

Quality Regulation in Expansion of Educational Systems: A Case of Privately Sponsored Students' Programme in Kenya's Public Universities

Yego Helen J. C.

Department of PSSP Coordinating Office
Eldoret West Campus, Moi University, P.O Box 8210-30100, Eldoret, Kenya

Abstract

This paper examines the expansion and management of quality of parallel programmes in Kenya's public universities. The study is based on Privately Sponsored Students Programmes (PSSP) at Moi University and its satellite campuses in Kenya. The study was descriptive in nature and adopted an ex-post facto research design. The study sample consisted of 460 privately sponsored students from all schools and campuses of Moi University and 140 teaching and non-teaching staff. A stratified random sampling procedure was used to identify the schools and the students while purposive sampling was used to identify the staff. Data collection was done using questionnaires for students and staff while administrators of schools and satellite campuses were interviewed. The study established that there are acute challenges in the management of the PSSP which impact on the quality of educational programmes under the parallel and privately sponsored students' programmes. Quality has been compromised. One of the challenges is the expansion in terms of increase in students' number and satellite campuses in early every city in Kenya. The study further points out some mechanisms that could be adopted to ensure quality in the stated programmes in all public Universities in Kenya. The study recommended that since the quality of programmes in Public universities has declined, universities should invest in facilities, activities and infrastructure that support learning/teaching as the university's core mandate. Secondly that public universities need to adhere to the established quality regulatory mechanisms in place to assure the students and other stakeholders of education of the quality of the education offered at universities. The recommendations from the study should be utilized by policy makers in Public Universities to come up with policies that address the shortcomings and in the process improve and meet the demand for quality education in those universities.

Keywords: Privately Sponsored Students Programmes (PSSP), Education System, Public Universities, Quality.

1. Introduction

1.1 Quality Assurance Mechanisms in Education

The term quality has been borrowed from the industrial sector and is often used descriptively in educational issues to assess educational programmes (Green, 1993). Generally, the quality of a product or a service is described as the degree of its excellence, the extent to which something is fit for its purpose, conformance with requirement and a degree of customer satisfaction. This concept of quality on a product or service has to do with psychological expectation of the end users or consumers towards performance or achievement of the desired results. Against this background, there must be knowledge of the expected results measured against some benchmarks. In the field of academia, the term benchmark refers to an absolute-like truth that allows no compromise and whose end result is the production of desired outcome or expectations.

According to UNESCO (2003), the term quality in education is a dynamic concept that changes and evolves with time and takes many forms since world societies are also dynamic. The Inter-University Council of East Africa (IUCEA, 2006) in collaboration with German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) argue that quality does not exist in higher education, but for the sake of common understanding and standardization among universities in East African region, quality has been described as achieving set goals and aims in an efficient way while bearing in mind that these goals reflect the requirements of the stakeholders who have their varied ideas on quality. Stakeholders in education here refer to government, employers, students, parents and society at large.

IUCEA (2003) further recommends that each university should check and assure the public of its quality by having it assessed by an external body. This calls for clearly set standards and criteria of benchmarks against which a university's quality education can be assessed. The quality aspects to be assessed include but not limited to the curriculum content, design implementation, learning strategies, teaching and non-teaching staff, students, entry qualification to the programmes, staff/student ratio, internal quality assurance mechanisms, student support services, staff development programmes and teacher testing stakeholder satisfaction, student assessment procedure, and physical facilities and infrastructure.

Moreover, IUCEA (2006) further recommends that for quality standards to be maintained in universities, programme specifications should be clear. The course designers must carry out a needs assessment before settling down to draw course requirements. Course objectives should be clearly stated and in line with national goals of education in the country. They must also reflect the aspirations of the institution. In attempts to

ensure provision of quality education, the courses designed by the academic departments need to be approved by the relevant academic authorities of the institutions for appropriateness.

