.2.3 The expected learning outcomes have been adequately translated into the program					
	2.2.4 The contribution made by each course to achieving the learning outcomes is clear					

		1	2	3	4	5
2.3	*Program specification(for intended learning outcomes)* 2.3.1 The institution uses program specifications					
	2.3.2 The program specification shows the expected learning outcomes					
	2.3.3 The program specification is informative for the stakeholders					
2.4	**Program organization** 2.4.1 The curriculum is coherent and all courses have been integrated					
	2.4.2 The curriculum shows breadth and depth					
	2.4.3 The curriculum clearly shows the level of course type					
	2.4.4 The curriculum is up-to-date					
2.5	**Concern for teaching/learning strategy** 2.5.1 The staff have a clear teaching-learning strategy					
	2.5.2 The teaching/learning strategy enables students to acquire and manipulate knowledge					
	2.5.3 The teaching/learning strategy is student oriented and stimulates quality learning					
	2.5.4 The curriculum stimulates active learning and facilitates learning to learn					
2.6	**Assessment of students' performance** 2.6.1 Student assessment considers student entrance, student progress and exit tests					
	2.6.2 Student assessment uses a variety of methods					
	2.6.3 The assessments reflect expected learning outcomes					
	2.6.4 The assessment arrangements cover the objectives of the curriculum					
	2.6.5 The standards applied in the assessment are consistent					
2.7	**Academic Staff quality** 2.7.1 The staff are competent to fulfill the requirements					
	2.7.2 The staff are sufficient to deliver the curriculum adequately					
	2.7.3 Recruitment and promotion are based on academic merits					
	2.7.4 The roles and relationship of staff members are well defined and understood.					
	2.7.5 Duties allocated are appropriate to their competencies					
	2.7.6 Time management systems are designed to support the quality of teaching and learning					
	2.7.7 Accountability of the staff members is well regulated					
	2.7.8 Social benefits are planned and well implemented.					
	2.7.9 There is an efficient appraisal system					
2.8	**Quality of the support staff** 2.8.1 There are adequate support staff for the libraries					
	2.8.2 There are adequate support staff for the laboratories					
	2.8.3 There are adequate support staff for computer facilities					
	2.8.4There are adequate support staff for the student services					
2.9	**Student quality** 2.9.1 The selection of entering students is adequate					
	2.9.2 There is an adequate intake policy					
	2.9.3 There is an adequate credit points system					
	2.9.4 The actual study load is in line with the calculated load					
2.10	**Student support** 2.10.1 There is an adequate student progress system					
	2.10.2 Students get adequate feedback on their performance					
	2.10.2 Coaching for first-year students is adequate					
	2.10.3 The physical and material environment for the student is satisfactory					
	2.10.4 The social and psychological environment for the student is satisfactory					
2.11	**Facilities and infrastructure** 2.11.1 The lecture hall facilities are adequate					
	2.11.2 The library is adequate and up-to-date					
	2.11.3 The laboratories are adequate					
	2.11.4 The computer facilities are adequate					
2.12	**Quality Assurance** 2.12.1 The curriculum is regularly evaluated					
	2.12.2 Revision of the curriculum takes place at reasonable time periods					
	2.12.3 Quality assurance of the curriculum is adequate					

		1	2	3	4	5
	2.12.4 Quality assurance of the assessments/examinations is adequate					
2.13	**Student evaluation**					
	2.13.1 Curricula are subject to structured student evaluation					
	2.13.2 Student feedback is used for improvement					
2.14	**Curriculum design**					
	2.14.1 The curriculum was developed as a joint enterprise by all the staff members					
	2.14.2 Students are involved in the curriculum design					
	2.14.3 The employers are involved in the curriculum design					
2.15	**Staff development activities**					
	2.15.1 There is a clear vision on the needs for staff development					
	2.15.2 The staff development activities are adequate to the needs					
2.16	**Feedback from stakeholders**					
	2.16.1 There is adequate structural feedback from the labor market(employers)					
	2.16.2 There is adequate structural feedback from the alumni					
2.17	**Output**					
	2.17.1 The pass rate is satisfactory					
	2.17.2 The level of the graduates is satisfactory					

3. Questions on "Quality of Institutions"

In this section the researcher is interested in your beliefs about what the **quality of institutions** look like in Higher Education system. Hence, in the following table are items that describe "**quality of institutions**" in higher education. Please rate their degree of adequacy in your institution according to what is given below by putting a check mark (✓) under one of the scale numbers (1-5) that most closely represents your observations.

