

---

## **Effect of Educational Regulatory Agencies on Performance Evaluation of Higher Institutions in Nigeria**

**Ifurueze Meshack**

Department of Accountancy  
Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University  
Igbariam Campus  
[mifurueze@yahoo.com](mailto:mifurueze@yahoo.com)

**Manukaji Ijeoma Juliana**

Department Of Accountancy  
Federal Polytechnic, Bida  
Niger State  
Ijmanukagi@Yahoo.Com

---

### **ABSTRACT**

*The issues concerning educational regulatory agencies and performance evaluation of higher institutions in Nigeria has remained an empirical issue in the nation's development literature for the past few decades. Several resources are available to help regulatory agencies carry out their performance evaluation process. However several identified problems have inhibited regulatory agencies from effectively carrying out their mandate. Policies and procedures have not been streamlined to handle the vast load on education system. There has been high external interference and pressure in all aspects of education. Wide variation in admission policies adopted by various institutions and Government has played a role. In view of this, the study examines the effect of educational regulatory agencies on performance evaluation of higher institutions in Nigeria. In doing this, survey research design was adopted. The population of the study consists of staff of the National Board for Technical Education (NBTE) Kaduna. Through purposive sampling technique, the study selected Ninety (90) staff as sample size. Data were collected through primary and secondary sources. The data were organized and analyzed around the research questions. The data generated by the researchers were analyzed using the statistical means on five Liker type scale. Findings show that there has been high external interference and pressure in all aspects of education. Wide variation in admission policies adopted by various institutions and Government has played a role. Inadequate infrastructure and facilities have compounded the problem. The paper therefore recommended that external interference and pressure in all aspects of education should be curtailed; there is need for a well designed institutional structure to be adopted to sustain performance. Developing of structure involves participatory approach through allocation of task responsibility and authority within the institution.*

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

A regulatory agency, in the context of education, is an external organization that has been empowered by legislation to oversee, control and evaluate the educational performance, process and outputs of educational institutions relevant to it. Regulatory agencies are specifically set up by Governments to assure the quality of the products of higher institutions. Performance evaluation therefore is the process in which regulatory agencies of Government continuously assure that the quality of graduates produced are of standard using the best facilities. Performance evaluation therefore is a regulatory mechanism focusing on

accountability and improvement, thus, establishing confidence in end users that the inputs, processes and output of educational systems fulfill the expectations or measure up to minimum standards. Regulatory agencies like National Universities Commission (NUC), National Board for Technical Education (NBTE) and National commission for College of Education (N CCE) ensures that programmes run by the respective higher institutions are of standard. Performance evaluation therefore believes that quality assurance is the guaranty of confidence and certainty that standards and quality of a programme run by the institutions are being maintained and enhanced

A performance evaluation system should be a key component of the practice structure of any regulatory agency. When implemented effectively, it ensures fairness and accountability, promotes growth and development and encourages a sense of pride in that institution's contributions to national development. The primary goals of a regulatory agency that carries out performance evaluation functions are to provide an equitable measurement system for the institutions, produce accurate appraisal documentation to protect the institutions and obtain a high level of quality and quantity in the students produced by those institutions. To create a performance evaluation system by regulatory agencies they should, develop an evaluation criteria, identify performance measures, set guidelines for feedback, create disciplinary procedures and set an evaluation schedule. Normally, the goal of performance evaluating agencies is to allow individual institutions to find out how well they had performed their performance targets or key performance indicators during a specific performance period. Performance evaluation may be described generally as the process by which we collect performance information and use it for improvement, by drawing on a range of evaluative processes such as performance measurement and evaluation (Davies, 1999)

Burt in Davies (1999) tells us how performance measurement needs to be complemented with more robust and comprehensive evaluation. The European Commission (1997) stated that evaluation depended on performance measurement. Adding that monitoring is of key importance to improving programme performance and successful evaluation bring upon successful monitoring. According to Eziyi, (2010), performance management in institutions is generally linked with performance measurement, target setting and rewards/sanction. It was also viewed by Hood et al in Andrew, (2014) as information gathering, setting standards (directors), and behavior modification (effectors). However evaluating performance during a given performance period is to determine how well an institution has performed, relative to agreed objective, or goals and this is only one of many important activities within the overall concept of performance evaluation.