Quality teaching/learning embraces virtues such as responsibility, and commitment (ICUEA, 2006). Universities must adopt teaching/learning strategies that appropriately suit the programme designed. According to Nunnally (1978), effective teaching strategies involve having basic principles and procedures required by the subject, proper preparation and planning of the lesson, careful selection and use of teaching/learning resources, flexibility, self reflection and modification of the teaching learning techniques. Gibbs and Jenkins (1992) also describe a number of problems that may be faced when teaching students noting that quality becomes harder to maintain as class size increases. Courses with smaller numbers of students can afford to achieve clarity of purpose and aim through contact with lecturers.

1.2 Quality Regulatory Mechanisms

All students, regardless of where the campus is located, belong to a school and are therefore the responsibility of the Dean of the School. Formulation of quality of teaching/learning, research and outreach services for Moi University was carried out in 2008 (MU, 2008) and the University embraced the concept of quality and quality assurance in academic activities by developing and documenting procedures, including work instructions to demonstrate compliance. This is in addition to its quality policy statement as expressed below in its Quality Management Manual (MU/QMS/01) that:

Moi University is committed to providing quality education and services that meet the needs of its customers and stakeholders through quality and relevant teaching, research and community service and outreach. The university is committed to a quality work and learning environment that is grounded in intellectual and academic freedom, teamwork quest for excellence, professionalism, discipline and continuous improvement of its programmes, activities and services so as to achieve client/customer satisfaction. To be able to realize this commitment, the University will continually review its programmes, activities and services to conform to the Quality Management Systems based on the ISO-9001-2008 standard.

The quality regulatory mechanisms for the case stated above therefore refer to academic excellence, client satisfaction, and value for money of the stakeholders, sponsors and the taxpayers.

1.2.1 Components of Quality in Education

To be able to plan, implement and monitor quality in education, the following needsto taken into consideration: quality of the students, quality of the curriculum, assessment and grading procedures, quality and adequacy of staff, infrastructure and academic environment, academic support systems to include laboratories, libraries, internet facilities, information communication technology, students' welfare support services and a Directorate of Quality Assurance.

1.2.2 Internal Quality Regulatory Mechanisms

These are parameters to be designed, implemented and monitored by the academic institutions to ensure quality of its programmes, namely: students' admission criteria – through quality intake selection, student induction and orientation; setting quality objectives and strategic policies; quality and quantity of teaching staff and facilities; monitoring teaching/learning of students; teacher-student ratio, student evaluations and classification of awards; external examiners for courses; design of new programmes; review of existing programmes; staff development and training; encouraging research and dissemination of research findings through workshops and conferences, and review of practice and procedures for continual improvement.

Moi University Council and Senate approved rules, regulations and procedurethatstate that adherence to these regulations for recognition nationally and internationally as follows (MU, 2008):

To promote features for quality provision of core services, address shortcoming through appropriate quality assurance, assure stakeholders that the Higher Education offered at Moi University meets and exceeds their quality expectations and assure strategic partners and collaborating institutions and peers that teaching/learning and research meets quality standards (p. 16).

1.2.3 External Quality Regulatory Mechanisms

Universities need to develop and enhance a culture of self assessment in addition to having accreditation and validation arrangements with credible external bodies and professionals such as Commission forUniversityducation (CUEE), Public Universities Inspection Board (PUIB), ISO Quality Management Audits, Supra-National Accreditation – Europe, Inter-University Council of East Africa (IUCEA), Comparability Joint Quality Initiative (JQI), and European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA).

1.3 Quality of the PSSP Student on Admission

Quality education depends a lot on the quality of students enrolled in the courses and programmes of study. IUCEA (2006) points out that every university that seeks to attain quality education should observe the kind of students enrolled in various courses in the university and set clearly formulated criteria for all programmes so

that when there is a selection and admission, the procedure and criteria are clear, adequate and transparent. It is now evident that public universities have programmes that accommodate even the academically weak students because the academic excellence that these universities should nurture has been eroded by the entrepreneurship approach to recruitment of students by some universities.