Responses: 1 = Highly inadequate 2 = Inadequate 3 = Average 4 = Adequate 5 = Highly adequate

No	Item	Scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
3.1	**Clarity of mission statement**					
	3.1.1 The institution has a clearly formulated mission statement					
	3.1.2 The mission statement is publicly known					
	3.1.3 The mission statement is in line with the academic context					
3.2	**The policy plan**					
	3.2.1 The institution has a clear policy in line with the mission statement.					
	3.2.2 The institution has strategic plan in line with the mission statement					
3.3	**Management**					
	3.3.1 The institution has a clear management structure					
3.4	**Human resources**					
	3.4.1 The institution develops and retains high-quality academics and support staff					
	3.4.2 The institution develops body of knowledge possessed by its staff					
	3.4.3 The institution provides training to develop the potential of its staff					
	3.4.4 The institution sets up a system of evaluation					
	3.4.5 The institution establishes an activity plan and evaluates its activities.					
	3.4.6 The institution enhances professional ethics of its students and academics					

3.5	**Funding** 3.5.1 The institution has adequate funding to achieve the goals.	1	2	3	4	5
	3.5.2 The institution has adequate financial management system					
3.6	**Educational activities** 3.6.1 The institution evaluates its programs regularly					
	3.6.1 The institution adds the evaluation outcomes to get the general overview of the quality					
3.7	***Research*** 3.7.1 The institution establishes and implements research policies					
	3.7.2 The institution has designed guiding principles to conduct research and development					
	3.7.3 The institution supports scholarly activities					
	3.7.4 The institution is committed to professional standards of scholarly research ethics.					
	3.7.5 The researchers have familiarized themselves with the contents of research policies.					
	3.7.6 The institution has a clear research policy					
	3.7.7 The institution has a clear code of conduct for research, including a code of ethics.					
3.8	**The contribution to society and the community** 3.8.1 The institution has clear guidelines on consultancy					
	3.8.2 The institution has clear guidelines on the contribution to society					
3.9	**Achievements** 3.9.1 The institution has opportunities to check achievements					
3.10	**Stakeholder satisfaction** 3.10.1 The institution has a structured method for obtaining feedback from stakeholders					
3.11	**Subject benchmarking** 3.11.1 The institution uses the outcomes of the self-assessment.					

4. Questions on Government Support

The following are expected support of private higher education institutions from government. Please rate the expected support that the government provides these days.

No	Item	High	Moderate	Low
4.1	Access to incentives			
4.2	Provision of technical support			
4.3	Provision of short term training			
4.4	Joint experience sharing modalities			
4.5	Fostering public- private partnership			
4.6	Other, (please specify)			
	a)			
	b)			
	c)			
	d)			

4. Your Observation/Suggestion

As an academician and practitioner, what other problems do you think are there in the implementation process of quality assurance system with private HE institutions?

4.1 Problems related to policy issues in association with the MoE regulatory body (HERQA) in terms of quality assurance and accreditation

a)_____

b)_____

c)_____

4.2 Problems related to institutions (overall management aspects)

a)_____

b)_____

c)_____

4.3 As a solution what do you recommend?

a)_____

b)_____

c)_____

5. Your Observation/Suggestion

As an academician and practitioner, what other problems do you think are there in the implementation process of quality assurance system with private higher education institutions?

5.1 Problems related to policy issues in association with the MoE regulatory body (HERQA) in terms of quality assurance and accreditation

a)_____

b)_____

c)_____

5.2 Problems related to institutions (overall management aspects)

a)_____

b)_____

c)_____

5.3 As a solution what do you recommend?

a)_____

b)_____

c)_____

Appendix C

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
College of Education
Department of Educational Planning and Management
(Educational Policy and Planning)

Structured Interview for Higher Officials of Private Higher Education Institutions

Dear respondent,

The purpose of this guided interview is to gather primary data for the work of a Master's Thesis on the title " An Assessment of the Implementation of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Private Higher Education Institutions in Ethiopia." Please, fill in all the interview questions. Your responses are believed to be so much helpful to strengthen the research that is aimed at identifying major implementation problems and forwarding some feasible recommendations accordingly.

Thank you in advance,

Please read the following items and put a tick mark (✓) in the boxes in front of the given choices or write short answers in the spaces provided.

1. Your position: _____

2. Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

3. Age: ☐ Below 20 ☐ 20-35 ☐ 36-45 ☐ 46 and above

4. Educational Qualification ☐ PhD ☐ MA/MSc ☐ BA/BSc ☐ Diploma

5. Field of Study (Please write): _____

6. Terms of Employment: ☐ Fulltime ☐ Part-time ☐ Other, (specify)_____

7. Total number of your service years: _____

8. What education programs does your institution have in degree level?

_____

_____

9. Which programs have been accredited so far?

_____

_____

10. What are the criteria for the accreditation?

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. To what extent do the accreditation requirements have foundation of laws, administrative rules and procedures?

_____

_____

_____

12. To what extent of adequacy does your institution have resources (mentioned below) to carry out its duties and responsibilities?

a) **Academic staff**

_____

_____

b) **Administrative Staff**

_____

_____

c)**Teaching-learning materials**

_____

_____

d) **Financial resources**

_____

_____

e) **Facilities**

13.To what extent does your institution work towards quality assurance system;
a) **at a program level**?