In spite of the increasing research attention on performance evaluation and measurement in institutions, the challenges facing performance evaluation in both public and private sectors have been widely observed Behin,(2003), Hood, (2006), Kaplan and Norton (2004) and Garba (2014). It is not easy to effectively and efficiently evaluate the performance of higher institutions in Nigeria. Therefore, the main objective of the study is to examine the effects of regulatory agencies like NBTE on performance evaluation of Polytechnics, Monotechnics, Colleges of Agriculture and Colleges of Technology in Nigeria . The research paper will also focus on what are the quality related problems in the present education system and what is the role of regulatory bodies in improving the quality of education system

## **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Several resources are available to help regulatory agencies carry out their performance evaluation process. However several identified problems have inhibited regulatory agencies from effectively carrying out their mandate. Policies and procedures have not been streamlined to handle the vast load on education system. There has been high external interference and pressure in all aspects of education (Carol and Deborah 2003). Wide

variation in admission policies adopted by various institutions and Government has played a role. Examination process has suffered great set back in achieving its objectives. Inadequate infrastructure and facilities have compounded the problem. Outmoded teaching methods are prevalent. Declining research standards has resulted because of poor funding. Policies for promoting and regulating educational institutions are of ad-hoc nature. Government policies, have made the system to be strait-jacketed and inhibit innovation.

### **OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY**

The general objective of the study is to examine the effects of regulatory agencies like NBTE on performance evaluation of Polytechnics, Monotechnics, Colleges of Agriculture and Colleges of Technology in Nigeria. Specific objectives are

1. To determine the extent to which external interference and pressures affected all aspects of performance evaluation of regulatory agencies
2. To investigate how variations in admission policies by various Institutions under NBTE and Government affected the work of regulatory agencies in their performance evaluation in Nigeria
3. To ascertain the extent to which decline in funding affected regular performance evaluation of Institutions under NBTE by regulatory agencies

### **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. To what extent has external interference and pressures affected all aspects of performance evaluation of regulatory agencies
2. How has variations in admission policies by various Institutions under NBTE and Government affected the work of regulatory agencies in their performance evaluation in Nigeria
3. To what extent has the decline in funding affected regular performance evaluation of Institutions under NBTE by regulatory agencies.

### **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

According to Wikipedia government agency is a permanent or semi permanent organization in the machinery of government that is responsible for oversight and administration of specific functions, such as intelligence agency. A government agency may be established by either a national government or a state government within a federal system. In Nigeria successive government since independent have set up various ministries and agencies in order to enhance it stewardship and reporting roles to the general public (Rasheed, 2006).

The ability of an organization to evaluate and reward performance in the public sector is of critical importance. It is a system that is realistically expected to promote successful execution of an organization's strategic goals and objective ( Natalie and James 2006).

According to Idemobi and Onyizube (2011) performance evaluation is a tool which focuses on managing the individual and the work environment in such a way that an individual or team can achieve set organizational goals. Performance evaluation is a constructive process to acknowledge the performance of individual or organization. According to Judy (2003), performance evaluations, which provide employee's contribution to the organization are essential to developing a powerful work team. He stated that performance can enforce the acceptable boundaries of performance, promote staff recognition, effective communication and motivate individuals to do their best for themselves and the practice. Judy, describes performance evaluation as a key component that will ensure fairness and accountability, promotes growth and development and encourage a sense of pride in your employee's contributions to the practice.

## NEED FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

- A performance evaluation system motivates staff to do their best for themselves promoting staff recognition and improving communication.
- Evaluations conducted fairly, consistently and objectively protects your employees and your practices
- An effective performance evaluation system provides standardized evaluation forms, performance measures, feedback guidelines and disciplinary procedures.

Performance evaluation is a tool to measure individual or organizational effort in the achievement of public goals. It comprises of a series of actions for individuals and organization to improve their performance by checking their policy outputs and outcomes internally as well as externally. Evaluation of performance is recognized as a necessary process for result-based management in public organizations (Koike and Kabashima 2008).

In Nigeria, public service (Ministers, Department and Agencies) has always been the tool available to the Nigerian government for the implementation of development goals and objective. It is responsible for the creation of an appropriate conducive environment in which all sectors of the economy can operate maximally.

