Quality Matters

In this Issue

Quote of this issue

Quality assurance and governance share several key issues namely; defining the mission, the institutional structure, planning, participation, and transparency, therefore, good governance is expected to improve the quality of the service being provided and enables higher education institutions to the better competition.(Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 1995).

This newsletter is published every three months by the Center for Educational Improvement and Quality Assurance (CEIQA) of St Mary's University (SMU). The objective of the newsletter is to inform the SMU community as well as interested public, private, non-governmental stakeholders about the activities and endeavors of the institution in fostering quality education and research in the Ethiopian Higher Education setting.

- -

From the Editorial Desk

Quality Education is a key component for an overall growth and development of social, economic and political development of a country. Economically, quality education improves the productive capacity of society, because the ability of a nation for the application of modern technology in industry and agriculture is highly determined by the quality of its human capital (Hallak, 1990:46).

It is known that, governance has become a major influential tool for improving quality in all aspects of higher education. Meanwhile, (Fabrice Henard, and Alexander Mitterle, (1999) said that quality assurance has increased worldwide with a view to addressing the balance between autonomy granted to institutions and accountability. The need for good governance has dominated the debate on the effectiveness of higher education. The need has increased with growing institutional autonomy and the expansion of university missions. According to the website, www.oecd.org/edu/imhe, in several countries, this development has been accompanied by the emergence of guidelines for establishments, drawn up on the initiative of governments or university organizations. Since the start of the millennium, most countries have created national or regional quality assurance systems and prepared codes or principles that include institutional governance.

Achieving quality in education has increasingly become crucial in strategic improvement plans of developing countries. While the concept of quality and its priority indicators may differ from country to country, it is commonly considered as a determining factor in facilitating the implementation of education for all

1

initiatives (Boissiere, 2004; World Bank Independent Evaluation Group, 2006). Quality in education is also viewed as an influential factor in implementing plans for bridging the poverty gaps between the developing and the developed worlds. At the centre of strategies for accelerating the achievement of quality education is effective leadership at all levels of the education system.

The nature and scope of country context initiatives that aim at enhancing quality leadership for implementing quality education in developing countries is critical to our understanding of how global quality initiatives impact on local policy practices. Unarguably, the central issue facing educational policy makers and practitioners in the developing world is one of matching the imperatives for quantitative expansion of educational provision with the need to ensure the quality of the education provided for those children who do enter the school environment.

AsLeu & Price-Rom (2006) have suggested, 'Educational quality in developing countries has become a topic of intense interest, primarily because of countries' efforts to maintain quality…in the context of quantitative expansion of educational provision…Whether explicit or implicit, a vision of educational quality is always embedded within countries' policies and programs'.

There are challenges and identified direct effect on quality of higher education with regard to governance and leadership. According to Patil and Gaikwad (International Research Journal of Science & IT Management, Volume: 01, Number: 03, Jan-2012), the following are higher education challenges and identified direct effect on quality of higher education:

To Increase the enrollments, to reduce the dropout rate , to provide free and fair education to enrolled students, to use advanced tools and techniques for learners, to use distance education mode effectively for learners, use of ICT, and proper control from government bodies to maintain quality.

The governance and leadership should be dynamic to handle the problems of the organizations and train the students on the areas in which the present companies are facing through their syllabus and preparing the course content in such a way that they are giving the first hand information to the learners. The following points, which have direct effect on quality of the higher education, are also identified by Patil and Anil (ibid):

1) Regulatory Bodies and Regulations to Higher Education,
2) Polices framed by State Governments.
3) Participation of Stakeholders in Quality Enhancement.
4) Dynamism in Leadership at various levels of Education.
5) Best Practices followed at the governance and leadership level.
6) Mission and Vision which is converted into achievable goals.
7) Participation from Students and Faculty to implement the objectives and,
8) Risk handling capacity of the top management.

Furthermore, the authors have suggested the following feasible solutions for Higher Education in Quality Enhancement:

➢ Strict control over various Institutions which do not maintain quality.
➢ Motivate students to enroll in Higher Education.
➢ Use knowledge centric exam system then using only marks system exam at various levels o f education system.
➢ Help poor learners by providing financial assistance.
➢ Adopt earn and learn system for all courses at higher education.
➢ Use of various advanced techniques for teaching and learning.
➢ Personal counseling at school level to motivate them to continue learning till post graduate level

Based on this, SMU has tried to bring good governance and leadership by changing its old structure and implementing the new modern structure and by developing new policies, rules and regulations. Besides, SMU participates in different community services, such as helping financially challenged learners by assuring scholarship grants, providing tailored educational trainings for Addis Ababa sub city educational offices, giving financial support for different regional elementary and high schools, and providing supplementary English reading books for Addis Ababa primary schools. etc.

This newsletter focuses on good governance and leadership in higher education.

Enjoy reading it.

Reference

Boissiere M. (2004) Determinants of Primary Education Outcomes in Developing Countries. World Bank, Washington DC.

Leu E. & Price-Rom A. (2006) Quality Education and Teacher Learning: a Review of the Literature. United States Agency for International Development, Washington DC.

World Bank Independent Evaluation Group (2006) From Schooling Access to Learning Outcomes: An Unfinished Agenda. An Evaluation of World Bank Support to Primary Education. World Bank, Washington DC.

Hallak, J. (1990) Investing in the Future: Setting Educational Objectives in the Developing World. paris: pergamon press PLC.