---

b) **at an institution level**?

---

14. How have you been working with the external regulatory body, HERQA, in terms of quality assurance and accreditation system?

---

15. What support does the government provide to private higher education institutions?

a)_____
b)_____
c)_____
d)_____

16. Does your institution have internal quality assurance system? ☐ Yes ☐ No

17. If your answer is "yes", what activities are performed so far?

a)_____
b)_____
c)_____
d)_____

18. What achievements have you experienced so far in terms of quality education?

a)_____
b)_____
c)_____
d)_____

19. What major problems have you encountered so far in the area of quality assurance and accreditation processes?

a)_____
b)_____
c)_____
d)_____

20. What alternative solutions do you recommend?

a)_____
b)_____
c)_____
d)_____

Appendix D

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
College of Education
Department of Educational Planning and Management
(Educational Policy and Planning)

Structured Interview for HERQA Officials

Dear respondent,

The purpose of this guided interview is to gather primary data for the work of a Master's Thesis on the title " An Assessment of the Implementation of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Private Higher Education Institutions in Ethiopia." Please, fill in all the interview questions. Your responses are believed to be so much helpful to strengthen the research that is aimed at identifying major implementation problems and forwarding some feasible recommendations accordingly.

Thank you in advance,

Please read the following items and give your response by either putting a tick mark (✓) in the boxes in front of the given choices or writing short answers in the spaces provided.

1. Your position/Occupation: _____

2. Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

3. Age: ☐ Below 20 ☐ 20-35 ☐ 36-45 ☐ 46 and above

4. Educational Qualification ☐ PhD ☐ MA/MSc ☐ BA/BSc ☐ Diploma

5. Field of Study (Please write): _____

6. Terms of Employment: ☐ Fulltime ☐ Part-time ☐ Other, (Specify)_____

7. Total number of your service years: _____

8. To what extent of adequacy does HERQA have resources (mentioned below) to carry out its duties and responsibilities?

a) Skilled manpower

_____

_____

b) Material resources

_____

_____

c) Financial resources

_____

_____

d) Facilities

_____

_____

9. How does HERQA assure the standards of quality higher education in private higher education institutions?

a) In Input Level

_____

_____

b) In Process Level

_____

_____

c) In Out Put Level

_____

_____

10. To what extent do the quality assurance and accreditation requirements have foundation of laws, administrative rules and procedures?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. As a regulatory of government body, what support does HERQA provide to private higher education institutions?

a)_____

b)_____

c)_____

d)_____

12. What is the frequency of reviews for accreditation /re-accreditation?

_____

_____

_____

13. Does HERQA review both programs and institutions or are institutions delegated the responsibility to carry out regular academic program reviews?

14. Is each institution required to do internal audit prior to accreditation? How will that be structured? What will be required? Will a visiting team carryout a review on its own?

15 What achievements has HERQA experienced so far since its establishment?

a)

b)

c)

d)

16. What major problems do you have in the areas of quality assurance and accreditation processes in private higher education institutions?

a)

b)

c)

d)

17. What possible solutions do you recommend?

a)

b)

c)

d)

Appendix E

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
College of Education
Department of Educational Planning and Management
(Educational Policy and Planning)

Observation Checklist of Quality Assurance/Accreditation Standards in Private Higher Education Institutions

The purpose of this observation checklist is to gather primary data for the work of a Master's Thesis on the title "An Assessment of the Implementation of Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Private Higher Education Institutions in Ethiopia." It focuses mainly on sample institutions selected for the research on purpose.

Name of the Institution_____

No	Item	Available		Adequate		Remark
		Yes	No	Yes	No	
1	Academic Legislation					
2	Administrative Legislation					
3	Financial policy					
4	Strategic plan/plan					
5	Computer centre					
	➢ Computers					
	➢ Computer professionals					
	➢ Seats for students					
	➢ Light					
	➢ Ventilation					
	➢ Internet service					
	Other					
6	Workshop					
	➢ Instruments					
	➢ Technicians					
	➢ Electric power					
	➢ Water supply					
	➢ Raw materials					
	➢ Other relevant materials					
7	Classrooms organization					
	➢ Chairs					
	➢ Tables					

No	Item	Available		Adequate		Remark
		Yes	No	Yes	No	
	➢ Writing boards					
	➢ Display boards					
	➢ Light					
	➢ Ventilation					
	➢ Doors					
	➢ Windows					
	➢ Others relevant					
8	Library					
	➢ Tables					
	➢ Chairs					
	➢ Light					
	➢ Books					
	➢ Reference materials					
	➢ Professional Journals					
	➢ Professional workers					
	➢ Computers for CD- Rom					
	➢ Internet service					
	➢ Technical section					
	➢ Reader section					
	➢ Service to persons with disabilities					
	➢ Plan documents					
	➢ Other					
9	Lecture halls					
10	Multi-purpose halls					
11	Offices					
	➢ For administrative staff					
	➢ For instructors					
	➢ Tables for each office					
	➢ Chairs for each office					
	➢ Telephone service					
	➢ Light					
	➢ Ventilation					
12	Research Centre					
13	Store					
14	Clinic service					
15	Play grounds					
16	Toilet system					
17	Rest room					
	Others					
	➢					
	➢					

Appendix F

የኢትዮጵያ የግል የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት ማኅበር
Ethiopian Private higher Education Institutions' Association

ቁጥር፡- EPHEIA/033/004/2008

ቀን፡- የካቲት 24፣ 2000 ዓ.ም.