1.4 Infrastructural Support to Quality Education

Ajayiet *al.* (1996) confirm that many older universities were planned when much smaller numbers of students and staff were envisaged and further give the example of Ghana where a university build for 3,000 students is currently coping with about 24,000 without corresponding expansion in academic and physical facilities, overstretching existing facilities to their elastic limits. As such, in spite of the parallel degree programmes in Kenyan public universities becoming the new financial backbone of the institution, the pervasive pursuit to growth has turned universities into greedy money-minting machines with crumbling standards eating into their traditional roles and missions. The University of Nairobi, for example, has been growing by approximately 5,000 students every year since the introduction of the parallel degree programmes. There were about 59,000 students in 2010 compared to about 4,000 in 1998 before the start of the parallel degree programmes. The same for Moi University with an approximate student population of 23,000 in 2010 following the robust intake of the privately sponsored students programmes. It is for this reason that lecturers have threatened to go on strike in opposition to a government directive requiring all public universities to carry a double intake for regular students in addition to the already existing weight of a huge parallel degree programme and student population.

1.5 Student Assessment and Support Systems

Students are perhaps the main victims in the rush to increased admission into the parallel degree programmes. They have to contend with overcrowded classrooms, unavailability or insufficiency of academic facilities including accommodation, crowded libraries, research equipment, less and less computers and crowded laboratories. Occasionally, poor time-tabling may lead to classes being shifted and in the process valuable time being wasted. These frustrations in academic life bring about stress and may often lead to students becoming restless and ungovernable (Otieno, 2004).

Student assessment is one of the most important elements of higher education. Outcomes of assessments have a profound effect on students' careers (Kadenyi, 2009). Student assessment should therefore be observed and be well organized. Clear regulation covering student absence, illness re-assessment or other mitigating circumstances need to be taken into consideration. All the procedures need to be clear and known to the students and staff and be followed. Assessment is one of the ways through which a university can tell whether programme objectives are being met or not hence, high or low quality education. Moi University ISO manuals outline ways in which student evaluation of the programmes they are undertaking and also the lecturer who teaches is assessed to ensure objectivity. Feedback is taken from the students for the course and the instructor with a view of improving the quality of service.

The Quality Assurance directorate of Moi University is responsible for ensuring that there is objectivity and independence in continued monitoring of instructors and courses. The procedures are very well laid out but again implementation is an issue. For example, the course forms, in the case of Moi University MU/OP/QA/F/01, are supposed to be issued to students in all campuses by the quality assurance unit which in turn are supposed to analyze and reports prepared to be sent to deans of schools and the Registrar Academics for action but this is often not the case. Students need support services to be able to handle the stresses of their day-to-day life in campus (Agina, 2001). They require a functional guidance and counseling unit to support their career quests and to assist in relationship conflicts and general welfare matters. Consequently Students require access to a grievance as well as an appeal system that is independent of the institution so that they have a right to complain if the quality of any of their programmes is inadequate.

1.6 Increased Teaching load in Public Universities

The rising enrolment of students in the parallel degree programmes in Kenya's public universities has put a strain on academic staff in these institutions. According to the CHE (2010), the UON number of academic staff increased from 1,233 in 2001/02 to 1497 in 2006/07 and this still was not able to satisfy the demand at the university. In view of the large student numbers under parallel degree programmes, quality teaching and learning becomes a problem. The few academic staff in an institution means that the existing staff has to shoulder increased teaching hours. Often large classes have to be split into fewer groups with the same lecturer repeated to all the groups at different times.

In addition to teaching, the academic staff have to supervise practicals and tutorials, set examinations, and mark large numbers of scripts in the expected time. The public universities have introduced part-timing, an additional teaching for these programmes being undertaken mainly by existing staff and other lecturers from neighbouring universities, who are paid for the extra teaching over and above their prescribed teaching load. This

has now become an attractive way for staff to supplement their income, and, many staff are teaching throughout the year without taking any of their entitled annual leave (Gibbs & Jenkins, 1992). In Francophone universities the teaching load of staff in different categories is prescribed so the senior staff have a lower mandatory teaching load. The increase in the proportion of senior staff puts an additional financial burden on the institutions so the extra teaching hours are undertaken by the junior staff against payment or by part-time staff.