Quality Matters

If you have comments on this issue of the newsletter or would like to contribute to future issues, please contact our office on 011 553 79 99, 011 553 80 01 Ext 145

Email: ceiqa@smuc.edu.et

Virtual Links

Ethiopian Ministry of Education
Web site: http:// www.moe.gov.et
Higher Education Relevance and Quality Agency (Ethiopia)
Website: www.higher.edu.et
PROPHE- Programme for Research on Private Higher Education
Website: www.albany.edu/dept/eaps/prophe/
International Network for Quality Assurance Agency in Higher Education (INQAAHE)
Website: http: // www.inqaahe.org
Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (UK)
Website: http://www.qaa.ac.uk
Center for International Research on Higher Education
Website: http://bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe
Quality and Standards Authority of Ethiopia
Website: http://www.qsae.org/
International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa
Website: http://www.eric.ed.gov
International Network for Higher Education in Africa (NHEA)
Website: http://www.bc.edu
European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
Website: http://www.enqa.eu
Asian Pacific Quality Network
Website: http://www.apqn.org

PERSPECTIVE
Higher Education Governance is a Key Policy

Adugnaw Alamneh
(Senior researcher, SMU, CEIQA)

According to Kohler (2005) proposed an approximate definition of (good) higher education governance as: that institutional set-up and those processes at strategic level of both higher education and research institutions and of national and international systems which are concerned with the identification, validation, and realization of those prerequisites and consequences.

The culture and those steering devices which relate to institutional autonomy and individual freedom in their contexts with public responsibility of the institution to be governed, and which must be described and developed for the sake of maintaining and enhancing benefits with regard to the well-being of individuals and society. Furthermore, Kohler (2005) stated that traditional academic values and objectives, quality and quality assurance, institutional positioning, effectiveness and efficiency of mass higher education and Advanced research in democratic societies based on expert competence on inclusion and participation, on the rule of law, on the freedom of ethically responsible individuals, and on mutual respect and to add the belief of "good" governance to the definition of governance of higher education.

Higher education governance is a key policy issue of the 21st century, (Kennedy, 2003). Governance arrangements and governance issues addressed in quality guiding principles play a similar role in creating institutions more effective. Governance provisions concentrate on providing a reliable setting out of which competitive but culturally diverse institutions can take place. Their main aim is to clarify institutional structures and procedures. Mainly the governing panel seems to be the beneficiary for such arrangements. This is obvious in the significance set on the role and composition of the governing panel members, their relationships to the institutional administration and stakeholders and the appropriate delegation of authority toward committees and chairs. This is because governing members should play a major role in defining institutional responsibilities and have an important supervisory function concerning the institution. The inclusion of extra-institutional members into the work of the governing board and their honesty concerning their assigned role are vital to ensure the well-functioning of the institution and hence public trust.

The advisory character of the arrangements is further visible in frequent cross-referencing to relevant documentation and laws in order to outline the framework on which higher education institutions can be built and sustained. Questions of risk management as well as the development of ethical and academic values conclude this thrive for good institutional governance. (Kennedy, 2003). Furthermore, governance issues in quality address similar aspects, and good governance, however, sets a stronger attention on the planning processes and the promotion of a quality culture. In fact, while governance arrangements clarify on the fundamentals of good institutional governance, most of the reviewed quality guiding

4

principles focus less on the institutional setting and more on the improvement of practical aspects. This is explicit in the emphasis set on the formulation and sound implementation of an institutional mission as well as the participatory inclusion of stakeholders and actors in decision making procedures. Similar to the governance arrangements ethical values and transparency are underlined. Even though some structural differences can be seen between the ways governance is addressed in several of the quality guiding principles (notably European) and governance arrangements, the detailed structure of the US-American quality guidelines in a way eliminate clear differences, (Witte, 2008). The difference is hence less apparent in the content but in the role they play in higher education. It is clear that most governance arrangements are advisory in nature, which allows the institution to use them in its own way. To some extent, they represent a careful approach to help institutions progress without hampering the diversity of higher education. In comparison, quality guiding principles have a rather binding character and may demand compliance from institutions looking for full accreditation, (Witte, 2008). Furthermore, ultimately quality guidelines endorse an external position on how the assessed university should work, although the criteria against which effective governance will be assessed remain undefined. Some may become quite strict (remarkably for program accreditation) and leave little breathing space to institutions. Acceptance of these quality frameworks implies acceptance of the criteria used by the quality assurance agency, the ministry and institutions. At this point the mentioned tension between stronger institutional autonomy and external control becomes quite clear, While governance arrangements by law are reduced, the development of a regionally and culturally embedded governance structure may be hampered through new restraining quality instruments (Singh, 2007).

Such an approach to governance would just produce another regulatory instrument next to funding, planning and steering (Ingram, 2004). The issues addressed cumulate in twelve principles to be embraced by Higher education governing panel members:

Setting mission and purposes, Appointing the president or chancellor, Supporting the chief executive, Monitoring the chief executive's performance, Assessing board performance, Insisting on strategic planning, Reviewing educational and public-service programs, Ensuring adequate resources, Ensuring good management, Preserving institutional independence, Relating campus to community and community to campus, Serving as a court of appeal (very selectively and carefully).