ለ፡ ለክቡር አቶ መለስ ዜናዊ
የኢፌዴሪ ጠቅላይ ሚኒስትር
አዲስ አበባ

ጉዳዩ፡- የግል የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ዘርፍ ችግሮችን ይመለከታል፡፡

የኢፌዴሪ መንግሥት በሀገራችን የግል ኢንቨስትመንት መስኮች እንዲበረታቱ በፈጠረው ዕድል ተጠቃሚ ከሆኑ ዘርፎች ውስጥ የግል የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ዘርፍ ይገኛል፡፡ ይህ ዘርፍ ላለፉት አሥር ዓመታት ሰፊ እንቅስቃሴ በአዲስ አበባና በመላ የሀገሪቱ ክልሎች ሲያደርግ በመቆየቱ የተለያዩ በጐ ውጤቶች ማስመዝገብ ተችሏል፡፡ ከእነዚህ ውስጥ ዋነኞቹን ለመጥቀስ 1. ከዚህ በፊት ባልታየ ሁኔታ ለጥቂቶች ብቻ ተወስኖ የቆየው የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ዕድል በመደበኛና በርቀት ዘርፍ በተሰማሩ የግል ተቋማት እንቅስቃሴ ለብዙዎች በመከፈቱ ዜጐች የመማርና ሀገርንና ወገናቸውን በብቃት የማገልገል ዕድላቸው እንዲሰፋ ሆኗል፡፡ 2. የግል ከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት በመንግሥት ተቋማት የማይሰጡ የስልጠና መስኮችን በመክፈት መንግሥት በሰው ሀይል ልማትና በከፍተኛ ትምህርት መስፋፋት ሂደቱ ለሚያደርገው ጥረት አጋዥ ኃይል ከመሆን አልፈው እንደ MDG አይነት ዓለም አቀፍ ግቦች እንዲሣኩ ከፍተኛ አስተዋፅኦ አበርክተዋል፡፡ 3. እንደማንኛውም የኢንቨስትመንት መስክ ሰፊ የስራ ዕድል ለዜጐች ከመፍጠር በተጨማሪ ለመንግሥት የተለያዩ ገቢዎች የሚያስገኝ መስክ ሆኗል፡፡ 4. በተለያዩ ሀገር አቀፍ የስልጠናና የምክክር መድረኮች ሰፊና ንቁ ተሣትፎ በማድረግ በሀገሪቱ ለሚታዩ የትምህርት ለውጦች ሰፊ እገዛ አድርገዋል፡፡ 5. ከተለያዩ መንግሥታዊና መንግሥታዊ ያልሆኑ አካላት ጋር በመተባበር በተለያየ ማኅበራዊና የጤናና የኑሮ ችግር ለተጐዱ በብዙ ሺህ ለሚቆጠሩ ወገኖቻችን የነፃ ትምህርት ዕድል በመስጠት የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተጠቃሚ እንዲሆኑ አድርገዋል፡፡

የኢትዮጵያ የግል የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት ከዕድሜያቸው ለጋነት አንፃር ያስናወኗቸው ተግባራት እጅግ ብዙ ከመሆን አልፎ በአሁኑ ወቅት በሀገሪቱ የቴክኒክና ሙያ ዘርፍ 60% ያህል ሠልጣኞች፤ በዲግሪ ዘርፍ 22% ያህል ሰልጠኞችን በማቀፍ ሀገራችንን ከአፍሪካ አህጉር ቀዳሚ ሥፍራ ማሰጠት ችለዋል፡፡ ሆኖም ዘርፉ አሁን ባለበት ደረጃ በተለያዩ ችግሮች ተተብትቦ የሚፈለገውን ያህል ውጤት አምጥቷል ለማለት አያስደፍርም፡፡ አንዳንዶች ችግሮችም አፋጣኝ መፍትሄ ያልተሰጣቸው በመሆኑ ለዓመታት በመስኩ የቆዩ አንዳንድ ተቋማት እየተዘጉና አንዳንዶቹም የሥልጠና ደረጃቸውን እየቀየሩ ይገኛሉ፡፡ ይህ የዘርፉን ዘለቂታማነት ጥያቄ ውስጥ የሚያስገባው በመሆኑ መንግሥት በዚህ ረገድ