A study of staff establishment, Muindi (2010) has shown that there is an acute shortage of professors in Kenyan universities at a time when the same universities are experiencing exponential growth and it is also apparent that a number of masters and doctoral students in some universities are being supervised by their peers, putting into question the quality of higher education in the country, as shown in the table 1 below.

1: Data on Staffing in Kenyan Universities

Nairobi University	Male	Female	Total
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities	26	5	31
Science/Technology	74	5	79
Total	100	10	110
Moi University			
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities	12	3	15
Science/Technology	19	1	20
Total	31	4	35
Kenyatta University			
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities	17	1	18
Science/Technology	11	1	12
Total	28	2	30
Jomo Kenyatta University			
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities	0	0	0
Science/Technology	17	5	22
Total	17	5	22
Maseno University			
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities	1	0	1
Science/Technology	14	2	16
Total	15	2	17
Masinde Muliro University			
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities	3	0	3
Science/Technology	7	1	8
Total	10	1	11
Egerton University			
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities	1	0	1
Science/Technology	8	0	8
Total	9	0	9

Constituent Colleges

Pwani University College (Kenyatta University)	Male	Female	Total
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities	1	0	1
Science/Technology	2	0	2
Total	3	0	3
Narok University College (Moi University)			
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities	0	0	0
Science/Technology	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0
Bondo University College (Moi University)			
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities	0	0	0
Science/Technology	2	0	2
Total	2	0	2
Mombasa Polytechnic University College (Jomo Kenyatta University)			
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities	0	0	0
Science/Technology	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0
South Eastern University College (University of Nairobi)			
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities	1	0	1
Science/Technology	3	0	3
Total	4	0	4
Multimedia University College (Jomo Kenyatta University)			
Discipline			
Arts/Humanities			
Science/Technology			
Total			

Source: Muindi, 2010

From this human resource audit of universities by CHE, it is clear that there are only 352 professors in all the 30 Kenya's public and private universities serving a student population of nearly 200,000. The university of Nairobi has the highest number of professors (110) followed by Moi University (35), Kenyatta (29) Maseno (17) Jomo Kenyatta, Masinde Muliro and Egerton (11). The university colleges, are the worst affected. Narok, Meru, Mombasa Polytechnic and Multimedia fall short of the criteria stipulated by CHE where departments should be headed by professors or associate professors employed on permanent terms.

According to Prof. Standa (2010), Secretary to CHE, professors are supposed to be the academic leaders in the universities to guide junior academic staffers and lead research and advancement in knowledge frontiers. Standa further states that academic standards in the country would decline if this is not checked. On the role of CHE, Standa postulates that, legally, universities are supposed to be autonomous and self regulating. But the role of CHE is hindered by the fact that public universities are independent entities formed by an Act of Parliament, and the power of the commission to curb sub-standard practices is limited.

1.7 Programmes offered at a Satellite Campus in Moi University

The Moi University Union of Academic Staff (UASU) Secretary General (Dr. Ogeta) is of the opinion that satellite campuses are a pervasive drain on human and financial resources of the university, a liability to quality education, and a big dent on the university image. He represents the Union's view that satellite campuses should only be launched upon a cost benefit analysis showing that they are sustainable and that PSSP funds advanced to set up a satellite campus be computed and refunded upon the campus breaking even.

All students at satellite campuses belong to different schools of Moi University. The school admits the students through the office of Chief Academic Officer who is the only one authorized to sign an admission letter

allowing a student to join the university. It is the school that decides what programmes to run where and therefore schedules lectures and examinations. The role of the Campus Director is administrative; to provide facilities for the students allocated to that campus and, together with programme coordinators who are answerable to deans of schools, monitor teaching and learning in satellite campuses (Satellite Campus Policy, 2010).

2. Materials and Methods

The study was carried out at Moi University, situated in Eldoret, and six of its satellite campuses, namely Chepkoilel Campus, Kericho Campus, Coast Campus, Nairobi Campus, Central Kenya Campus, Yala and Southern Nyanza Campus – Rongo. The Main Campus of the University is located on the Western part of Kenya, in Eldoret Town, 300 Km northwest of Nairobi, the capital city of Kenya.