Besides, (HEA/IUA, 2007) has stated also about the basic doctrine which should strengthen all codes of governance as follows: Openness and transparency, Selflessness, Honesty, Leadership, Fairness, Integrity, Independence, Accountability, Objectivity, Efficiency and Effectiveness and Value for money. Furthermore, (HEA/IUA, 2007,) clearly stated that good governance should be seen as an aid to effectiveness, not to inhibit enterprise or innovation. Governance in higher education refers to the way in which institutions are organized and operate internally and their relationships with external entities with a view to securing the objectives of higher education as a realm of enquiry and critique. In other words, governance in higher education refers to the internal structure, organization and management of autonomous institutions.

According to the authors, we can conclude that good governance promotes educational quality. However, traditions of governance vary from country to country and by type of institution. It is also suggested by scholars a set of basic principles that promote good governance across a wide variety of situations. Unfortunately, these

principles are frequently not observed, especially in developing countries, and especially where traditions of higher education are still not firmly established. The website wwwtfhe.net /report/ has therefore offered a number of tools that will help higher education systems and institutions move closer to the application of these principles. Good governance may be a critical, but it is not a universal remedy. In many parts of the world, pedagogy takes the form of canned lectures by professors and rote memorization by students; cheating is out of control and tolerated; and letters of recommendation are for sale. Shared governance does not guarantee quality if an oppressive majority is determined to prevent progress. Perhaps most importantly, quality is not likely to be achieved as long as professors are forced to moonlight as a consequence of inadequate pay. Therefore, we hope that higher education policymakers will start to make better use of the tools of good governance. They will not solve all problems quickly. But they will start the process of achieving sustainable and far-reaching improvement.

REFERENCES

HEA/IUA (2007), Governance of Irish Universities. A Governance Code of Legislation, Principles, Best Practice and Guidelines, Higher Education Authority and Irish Universities Association, Dublin.

Kennedy, K. J. (2003), ─Higher Education Governance as a Key Policy Issue in the 21st Century,‖ in Educational Research for Policy and Practice, Vol. 2, No. 1, Springer Netherlands, pp. 55-70.

Singh, M. (2007), ─The Governance of Accreditation, in GUNI (ed.), Higher Education in the World 2007 – Accreditation for Quality Assurance: What is at Stake? Guni Series on the Social Commitment of Universities 2, Global University Network for Innovation, pp. 96 108.

Witte, J. (2008), ─The Changing Political Framework of Quality Assurance in German Higher Education: National Debates in the European Context, in A. Beso et al.

(eds.) Implementing and Using Quality Assurance: Strategy and Practice. A Selection of papers from the 2nd European Quality Assurance Forum, European University Association, Brussels.

Kohler, J., 2005, 'Introduction to the Conference: purpose, programme, and expectations' presentation at the conference on Higher Education Governance Between Democratic Culture, Academic Aspirations And Market Forces.

RESEARCH CORNER
The effect of Institutional Leadership on Quality of Higher Education Provision

Evelyn Chiyevo Garwe

Zimbabwe Council for Higher Education (ZIMCHE)

ABSTRACT

The study was carried out with the aim of examining the effect of institutional leadership on the quality of educational provision in higher education institutions in Zimbabwe. The study analyzed the indicators determining provision of quality higher education in state and private universities and how they are influenced by institutional leadership. The major techniques used were documentary analysis, questionnaires, interviews and direct observation. The results showed that institutional leaders who promote intellectual growth of both staff and students and who create a culture of learning make it easy for their institutions to uphold high quality standards. The study also highlighted the need for an effective national quality assurance agency in making sure institutions are supported in the global quest for quality. Key words: institutional leadership, quality, higher education provision Research in Higher Education Journal the effect of institutional leadership.

INTRODUCTION

The vital role that higher education plays in the development of the society has been highly acknowledged. (Mustard, 1998). Muhammed, et. al., (2011) observed that with the arrival of knowledge based economies and globalization, higher education has become more important, and in particular the quality of education is critical to national development. Quality is at the top of most agendas and improving quality is the most important task facing any higher education institution (Sallis, 2002). The need for quality was brought about by the global trends in higher education, such as mystification, funding reduction, adoption of new public management ideals with their stress on the accountability and efficiency domains, brought about by the taxpayer backlash (Alexander, 2000), the rapid growth of the Internet, increasing internationalization of higher education, new relations and forms of relations with the state, and the adoption of market mechanisms and competition (Van schalkwyk, 2011). Higher education in Zimbabwe also faced similar quality challenges that lead to the establishment of the Zimbabwe Council for Higher Education (ZIMCHE) to guarantee and maintain quality. ZIMCHE recognizes that quality assurance is the primary responsibility of individual universities and has described Vice Chancellors as the gatekeepers of quality (Chetsanga, 2011); hence the need to advocate for stronger and visionary leaders in universities. It is also critical to have leaders in universities who are capable of turning their visions into reality. There exists a multitude of definitions of leadership, but for the purpose of this study, the definition by Van Schalkwyk (2011), be adequate. He defined leadership as the mobilization and influencing of people to work towards a common goal through the building of interpersonal relationships and the breaking of tradition to achieve the organization's objectives regardless of risk and uncertainty. Kouzes andPosner (2007) found that this is achieved by engaging in the following leadership practices: modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act and encouraging the heart. Weese (1996) and Lim and Cromartie (2001) found a significant correlation between leadership and organizational effectiveness. Indeed many researchers agree that institutional leadership is the key to