ተገቢውን እርምጃ ሊወስድ ይገባል ብለን እናምናለን። በዚሁ መነሻነት ከዙር ጠቅላይ ሚኒስትሩ የዘርፉን ዋነኛ ችግሮች መገንዘብ እንዲችሉ ይህ ማስታወሻ ቀርቧል።

1. <u>ለዘርፉ ማደግ አስፈላጊ የሆኑ ማበረታቻዎች እስካሁን በበቂ ሁኔታ ያልተሰጡ ስለመሆኑ</u>

   - የሀገራቱ የኢንቨስትመንት አዋጅ በከፍተኛ የትምህርት ዘርፍ የተሰማሩ ባለሀብቶች ከቀረጥ ነፃ ቦታ እንደሚያገኙ ቢደነግግም ይህ በመዲናይቱ በአዲስ አበባ ባለመፈፀሙ ላለፉት 10 ዓመታት በተለየዩ ሀገሃዎች ላይ ያለምርጫቸው ብዙ ተቋማት እንዲኖሩ ተገደዋል። በክልሎች አካባቢም ከአዋጁ በተፃራሪ የሊዝ ክፍያ እየተጠየቀ ነው። ይህም በየጊዜው እያሻቀበ ከሚሄደው የቤት ኪራይ ውድነት አንፃር ቦታ ያላገኙ ተቋማትን ለአላስፈላጊ ወጪ ከመዳረጉም በላይ ለተለያዩ የትምህርት ጥራት ማሻሻያ ተግባራት ሊውሉ ይችሉ የነበሩ ወጪዎችን በኪራይ ላይ ብቻ እንዲውሉ አስገድዷል።
   - መንግሥት ለዘርፉ የሚያስፈልጉ እንደ ኮምፒዩተር፣ ኬሚካሎች፣ የምህንድስናና የህክምና ዘርፍ ግብዐቶች ተቋማት ከቀረጥ ነፃ እንዲያስገቡ በስፋት ሊያበረታታ የግድ ቢሆንም በዚህ በኩል ያለው እንቅስቃሴ አበረታች አይደለም።
   - መንግሥት ዘርፉን ለማበረታታት እንደሌሎች የኢንቨስትመንት መስኮች ልዩ የብድር ግልጋሎቶች (soft loans) ፤ ለግንባታና ሌሎች መሠረታዊ ተግባራት የሚውል ተዘዋዋሪ ፈንድ (Revolving Fund) ወዘተ ማዘጋጀት ሲገባው በዚህ ረገድ አንዳችም እንቅስቃሴ የለም።
   - በሌሎች ሀገራት እንደሚደረገው መንግሥት ዘርፉን ለማሣደግ ከሌሎች መንግሥታት የሚገኙ እርዳታና ድጋፎችን የመጠቀም አዝማሚያ እስካሁን እያሣየ አይደለም።
   - በተለያዩ የኢንቨስትመንት ዘርፎች እንደሚደረገው ሁሉ የሥራውን እንቅስቃሴ ከሚያበረታቱ አካላት ጋር የሚያደርገው ግንኙነት ውሱን መሆንና በዘርፉ ጥሩ እንቅስቃሴ ላበረከቱ ተቋማት እስከዛሬ ድረስ አንዳችም ልዩ ማበረታቻ አለመደረጉ ተገቢውን የመነቃቃት መንፈስ አልፈጠረም።

2. **የትምህርት ሥርዓቱ የግሉን ዘርፍ ታሣቢ አድርጐ ያለመሄድ ችግር**

የሀገራችን የከፍተኛ የትምህርት ዘርፍ የግሉን ዘርፍ እንደ ተቀጥላ (appendix) እና በመንግሥት ተቋማት ያልተደላደሉ ተማሪዎች ብቻ የሚቀበል ዘርፍ አድርጐ ከማየት ተላቆ በአጠቃላይ እንቅስቃሴውና የወደፊት አቅጣጫው ላይ ተገቢውን ቦታ ሊሰጠው ይገባል። በዚህ ረገድ

   - እንደ ትምህርት ዘርፍ የልማት ፕሮግራም 3 (ESDP III) ያሉ የወደፊት አቅጣጫ ጠቋሚ የመንግስት ፖሊሲዎች ትልሞች ላይ ዘርፉ ከየት ተነስቶ የት መድረስ እንዳለበት የሚያሣይ ዕቅድና ስትራቴጂ (Road Map) ተነድፎ አልተቀመጠም።
   - እንዲህ አይነቱ ትልም ባለመኖሩ መንግሥት በግሉ ዘርፍ ባሉ ተቋማት በቀላሉ ሊሰጡ የሚችሉ ስልጠናዎች በተደጋጋሚና በከፍተኛ ወጪ በመንግሥት የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት ሲሰጡ ይታያሉ።