The study used the ex post facto design to investigate how expansion of the privately sponsored students programme has influenced quality, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of higher education system without manipulation. Kerlinger (1986) states that ex-post facto design is a systematic empirical enquiry where the researcher does not have direct control of the independent variables because their manipulation has already occurred. A mixed method approach was also embraced. This is a method where both qualitative and quantitative approaches are used to gather data.

The target population for the study comprised all the PSSP students (11,185) enrolled in the academic year 2009/2010 in all the schools that have these programmes in Moi University.

The study sample comprised six hundred respondents from which, 460 privately sponsored students were accorded questionnaires while 140 teaching and non-teaching staff were interviewed.

The collected data was coded and tabulated before being analyzed by use of statistical package of social sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations and frequencies were used in the analysis.

3. Results and Discussion

Minimal infrastructural changes, including hiring of extra space outside of the university as extension for teaching space, are yet to fully address and match the rising student numbers being admitted into this university. Interestingly, the universities still look up to the Exchequer for infrastructural development support and improvement of the academic environment in the university despite being able to realize improved earnings from the PSSP programmes being mounted. The distribution rates of PSSP income in Moi University shown in the table below illustrates that funding infrastructure development is not a priority to the university because it is expected that the government should be responsible for capital development. It has been allocated a mere 2% of the total PSSP budget.

2: Current and Proposed Distribution of PSSP Tuition Fees

Category	Within Eldoret		Satellite Campus	
	Current Rates	Proposed	Current Rates	Proposed
	%	%	%	%
1. Service Providers I	35	32	46	40
2. School Capital Development and Maintenance	0	*3	0	3
3. Rent, Utilities, Security & Others	1.50	1.50	1.50	4.50
4. Service Providers II	1	1	1	1
5. Coordinating Office	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50
6. Library	2	2	2	2
7. Research	2	2	2	2
8. Capital Development	2	2	2	2
9. Central Vote	51	51	40	40
10. Service Providers III	2	2	2	2
11. Capital Reserve	0	0	0	0
12. Teaching Materials	2	2	2	2
Total	100	100	100	100

Source: Moi University coordinating office, 2010

Fifty-one percent of PSSP earnings go into the university's central budget to cushion the improved salaries and allowances to staff. The University Academic Staff Union (UASU) chapter is strongly against this, arguing that PSSP funds should be de-linked from payment of wages and personnel emoluments. Payment to service providers from the PSSP funds has improved greatly, according to the figures on the table above and Moi

University has set aside 35% of the total collections to the school to pay service providers who are mainly the lecturers. Lecturers are not complaining because there is more money from teaching since they are paid per hour of teaching, but a time may come when they may be impaired by the weight of these obligations. Lecturers' attention to regular students who are seen as not being profitable to teach has also declined. Some lecturers have taken to the habit of hiring assistants whom they send to class on their behalf. A UASU official, and a lecturer in Education Department of Kenyatta University, is quoted saying "lecturing, especially in particular institutions has become very lucrative. Some lecturers earn up to Ksh10, 000.00 per hour in addition to their regular pay for teaching PSSP students depending on the course and number of students."

At the UON, a payment formula code-named Kibera IV that was formulated following two teaching staff strikes indicates that undergraduate lecturers earn Ksh 45, 000.00 for the first 18 students and Ksh 55 an hour for each extra student in their class. This has given lecturers the incentive to lobby for the largest class available. It has also led to bad blood amongst some lecturers as they challenge one another in the quest for who takes the largest class since it translates to more money.

3.1 Quality Regulatory Mechanisms in Place to Ensure Quality of the PSSP

This study sought to investigate the regulatory mechanisms put in place to ensure quality in PSSP. The author used Likert scale of 1 = Strongly Agree (SA), 2 = Agree (A), 3 = Undecided (U), 4 = Disagree (D) and 5 = Strongly Disagree (SD) to measure the extent to which respondents agree with the items and the interpretation.