7

improving quality (Goetsch and Davis, 2006; Hellriegel et al., 2006 and Evans, 2011). Gibbs et. al., (2009); and Murphy, (2005) state that leadership plays a fundamental role in the success of higher education institutions and is a critical factor in sustaining and improving the quality and performance of universities. University leaders must understand new challenges that affect quality delivery including the new regulatory requirements instituted by quality assurance agencies and be able to effectively restructure in order to ensure that standards and quality of educational provisions are being maintained. Shahmandi et. al., (2011) urged university leaders to improve their leadership competencies to enable their institutions to survive and continuously develop. These competencies include leadership skills, communication skills, persuasive skills and professional skills. Yang (2005) identified four categories of leadership competencies namely: personality and disposition, personal knowledge and skill, administrative competency and social responsibility competency. However, Bargh, Scott and Smith (1996) and Rowley (1997) observed that university Vice Chancellors that were appointed were usually prominent academics who did not possess any formal training beyond their academic credentials, achievements and experiences in the academia. In the face of the challenges facing higher education today, there is need for a standard shift and appointing a new kind of university leaders capable of navigating our new complex environment. Bryman (2009) and Gibbs et. al., (2009) recognize that effective university leadership evolved to be more explicitly associated with specific indicators and practices. Middlehurst et. al., (2009) advocated for transformational leadership in higher education. Transformational leadership detaches itself from the concept of having one super leader and embraces delegation of responsibilities and constant monitoring and dialogue. Anderson and Johnson (2006) and Bolden et. al. (2008) acknowledge that this style of leadership is highly appropriate for the higher education sector because of its focus on shared accountability thus enhancing the hierarchical structures that exist in higher education. Martin et. al. (2003) found a strong link between transformational leadership and the quality of student learning processes and outcomes.

The foregoing highlighted the need for university leaders to guarantee provision of quality university education through effective leadership. In neighboring South Africa, the former Minister of Education, Mrs. Naledi Pand indicated that South Africa had a shortage of effective educational leaders. According to her, most of the leaders could not formulate strategic plans or formulate perspectives that will lead to success (Niemann and Kotze, 2006). Sadly, no study has been carried out in Zimbabwe to determine the link between university leadership and quality of educational provision. Based on the critical indicators that determine provision of quality higher education, this study sought to establish the extent to which university leaders in selected universities have played their role in quality assurance. It was hypothesized that effective governance and leadership will have a positive impact on service quality in universities. This will thus impact on the competitive advantage which, in turn, will then lead to the long-term sustainability of the institution.

METHODOLOGY

There were nine public and six private registered universities in Zimbabwe when the study was undertaken. The researcher used documentary analysis and direct observation over a period of five years as the basis of selecting two public and two private universities to include in the study. This study was based on a descriptive methodology. The target population for this study consisted of a cross-section junior to senior level academic and non-teaching staff

as well as students from two public universities and two private universities. The perceptions of staff concerning their Vice Chancellor were closely studied to identify the Vice Chancellor's commitment and contribution to quality of educational provision. The data collection took six (6) months with a total of 186 responses (161 questionnaires and 25 interviews) from designated staff (Pro Vice Chancellors, Registrar, Bursar and Librarian), Deans, Academics, Directors, Heads of both academic and non-teaching departments and students. Self-administered questionnaires were distributed to collect individual data on the respondents. Overall the response rate was 85 percent. In addition to the questionnaires, interviews using open-ended questions were posed to enable participants to express their views. This was done for triangulation purposes in order to validate the responses from questionnaires. Although all participants answered to the same set of questions, there was flexibility to probe and explore issues that could surface during the interview as recommended by Merriam (1998). The interview protocols were based on the same questions posed in the questionnaire and consisted of seven semi-structured, open-ended questions in the endeavor to gain insights into the respondents' perceptions on university leadership's contribution to quality.

The following questions were propounded:

1. How do you rate your Vice Chancellor in relation to his commitment to the realization of the organization's vision and mission?
2. Is staff generally satisfied with their jobs and the university climate?
3. How concerned is the Vice Chancellor about staff development and encouraging others to improve their skills and abilities?
4. What are your comments on the quality of university facilities and equipment?
5. What do you think should be done to maintain academic quality?
6. How responsive is the Vice Chancellor to changes brought about by ZIMCHE?
7. Comment on the effectiveness of the university governance and leadership.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study identified six major issues that university Vice Chancellors had to tackle with in order to ensure quality of educational provision. These are:

1 Maintaining institutional quality

2 Recruitment and retention of experienced staff

3. Complying with the regulatory requirements on quality assurance

4. Securing funds for university core business and operations

5. Inadequate and inappropriate university facilities

6. Providing effective governance and leadership

Maintaining institutional quality

With the advent of ZIMCHE, all the four universities under study had implemented systematic and formalized internal/institutional quality assurance processes in line with the assertion by Burke & Minassians (2001) that these result in increased efficiency and accountability within higher education institutions. This view was also supported by Vaira (2007) who averred that the main thrust of formal quality assurance is to stimulate, attain and increase systems' and institutions' effectiveness, efficiency, cost savings, quality and transparency towards stakeholders