- መንግሥት ባወጣው የወጪ መጋራት ፖሊሲ የግል ተቋማት የሚሣተፉበትን መንገድ በመተለም የራሱን ወጪዎች የሚቀንስበትና የከፍተኛ ትምህርት የማስፋፋቱን ሂደት ይበልጥ ማገዝ ሲቻል በዚህ በኩል የተደረጉ እንቅስቃሴዎች የሉም።
- በመንግሥትና በግል ተቋማት መካከል የጋርዮሽና የህብረት አካሄድ ሥርዓት (Public-Private Partnership) በመፍጠር የሀገሪቷ ውስን ሀብት በመጋራት፣ የመረጃና ልምድ ልውውጥ በማድረግ ወጪን ቆጣቢ በሆነ መልክ የተሻለ ለውጥ ማምጣት ሲቻል በዚህ ረገድ ብዙ የተሠሩ ሥራዎች የሉም።

3. <u>የመንግሥትና የግል ተቋማትን ነጥለው የሚያዩ የአሠራር አካሄዶች (Double Standards)</u>

የግልና የመንግሥት ተቋማት በሀገሪቱ የከፍተኛ ትምህርት እንቅስቃሴ ውስጥ የጋራ አስተዋፅኦ እንደሚኖራቸው ቢታመንም በተለያየ ደረጃ አስፈላሚ በሆኑ አካላት በኩል የልዩነት አካሄድና የአፈፃፀም ሥርዓት እንዲኖር እየተደረገ ነው። ይህ አይነቱ አካሄድ የግል ተቋማትን የውድድር መንፈስ የሚጐዳና ነፃነታቸውንም የሚጋፋ ነው። በዚህ ረገድ የሚታዩ ችግሮችን ለመጥቀስ፣

- የዕውቅና ሥርዓት የከፍተኛ ትምህርት አዋጅ በሚያዘው መሠረት ለሁለቱም ዘርፎች መሥራት ሲገባው በአሁኑ ወቅት ህጉ ተግባራዊ የተደረገው በግል የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት ላይ ብቻ ነው።
- መንግሥት "ከግሉ የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት የሚመረቁ መምህራንን አልቀጥርም" ካለ ወዲህ በተለያዩ የሙያ መስኮች የሚመረቁ የግል ተቋማት ምሩቃን ህገመንግሥታዊ መብታቸውን በሚፃረር መንገድ የቅጥር ማግለል እየተደረገባቸው ይገኛል።
- በመንግሥት የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት ለሚሠሩ መምህራን የሚሰጡ እንደ ድህረ ምረቃ ትምህርት አይነት የቅድሚያ ዕድሎች ለግሉ ዘርፍ የተመቻቹበት ሁኔታ የለም። በቅርቡ ጠቅላይ ሚኒስትሩ ለኢትዮጵያ የከፍተኛ ትምህርት መምህራን የገቧቸው ቃሎችም በግሉ ዘርፍ ላሉ መምህራን ጭምር ተግባራዊ እንደሚሆኑ ፅኑ እምነት አለን።
- በ10+3 ደረጃ የጨረሱ ምሩቃንን የመንግሥት ተቋማት ለዲግሪ ተቀብለው ሲያሰለጥኑ ይህ በግል ተቋማት ተግባራዊ እንዳይደረግ ተከልክሏል።
- የግል የርቀት የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት በየክልሉ የራሣቸው የሆኑ ቢሮዎችና አደረጃጀት እንዲኖራቸው ትምህርት ሚኒስቴር ህግጋትን በማውጣት ሲያስገድድ የመንግሥት ተቋማት ተመሣሣይ ሥልጠናዎች በየከፍተኛ ሁለተኛ ደረጃ ትምህርት ቤት እየሰጡ የሚገኙበት ሁኔታ ይታያል።

4. <u>ህጋዊ የሆኑ አካሄዶችን፣ አዋጆችንና መመሪያዎችን የሚጥሱ አካላቶች የሚፈጥሯቸው ችግሮች</u>

የግል የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ዘርፍ መንግሥት ባወጣቸው አዋጆችና መመሪያዎች እንደሚዳኝ የሚጠበቅ ቢሆንም በተለያየ ደረጃ የሚገኙ አስፈላሚ አካላት በሚፈፅሟቸው ግብታዊና ህገ ያልተከተሉ ተግባራት ዘርፉ እየተጐዳ ይገኛል። ለምሣሌ ያህል፦

- የዕውቅና/ የቅድመ ዕውቅና የሚቆይበት ጊዜ በህግ ተደንግጐ ሣለ አንዳንድ ክልሎች በራሣቸው ውሣኔ ጊዜውን እንዲያጥር ማድረግ፣
- ያለ ህግ አግባብ ቅድመ ዕውቅናና ዕውቅናን መሻር፣