3: Student Responses on Quality Regulatory mechanisms

Statement		SA	A	U	D	SD
My course involves too much paperwork	Frequency	162	103	43	84	23
	Percentage	39	24.8	10.4	20.2	5.5
Lecturers do not explain their concepts fully	Frequency	65	147	56	93	54
	Percentage	15.7	35.4	13.5	22.4	13
I feel satisfied with the way examination are administered	Frequency	47	150	97	36	85
	Percentage	11.3	36.1	23.4	8.7	20.5
Supervision of examination should be stepped-up	Frequency	121	128	63	27	76
	Percentage	29.2	30.8	15.2	6.5	18.3
I feel unappreciated when think about how examination are invigilated, marked and processed	Frequency	198	97	27	57	36
	Percentage	47.7	23.4	6.5	13.7	7.2

Source: Survey Data, 2012

In the table 3, 162(39%) of the respondents strongly agreed that their course involves too much paperwork, and this was closely followed by 103(24.8%) of the PSSP students who agreed on the same. A hundred and forty-seven 147 (35.4%) of the PSSP students agreed that lecturers did not explain their concepts fully; 150(36.1%) agreed that supervision of examinations should be stepped up as reported by 128(30.8%) and 121(29.2%) who strongly agreed and agreed respectively. A hundred and ninety-eight 198 (47.7%) and 97(23.4%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively that they feel unappreciated when they think about how examinations are invigilated, marked and processed.

4: Scale of Interpretation

Range	Weight	Interpretation
4.50 – 5.00	5	Strongly Agree
3.51 – 4.50	4	Agree
2.51 – 3.50	3	Neutral
1.51 – 2.50	2	Disagree
1.00 – 1.50	1	Strongly Disagree

Source: Survey Data, 2012

The Table above 4 illustrates the scale used to measure the extent to which respondents will either agree or disagree on the items in the questionnaire used to collect data.

5: Mean and Standard Deviation of Student Responses on Quality Regulatory mechanisms

	Mean	Standard Deviation
My course involves too much paperwork	2.28	1.314
Lecturers do not explain their concepts fully	2.82	1.302
I feel satisfied with the way examination are administered	2.91	1.31
Supervision of examination should be stepped-up	2.54	1.437
I feel unappreciated when i think about how examination are invigilated, marked and processed	2.08	1.329

Source: Survey Data, 2012

From the table above, the mean of all the items falls within 2.08-2.91, PSSP students agreed that their work involved much paper work (mean ≥ 2). They also agreed that they feel unappreciated when they think of how their examinations are invigilated, marked and processed. Nevertheless, students were neutral on whether or not lecturers did not explain their concepts fully (mean = 2.82). Students were also neutral on whether or not they felt satisfied with the way their examinations were administered and the argued that supervision of examinations should be stepped up (mean = 2.91 and 2.54 respectively).

The author used a different Likert scale (1 = Very Accessible, 2= Accessible, 3= Not accessible and 4 = Not available) to measure the accessibility of university learning/teaching materials to PSSP students.

6: Accessing the University Learning/teaching materials

		Very Accessible	Accessible	Not Accessible	Not Available
Library	Freq.	131	191	69	24
	%	31.6	46	16.6	5.8
Lectures halls	Freq.	155	201	23	27
	%	37.3	48.4	5.5	6.5
Furniture	Freq.	95	220	52	48
	%	22.9	53	12.5	11.6
Computer labs	Freq.	39	66	163	132
	%	9.4	15.9	39.3	31.8
Computer	Freq.	36	87	132	136
	%	8.7	21	31.8	32.8
Recommended textbooks for the course	Freq.	42	72	147	148
	%	10.1	17.3	35.4	35.7
Textbook for further reading	Freq.	45	87	121	153
	%	10.8	21	29.2	36.9
Relevant journal and other periodicals	Freq.	45	116	130	121
	%	10.8	28	31.3	29.2
Internet facilities on campus	Freq.	24	73	155	163
	%	5.8	17.6	37.3	39.3

Source: Survey Data, 2012

Results from Table 6 show that 191(46%) of the PSSP students reported that library was accessible to them and 131(31.6%) of them indicated library was very accessible to them, while 69(16.6%) reported that library was not accessible to them. Regarding lectures halls, 201(48.4%) and 155(37.3%) of the students reported that lecturers halls were accessible and very accessible respectively, while 23(5.5%) reported that lecture halls was not accessible to them and only 27(6.5%) of the PSSP students indicated that lecture halls were not available to them. Furniture was accessible to PSSP students as shown by 220(53%). However, 163(39.3%) and 132(31.8%) of PSSP students reported that computer laboratories and computers were not accessible respectively while 132(31.8%) and 136(32.8%) of the PSSP students reported that computer laboratories and computers are not available.