interested and involved in it. The quality management systems thus developed by the universities under study focused on quality assurance and self-evaluation at all levels in accordance to the standards set up by the national quality assurance agency, ZIMCHE. ZIMCHE provided the external assessment to ensure quality of the educational processes in each university. The universities together with ZIMCHE focused on the development of a culture of organizational excellence that is meant to impact on staff and stakeholder satisfaction and the society at large. The findings revealed that although no quality assurance policies were in place yet, all the Vice Chancellors had to set clearly defined strategies on quality assurance and incorporate these in their strategic plans. The two public universities had each employed a Director responsible for quality assurance. The Directors were busy establishing fully-fledged quality assurance units in accordance to the regulatory requirements. However, the two private universities were yet to establish quality assurance units but they were willing to do so as evidenced by the establishment of Quality Committees chaired by the Vice Chancellors. One of the private universities had incorporated the quality dimension in the theme of their 2012-2015 Strategic plans ("Growth with Quality") as a way of continuously reminding staff of the importance of embracing quality. Some of the issues that were brought up as challenges in the maintenance of quality include:

a) **Respondents criticized the continued increase in student enrolments in some of the programs citing that this practice had a negative bearing on quality.** Cases were given where in one of the state universities a single intake for the Accountancy degree had 365 students. Traditionally the entry requirements for entry into that degree program were inclined at a very high level of at least 12 advanced ('A') Level Research in Higher Education Journal. However, the current Vice Chancellor lowered these points to at least four 'A' Level points. The argument proffered was that observation over several years had shown that entry points had no bearing on the subsequent performance of students. Consequently, as long as the prospective student met the minimum requirements for entry into the university (two 'A'Level points obtained from at least two 'A' Level subjects) and satisfied other requirements, they were eligible for entry into programs of their choice. However, respondents were of the opinion that the major reason for increasing enrolment was for fund-raising purposes. Accordingly, they expressed a need to strike a balance between competing demands such as access, resource mobilization and maintenance of academic quality. Raising the entry requirements of students will result in lower enrolment numbers and better learning environment hence ensuring quality of delivery. Zezekwa & Mudavanhu (2011) averred that differences in entry qualifications for a particular university course maybe strong predictors of students' educational performance.

b) **The excessive teaching loads impacted negatively on the quantity and quality of research by lecturers and yet the promotion criterion was largely based on the quality and quantum of research.** Some lecturing staff also complained that they were undertaking a lot of administrative work at the expense of academic work and research. They challenged Vice Chancellors to identify a sustainable and collaborative model which balances the needs of administrative demands and quality of delivery. This was consistent with findings by Garcia-Gallego et.al (2012) that quality of university teaching is positively affected by published research and that higher teaching loads decrease teaching quality. They also found that administrative duties interfere with quality of teaching if these duties do not entail a compensating reduction in teaching loads.

c) **Vice Chancellors from private universities were accused of failing to actively embrace staff and students' ideas and feedbacks.** This behavior de-motivated staff and negatively impacted on quality. Staff also felt that their leaders were not promoting the notion of academic freedom. Barnett (1990) advocated for the expansion of the definition of academic freedom from its narrow definition of staff immunity from censorship towards a universal freedom to present and to criticize ideas. Interviewees refrained from expressing their opinions about their Vice Chancellors citing fear of intimidation and lack of appreciation of their views. Ong (2012) found that repression of ideas and opinions by top management came in the form of threat of dismissal or questioning the competency of the staff to handle a particular task. He also discovered that fear of discrimination by university leaders discourage staff from discussing openly important subject matters which could promote critical thinking about controversial ideas. The massive brain-drain experienced in Zimbabwean universities during the years of economic turmoil (2005-2009) resulted in serious loss of expertise, skills and institutional memory with medicine, applied sciences and engineering the worst affected disciplines (Machawira, 2009). According to the study, these losses of highly qualified staff in universities were reflected in the low percentage (7.9%) of lecturing staff with doctoral degrees. The current study found a remarkable improvement in recruitment of highly qualified and experienced staff in public universities. They had more PhD degree holders among their academic staff than private universities and presumably a higher calibre of lecturers than the latter when this is adjudged by the number of doctorate vis-à-vis those with Research in Higher Education Journal. Private universities found it difficult to attract experienced and well qualified staff due to the lower salaries, absence of non-salary incentives and generally poor working conditions prevalent in private universities. Whilst the government increased remuneration for staff in state universities, private universities failed to do the same as they rely on funds from tuition fees and well wishers. The private institutions are characterized by a strong complement of part-time staff, with several of the part-time staff being full-time employees at public universities and in industry. For instance, at one private university, 65% of the academic staff was part time. Both public and private universities were involved in implementing conscious and serious professional development plans for staff as a way of motivating them and improving quality. Staff members were involved in determining the content of the plans. These plans outlined the support provided for various staff developmental activities including the following:

1. Scholarships for attainment of higher degrees

2. Support for foreign training on specific aspects related to members jobs

3. Support for attendance at conferences, workshops, seminars and meetings

4. Staff exchanges programs

5. Contact and sabbatical leave

6. Support for publishing scholarly work

7. Exposure to administrative opportunities e.g. Departmental Chairs were on two-year rotational basis. In addition to this ZIMCHE offered opportunities for university staff members to be appointed as peer reviewers. These were given assignments in their areas of expertise and were responsible for accreditation, registration, setting benchmarks and assessing foreign qualifications. ZIMCHE's requirement for engaging only peer reviewers with at least eight publications motivated staff members to meet this requirement and at the same time this

improved their quality of research and teaching. ZIMCHE also provided an opportunity for staff members to interact, research and showcase their innovations through the Research and Intellectual Expo which is an annual event. In this respect, the university leaders and ZIMCHE should be applauded for creating a conducive environment in line with findings by Shahmandi et. al. (2011) that the most significant function of an institution higher education is its leadership effectiveness in creating a pleasant environment which promotes good quality of education.