- አዲሱ የቴክኒክና ሙያ ካሪኩለም ካስቀመጠው እሣቤ ውጭ ተቋማት እንደገና ዕውቅና እንዲጠይቁ ማድረግና በርቀት ዘርፍ እያንዳንዱን ሞጁል እንዲያስገመግሙ ጥያቄ ማቅረብ፣
- በአዲሱ የቴክኒክና ሙያ ዘርፍ መንግሥት ሠልጣኞች ተግባራዊ ልምምድ እንዲያደርጉና ለዚህም ተቋማት ትብብር የማድረግ ግዴታ እንዳለባቸው ቢያዝም በጤናው መስክ የሥራ ላይ ልምምድ ለሚያደርጉ ሠልጣኞች 'የልምምድና ፎኩቴ' ክፍያ በአንዳንድ ክልሎችና የመንግስት ሆስፒታሎች መጠየቁ፣
- በአጠቃላይ የአስፈላሚ አካላት የተጠያቂነት ወሰን ያለመኖርና ችግሮች ሲፈጠሩ ሰሚ አካል ማጣት፤በዘርፉ የተሰማሩ ተቋማትም አስፈላሚ አካላትን የሚገመግሙበት ሥርዓት ያለመኖር

5. <u>የመመሪያዎች ድንገተኛነት፣ ወቅታዊ ያለመሆን፣ ፈጥኖ መለዋወጥና የተዘበራረቀ መሆን</u>

የትምህርት ተቋማት ራሣቸውን በየጊዜው እያሻሻሉና እየለወጡ መሄድ የሚገባቸው ሲሆን ከየዕለት ሥራዎቻቸው በተጨማሪ ሰፊ የረዥም ጊዜ ትልም አውጥተው ሊንቀሣቀሱ እንደሚገባ እሙን ነው። ነገር ግን በዚህ ዘርፍ የሚታየው የመመሪያዎች ድንገተኛነትና ለውጥ ዘርፉ የተረጋጋ እንዳይሆን እያደረገ ነው። ለምሣሌ ያህል፣

- መሠረታዊ በሆነ ደረጃ የካሪኩለም ለውጦች ከ2-3 ዓመታት ባሉ አጭር ጊዜ ውስጥ ስለሚለዋወጡ ተቋማት ለስትፍኛ ብክነትና ወጪ ይዳረጋሉ።
- በጤናው መስክ የነርስነት ስልጠናን በተመለከተ በአጭር ጊዜ ውስጥ በተዛፈ ደብዳቤ በ10+1 እና 10+2 ደረጃ የሚሰጡ ስልጠናዎችን እንዲያቆሙና በማታ የሚሰለጥኑ ሰልጠኞችን ወደ ቀን እንዲያዞሩ ተቋማት አፋጣኝ ትዕዛዝ ተሰጥቷቸዋል።
- ከ10+3 የሙያ ስልጠና ወደ ዲግሪ ፕሮግራም መሸጋገር እንደማይቻል መመሪያ ቢኖርም ይህ መመሪያ ከግብርና የቴክኒክና ሙያ ትምህርት የሚመረቁ ሰልጣኞችን አይመለከትም፣ የዚህ የአሠራር ልዩነት ምንጭ ምን እንደሆነም ግልፅ አይደለም።
- ያለአንዳች ቅድመ ማስጠንቀቂያ በቂ የዝግጅት ጊዜ ሣይሰጥ "የግል የመምህራን ትምህርት ሠልጣኞችን መንግሥት አይቀጥርም" የሚል መመሪያ በመውጣቱ ለአንዳንድ ተቋማት መዘጋትና ለብዙዎቹ ለኪሣራ መዳረግ ምክንያት ሆኗል።
- ሀገሪቷ በምትሰጣቸው ተመሣሣይ የሥልጠና መስኮች ለሚደረጉ ሰልጣኞች ከቅበላ መሥፈርት አንስቶ፣ የሰልጣኝ ቁጥር፣ የመማሪያ ክፍል መጠን ወዘተ የተለያዩ ክልሎች የተለያየ መመሪያ ያላቸው መሆኑና ይህም ወደፊት በሠራተኞች ዝውውር ላይ ሊፈጥረው የሚችለው ተፅዕኖ መኖሩ።
- የግሉ ዘርፍ አዳዲስ አሠራሮችንና አካሄዶችን እያጠና በፍጥነት ተግባራዊ ሊያደርጋቸው በሚፈልጋቸው ተግባራት ላይ የመንግሥት አካላት ፈጣን ውሣኔ ያለመስጠት ችግሮች ይስተዋላሉ። ለምሣሌ፡- በቅርቡ የሀገራችን የግል የርቀት ትምህርት ተቋማት በውጭ ለሚኖሩ ኢትዮጵያውያን የፈጠሩት የትምህርት ዕድል "መመሪያ እስኪዘጋጅ አቁሙ" በሚል ትዕዛዝ እንዲቆም ተደርጓል።
- ሰፊ የሥራ ልምድ ያላቸው በሣል ተማሪዎች (adult/matured learners) የሚዳኙት ለመደበኛ ተማሪዎች በወጡ የቅበላ ህጐች በመሆኑ የህይወት ተሞክሮና የሥራ ልምዳቸውን ያገናዘበና የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ዕድል የሚከፍትላቸው ሥርዓት መዘርጋት አልተቻለም።