More analysis indicated that recommended textbooks for their courses, textbook for further reading, relevant journals and other periodicals and internet facilities were not available as reported by 147(35.4%), 121(29.2%), 130(31.3%), and 155(37.3%) students respectively. Similarly, recommended textbooks for their courses, textbooks for further reading, relevant journal and other periodicals and internet facilities were not available as shown by 148(35.7%),153(36.9%),121(29.2%) and 153(36.9%) respectively.

7: Mean and Standard Deviation of Accessing the University ELearning/teaching materials

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Library	1.97	0.845
Lectures halls	1.81	0.818
Furniture	2.13	0.896
Computer labs	2.97	0.941
Computer	3.4	3.796
Recommended textbooks for the course	3.2	2.734
Textbook for further reading	2.94	1.017
Relevant journal and other periodicals	2.79	0.986
Internet facilities on campus	3.1	0.89

Source: Survey Data, 2012

4. Conclusion

Both internal and external components of quality in education have been examined including the quality of the student on admission to a programme in the university, the quality of the curriculum being taught, the teaching, assessment and final grading. The quality and adequacy of the teaching staff and the general academic environment of the institution of higher learning is also examined. It is shown that although PSSP has given Kenyan universities a new lease of life by providing the much needed additional income, discussions on declining standards and quality of Higher Education are increasingly coming up in public debates. Universities have expanded and gone provincial forging links with public and private institutions in an effort to establish campuses throughout the country to defeat their competitors.

5. Recommendations

The study recommends that among other raft of measures that need to be undertaken an admission policy needs to be formulated to limit the number of students being admitted in each university based on facilities and the capacities declared by each university. This will in turn reduce the workload on lecturers having to handle large classes. Lecturers and academic staff will then devote more time to research and publishing.

It is therefore highly recommended that university councils and management boards in public universities and other stakeholders of tertiary institutions need to urgently address the issue of massification and the declining quality of university education in Kenya.

References

- Agina, B., & Kay, C. P. P. S. (2001). Education Too Costly. *East African Standard*, <http://www.eastandard.net>.
- Ajayi, A. G. L., & Johnson, A. (1996). *The African Experience with Higher Education*. The Association of African University.
- Gibbs, G., & Jenkins, A. (1992). *Teaching Large Classes in Higher Education: How to Manage Quality with reduced Resources*. London: Kogan Page.
- Green, H. (1993). *The uncertainty of everyday life, 1915-1945*. New York : HarperPerennial.
- IUCEA (2006). *A Road Map to Quality Assurance in Higher unpublished materials*. IUCEA
- IUCEA (2003). Inter University Council of East Africa- Harmonization of The Education System in EAC. Regional Report of the Advisory Committee on Education.
- Kadenyi, M. M. (2009). *Conference Paper Presented at Kenya Institute of Management: Challenges in the Implementation and Management of Part-time Degree Programmes in Kenyan Universities*. Unpublished
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). *Foundations of Behavioural Research*. New York: Subject Publications.
- Moi University (2008). *Quality Management Manual*. Moi University.
- Muindi, B. (2010, November 14). How Part Time Tutors Are Ruining Varsity Education. *Sunday Nation*, p. 8. Nairobi: NMG Muindi, 2010
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Otieno, W. (2004). The Privatization of Kenya Public Universities. In *International Higher Education No. 3666*. Pedagogy. New York and London: Routledge.
- UNESCO (2003). *Ministerial Round Table on Quality Education*. Paris: UNESCO.