Complying with the regulatory requirements on quality assurance special mention is made of the Vice Chancellor from one of the public universities under study. Respondents gave an account of how the Vice Chancellor spearheaded implementation of quality assurance processes as soon as ZIMCHE was established. The Vice Chancellor, being a member of the ZIMCHE Council, took it upon himself to transform his institution in line with the regulatory requirements. Several meetings were held involving staff and students to discuss quality matters and to formulate appropriate strategies. The Vice Chancellor proactively organized a workshop on quality assurance where officials from ZIMCHE were invited to facilitate. This was able to put the university community in the picture of the emerging global trends and the required changes. The attribute of the Vice Chancellor in this respect was similar to the one described by Jansen (2000) as that of a transformational leader who involves everybody in the transformation process and ensures that they acquire the necessary skills and training to participate effectively in the change process. In her study on studied leadership competencies of Mexican institutions of higher learning, Gonzalez (2004) found that national policies and trends demanded leaders with a broad understanding of the national situation, with the resources to support the national initiative, and with the ability to make appropriate responses in their own institutions. In the other three universities, staff and students only became aware of what was happening in the quality assurance showground when ZIMCHE officials held quality assurance workshops at their universities in order to make staff aware of the new regulatory framework. These workshops were very useful as they managed to put to an end the apparent lack of transparency and the absence of useful information concerning the quality assurance processes and guideline. Prior to these workshops, Vice Chancellors would intimidate staff by telling them that ZIMCHE would fire them for lack of compliance without giving full details. In some instances lectures were fired on the pretext that ZIMCHE had decreed so when in actual fact it was the Vice Chancellors who, for reasons known to them, wanted to relieve them from their duties. Securing funds for university core business and operations all the four universities experienced serious financial difficulties. In respect of state universities, treasury allocations fell far short of the institutional requirements. Student fees seemed to be one of the main sources of institutions' expected income. Private universities received funds from other sources, but respondents were reluctant to reveal the exact amounts generated from these sources. Public universities were fortunate in that the salaries for staff were paid by Treasury whereas in private universities they paid from own resources and these salaries tended to be at least 40% lower than those paid in public universities. Inadequate and inappropriate university facilities in all the universities, the buildings and other facilities used for learning purposes were inadequate, unsuitable for institutions' needs, or incomplete. One of the state universities used inherited infrastructure that was not commensurate with their mandate. The second state university under study and the two private universities were far from completing the construction of required infrastructure, and thus faced a shortage of essential structures.

The building structures that were not available in sufficient quantities or sizes were student halls of residence, dining halls, libraries, lecture rooms, theatres and seminar or tutorial rooms, student union blocks, student and staff clinics, office complexes, laboratories and workshops, and sports and recreational facilities. Poor ICT connectivity was prevalent in the private universities, had a negative impact on teaching and learning as well as for their operations. Generally, equipment required for teaching, learning, administrative processes, sporting, and social activities were in short supply. Providing effective leadership respondents from the two private universities and one public university were concerned that their Vice Chancellors were always travelling on the pretext of attending conferences, workshops and other events beneficial to the institution, when in actual fact they were enriching themselves at the expense of the institution. A very interesting and opposing view was given by respondents from the second public university. They stated that it was important for the Vice Chancellor to travel widely as this brought the following benefits to the institution.

a) The leader marketed his institution abroad. Each time he came back he would have networked and obtained scholarships, exchange programs and opportunities for his staff and students.

b) A lot of staff members with PhDs had been recruited from abroad after they had initially interacted   and were courted and encouraged to join the university by the Vice Chancellor

c) Donations of funds, books and facilities were given to the university as a result of the efforts from the Vice Chancellor during these trips

d) The university leader gained a lot of exposure and insight on how things are done from other institutions through the visits. This enabled benchmarking to be done leading to improved institutional quality

e) The absence of the leader empowered the cadres who were left in acting positions and gave them the opportunity to improve their leadership capabilities in preparation for future career advancement. This motivated them greatly. Empowering subordinates, according to Morakul & Wu (2001) depicts a transformational leader and such leaders are sine qua non to the success of a university (Anderson and Johnson, 2006 and Bolden et al 2008). With the exception of one public university, respondents reported on the lack of trust between leaders and their staff. Allegations were that Vice Chancellors only surround themselves with people whom they can trust at the top echelons well as in some other strategic positions in the university. The rest of the staff members were treated with suspicion and their views are always disregarded. These findings were similar to those by Ong (2012) who found that whilst respondents found university leaders to be technically competent and to possess cognitive abilities, they lacked in emotional competencies.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed the need for university leaders to embrace changes and work with their staff to achieve institutional goals. Institutional leaders who promote intellectual growth of both staff and students and who create a culture of learning make it easy for their institutions to uphold high quality standards. The results confirmed the hypothesis that effective leadership and governance will have a positive impact on service quality in universities. This will thus impact on the competitive advantage which, in turn, will then lead to the long-term sustainability of the institution. The study also highlighted the need for an effective governance and leadership in making sure institutions are supported in the global quest for quality.