6. <u>የግሉ ዘርፍ በሚገመገምበት የመመዘኛ ሥርዓትና አፈፃፀም ላይ የሚታዩ ችግሮች</u>

የአንድ ሀገር የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ዘርፍ የሚገባውን ውጤት እንዲሰጥ በተቋማት ላይ አስፈላጊው ግምገማ በየወቅቱ መካሄድ እንዳለበት ቢታመንም በዚህ ረገድ የሚሠሩ ሥራዎች ከፍተኛ ጥንቃቄ የሚፈልጉ ናቸው። በዚህ ደረጃ ከሚታዩ ዋና ዋና ችግሮች መካከል፣

- የመገምገሚያ መሥፈርቶች የሀገሪቱን ሁኔታ ፍፁም ያላገናዘቡ የሚሆኑበት ጊዜ አለ። ለምሣሌ- አንድ የዲግሪ ሥልጠና የሚሰጥ ተቋም 20% ፒኤችዲ፣ 30% ኤምኤ እንዲሁም 50% የቢኤ/ቢኤስሲ ደረጃ ያላቸው መምህራን እንዲኖሩት ሲጠየቅ ይህ በአሁኑ ወቅት ሀገሪቷ በመንግሥት ዩኒቨርስቲዎች ደረጃ እንኳን የሌላት ጥንቅር ነው። በሌሎች ግብዐቶች /ለምሳሌ፡ ህንፃ፣ የክፍል መጠን፣ ወዘተ/ ዙሪያ ያሉት መሥፈርቶችም እጅግ የተጋነኑና ሀገራችንና ዘርፉ ባለበት ደረጃ ሊሟሉ የሚያዳግቱ ናቸው።
- በተለያየ ደረጃ የሚገኙ ገምጋሚ አካላት የዕውቀት፣ የልምድና የብቃት ችግሮች የሚታይባቸው ከመሆኑም በላይ በቁጥር አናሣ በመሆናቸው በማያውቋቸው የሥልጠና መስኮች ጭምር ብያኔ የሚያስተላልፉባቸው ወቅቶችና በመንግሥት የተደነገጉ የዕውቅና መስጫ ጊዜያትን ባለማክበር ተቋማትን ለችግር የሚዳርጉባቸው ጊዜያቶች አሉ።
- ዘመናዊ የአሠራር ስልቶችንና ዓለም የደረሰበትን ደረጃ የማያገናዝቡ የዕውቅና መመሪያዎች የሚፈጥሩት ችግር አለ። ለምሣሌ፡- በሲዲ ደረጃ ያሉ መፅሃፍቶች እንደመፅሃፍት እንደማይታዩ በሀገር አቀፍ ደረጃ በቴክኒክና ሙያ ትምህርት ዘርፍ የዕውቅና መመሪያ ላይ ወጥቷል።
- አንዳንድ ገምጋሚ አካላት ዘርፉን ከማበረታታት ይልቅ የትርፍ ማጋበሻ ዘርፍ አድርገው በማየትና አሉታዊ አመለካከቶችን በተደጋጋሚ በማንፀባረቅ ህዝቡና ተማሪዎች እምነት እንዳይኖራቸው፤ ባለሀብቶችም በመሸማቀቅ እንዲኖሩ ያደርጋሉ።
- አንዳንድ ገምጋሚዎች በአላስፈላጊ የዝቅጠት (Corruption) ተግባራት ላይ ተዘፍቀው በመገኘታቸው ወገናዊነትና አድልዎ እንዲኖር በማድረግ ዘርፉ ተገቢውን ክብር እንዳይጐናፀፍ የራሣቸውን አስተዋፅኦ እያበረከቱ ነው።

ክቡር ጠቅላይ ሚኒስትር

ከዚህ በላይ የተመለከቱት ችግሮች ተገቢውን መፍትሄ እንዲያገኙ ለአስፈላጊ አካላት መመሪያ ከመስጠት በተጨማሪ በዘላቂነት ዘርፉ የሚያድግበትን ትልም (Road Map) መንግሥት ነድፎ መንቀሣቀሱ አስፈላጊ መሆኑን የምናምንበት ሲሆን በዚህ ረገድ ማኅበራችን ከመንግሥት ጐን በመሰለፍ የሚጠበቅበትን ድርሻ ለመወጣት ዝግጁ መሆኑን በዚህ አጋጣሚ ልንገልፅ እንወዳለን።

ከሠላምታ ጋር

የኢትዮጵያ የግል የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት

የሥራ አመራር ቦርድ

Declaration

I, the under signed declare that this is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all source of materials used for this thesis are duly acknowledged.

Name: Tsegaye W/Giorgis

Signature _____

Date: July, 2008

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as university advisor

Name: Seyoum Teferra (Prof.)

Signature: _____

Date : July, 2008