REFERENCES

Alexander, F.K. (2000). The changing face of accountability. The Journal of Higher Education, 71(4) pp 411-431.

Anderson, D. & Johnson, R. (2006). Ideas of leadership underpinning proposals to the Carrick Institute: A review of proposals from the 'Leadership for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Program'. Carrick Institute Leadership Forum. Sydney, Australia.

Bargh, C., Scott, P. & Smith, D. (1996). Governing Universities: Changing the Culture? Buckingham:SRHE/OU.

Barnett, R. (2004). Learning for an unknown future.Higher Education Research & Development, 23(3) pp 247-260.

Bolden, R., Petrov, G. & Gosling, J. (2008). Developing collective leadership in higher education. In H. Goreham,H. (Ed.), Research and Development Series. London, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education

Bryman, A. (2009). Effective leadership in higher education. Research and Development Series. London, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Burke, J.C. & Minassians, H. (2001). Linking state resources to campus results: From fad to trend. The fifth annual survey. Albany, New York: The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government.

Chetsanga, C. J. (2011) Benchmarks for Quality Assurance in Higher Education Institutions in Zimbabwe. A paper presented at the Workshop of Vice Chancellors held at the Holiday Inn, Harare.

Evans, J.R. 2011. Quality management, organization and strategy. 6th edition.Cincinnati: South-Western.

Foster, S.T. 2010. Managing quality: integrating the supply chain. 4th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Garcia-Gallego, A., Georgantzis, N, MartinMontaner, J. & Perez-Amaral, T. (2012). (How) Do research and administrative duties affect University professor's teaching?

Gibbs, G., Knapper, C. & Picinnin, S. (2009). Departmental leadership of teaching in research-intensive environments. Research and Development Series. London, Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Goetsch, D.L. & Davis, S.B. (2006). Quality management: introduction to total quality management for production, processing, and services. 5th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Gonzalez, M.G.Y.E. (2004). Perceptions of selected senior administrators of higher education institutions in Mexico regarding needed administrative competencies. Doctoral Dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station

.Jansen, J. (2000). The emerging dynamics of change:Resistance, readiness and momentum. Human Resources Planning, 23 (12) pp 53.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z.(2007). The leadership challenge (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.

Lim, J. Y., & Cromartie, F. (2001). Transformational leadership, organizational culture and organizational effectiveness in sport organizationsThe Sport Journal, 4(2) pp 111-169.

Machawira, R. (2009) A Baseline study of Zimbabwe Higher and Tertiary Education. UNESCO

Martin, E., Trigwell, K., Prosser, M. & Ramsden, P.(2003). Variation in the experience of leadership of teaching in higher education. Studies in Higher Education, 28(3) pp 247-259.

Merriam, S.B. (1998). Qualitative Research and Case Study Application in Education: San Francisco. Jossy Bass.

Morakul, S. & Wu, F.H. (2001). Cultural influences in the ABC implementation in Thailand' environment. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 16(2) p 149.

Middlehurst, R., Goreham, H. & Woodfield, S. (2009) Why research leadership in higher education? Exploring contributions from the UK's le adership foundation for higher education. Leadership, 5(3) pp 311- 329.

Muhammad H. U, Muhammad A. & Fazalur R. (2011). Analysis of Quality Indicators of Higher Education in Pakistan. A paper contributed to the 22nd International conference on higher education held at Bilkent University, Ankara.

Mustard, F. (1998). The Nurturing of creativity: The role of higher education. Oxford University Press. Karachi

14

The Differences between a Quality Institution and an Ordinary Institution

QUALITY INSTITUTION	ORDINARY INSTITUTION
Customer focused	Focused on internal needs
Focus on preventing problems	Focus on detecting problems
Invests in people	Is not systematic in its approach to staff development
Has a strategy for quality	Lacks a strategic quality vision
Treats complaints as an opportunity to learn	Treats complaints as a nuisance
Has defined the quality characteristics for all areas of the organization	Is vague about quality standards
Has a quality policy and plan	Has no quality plan
Senior management is leading quality	The management role is seen as one of control
The improvement process involves everybody	Only the management team is involved
A Quality Facilitator leads the improvement process	There is no Quality Facilitator
People are seen to create quality - creativity is encouraged	Procedures and rules are all important
Is clear about roles and responsibilities	Is vague about roles and responsibilities
Has clear evaluation strategies	Has no systematic evaluation strategy
Sees quality as a means to improve customer satisfaction	Sees quality as a means to cut costs
Plans long term	Plans short term
Quality is seen as part of the culture	Quality is seen as another and troublesome initiative
Is developing quality in line with its own strategic imperatives	Is examining quality to meet the demands of external agencies
Has a distinctive mission	Has no distinctive mission

Source:- Total Quality Management in Education, Edward Sallis, 2002.

NEWS

Training Given to Staff of CODL

A training program in Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation and another one in Action Research, which were organized by the Quality Assurance and Research Unit of CODL, were attended by staff of CODL in June 2014. Led by Ato Shegaw G/Medhin , an expert from SMU's Center for Educational Improvement and Quality Assurance (CEIQA), the training in Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation was given to 15 heads of offices, units and departments on 19 and 20 June 2014 at SMU's New Building Syndicate Room.

The same training has also been cascaded to Coordinators of the[12] Regional Centers gathered at the offices of the Bahir Dar and Hawassa Regional Centers on 14 July 2014 and at Dessie and Addis Ababa Regional Centers on 22 and 23 July 2014 respectively. On the other hand, the training in Action Research was given to 13 academic and administrative staff members of CODL on 24 and 25 June 2014 at SMU's New Building Syndicate Room, the resource person being Dr. Melaku Girma, Director of CEIQA. Both training programs were opened by Ato Tsegaye Gebissa, Vice-President of CODL, who explained the relevance of the training programs and expressed his confidence that the trainees will apply what they gain from the training programs to their respective jobs.

National Student Research Forum and Multidisciplinary Seminar Held

The Research and Knowledge Management Office hosted its 8th Annual National Student Research Forum and Six Multidisciplinary Seminar on July 22 and July 24, 2014 respectively at Saint Mary's Multi- purpose Hall. Sixteen student researchers who were from Saint Mary's University, Addis Ababa University, Adama Science and Technology University, Debre Birhan University presented their findings in the day long event.

The student researchers were selected from Business and Informatics faculties of the different universities on competitive basis. The rigorous method they applied in their studies, their presentation and communication skills of the student researchers were remarkable. The President and Founder, Wondowsen Tamirat (Associate Professor) gave a welcoming speech for the Student Research Forum and Dr. Tesfaye Teshome (Associate Professor), Director General of HERQA made opening remarks. Dr. Tesfaye emphasized the need to produce research works which are guided by national and regional government policy frameworks. Ato Tedla Haile, the Executive Vice President, finally made the closing speech.

Similarly, twelve articles were presented by researchers who came from Saint Mary's University, Adama Science and Technology University, Wollo University, Mettu College of Teacher Education, each focusing on the diverse thematic areas set by the Research and Knowledge Management Office of the University. Ato Tedla Haile, the Executive Vice President, gave the opening speech, and Dr. Misganaw Solomon closed the seminar after delivering his closing speech.

On both days, participants took part actively by raising pertinent questions and forwarding fruitful comments.

International Conference Held

SMU has conducted the 12th International Conference on private higher Education on August 23, 2014 at UN-ECA Conference Center, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The conference was organized and sponsored by St. Mary's University on the major theme: Retrospect and Prospect of Private Higher Education Provision in Africa. In a daylong conference, His Excellency Shiferaw Shigutie Minister of Ministry of Education has opened.

Besides, twenty four research papers were presented by both Ethiopian and African researchers from Malawi, Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia. Besides sharing of Knowledge and find ways-out for challenges, such type of conference, helps to strive quality education in private higher educational sector. CEIQA has appreciated that SMU's endeavor to ensure quality education in private higher education sector through conducting research, knowledge sharing with stakeholders, self & institutional based monitoring and evaluation and external quality audit. Such cross boarder conference has galvanized the dedication of St. Mary's University to become more competent and efficient institution in producing manpower effective in the overall development of the country.

Pictorial Description of The 12ᵗʰ International Conference on Private Higher Education

CALL FOR PAPERS

JOURNAL OF BUSINESS and Administrative Studies (JBAS)

St. Mary's University is pleased to announce to contributors that JBAS's Editorial Committee has started receiving manuscripts for JBAS. Contributions can come from broad range of fields and disciplines seeking to reflect on the theoretical and practical developments in the areas of accounting and finance, economics, management, marketing, public management and policy, primarily focusing on Ethiopia.

Authors can send their manuscripts to: The Editorial Committee, Faculty of Business, St. Mary's University, P. O. Box 1211 or 18490, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, or E-mail: jbas@smuc.edu.et.

Authors can provide copies of their manuscripts in hard copies or soft copies. Manuscripts should be typed in English, and double spaced. The preferred length is between 15 to 20 pages for research articles, and 3 to 5 for book reviews.

The Editorial Committee will accept manuscripts through out the year.

A modest honorarium shall be paid to the authors whose papers are accepted and published.

JBAS style guide and editorial policy are available at: http://www.smuc.edu.et

* JBAS is a member of African Journal Online (AJOL).

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY

Post Graduate Regular Programs

- Master of Business Administration (MBA)
- Master of Business Administration (HRM Concentration)
- MBA in Accounting and Finance
- MSc in Rural Development
- MSc in Agricultural Economics
- MSC in Agri –Business

IGNOU Post Graduate Masters Programs

- Master of Business Administration (MBA)
- Master of Commerce (MCOM)
- Master of Arts in Economics (MEC)
- Master of Arts in Rural Development (MARD)
- Master of Arts in Sociology (MSO)
- Master of Arts in Public Administration (MPA)
- Master of Arts in Social Work(MSW)
- Master of Arts in Political Science

Under Graduate Regular Programs

- **Faculty of Business**
  - Accounting
  - Management
  - Marketing Management
  - Tourism and Hospitality Management
- **Faculty of Information**
  - Computing Science
  - Information Technology
  - Information System

Distance Learning

- Business (four programs)
- Agriculture & Development Studies (Six Programs)
- Educational Planning & Management
- Economics
- Sociology

For Further Information

Tel. 011-5538001   Or 011-5538017

Fax: 011-5538000

P.O.Box: 1211

e-mai: smu@smuc.edu.et.

Or

registraroffice@smuc.edu.et

Web site: http://www.smuc.edu.et