The National Board for Technical Education otherwise known as NBTE is a board of education which supervises, regulates and oversees educational programmes offered by technical institutions at secondary, Polytechnic and monotechnic levels through an accreditation process. ([Https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/National Board for Technical Education](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Board_for_Technical_Education)). It was established by Act No 9 of 11 July 1977 with the aim of providing standardized minimum guide curricula for Technical vocational education and training. The Federal Government by virtue of Act No 16 of 1985 (Education National Minimum Standards) has reposed upon the NBTE through the Federal Ministry of Education the enforcement of prescribed standards in technical education and a supervisory role on relevant institutions

The board therefore has been responsible for maintenance of standards in related institutions. It is also charged with the responsibility of accrediting National, Higher National and professional diploma programmes in all Polytechnics, monotechnics and colleges of Technology. The NBTE supervises and regulates the academic programmes of at least 47 Polytechnics, 22 colleges of Agriculture, 8, monotechnics and 60 schools of health, Nursing and related Institutions at post secondary level. In addition they regulate other technical training programmes run by the National Universities ([multi.gboosa.com/highereducation/detail/1080](http://multi.gboosa.com/highereducation/detail/1080)).

## THE ROLE OF NBTE IN PERFORMANCE EVALUATION.

According to Emadomi, Igbape and Philipa(2014), to have a share of the global market and gain competitive advantage is a desire of every institution. Therefore the role of NBTE in performance evaluation are

1. **Maintaining Standards:** As educational Institutions one is always concerned about setting own standard and maintaining it continuously, year after year. In order to maintain the standards, one should consciously make efforts to improve quality of the educational transactions as well as the educational provisions and facilities.
2. **Accountability:** It is stated that every institution is accountable to the stakeholders in terms of the funds (public or private) used on it. The quality can be considered as a monitoring mechanism.
3. **Improving employee moral and motivation of the staff in performing their duties and responsibilities( Emadomi, et al 2014)**

The function of regulatory bodies in improving quality education

- Regulatory bodies have to play the role of facilitators and not regulators.
- Maintenance of standards.
- Change in admission policy.
- Focus on autonomy: operational, financial and academic autonomy coupled with accountability.
- Focus on quality assurance system but it must be independent of political and institutional interaction.
- Equip students with the generic skills rather than tailor them to meet the specific requirement of the industry.
- Focus on public private partnership and Institution industry interface
- Encouraging Involvement of industry in the curriculum development and also implementation of curriculum.
- Appointment and retention of qualified, experienced, and competent faculty members.
- Quality improvement of junior faculty members.
- Improvement in institutional infrastructure.
- Improvement in teaching methodology
- More emphasis on laboratory work.
- Revision of curricula to make it more relevant to current needs.
- Development of research culture in the Institute.
- Strengthening interaction with industry.
- Encourage industry to utilize the human resource and infrastructure available in the institutions
- Provide the eligible with good quality education at reasonable cost.
- Encourage Industries to be partners with educational institutions
- Develop higher education as an infrastructure for social and economic growth of the Country.
- Equip libraries with the latest books, journals and periodicals
- Update facilities in Laboratories.
- Ensure that working facilities and workload of teachers are as per the norms.
- Encouraged teachers to attend various Conferences, Seminars, and Workshops in their disciplines.
- Regular monitoring and evaluation.
- Attract bright students after graduation/post graduation to the teaching profession.
- Facilitate E-Learning

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

This study adopts the theory on relative performance evaluation. The relative performance evaluation is an externally determined target setting. It is usually set to determine managers performance based on the performance of reference group that faces similar conditions Garba (2014).

Murphy, (2001) argued that performance targets can be difficult, especially when external events and managerial opportunism influence the attainability of the target. Based on agency reasoning, relative performance evaluation can improve the relevance of the target, by incorporating information about peer performance ( Hoffmann and Pfeil 2012). ( Namazi ,2013) demonstrated that agency theory has posited in the organization, stating that performance measures must be encompassed in a control system in order to attain a suitable performance that would provide an efficient resource allocation mechanism for the institutions. In Nigeria, Federal Government Agencies has continued to grow over the year in control procedures that take the forms of monitoring mechanisms and performance evaluation in an organization, which is inline with the relative performance evaluation theory.

## EMPERICAL REVIEW.

In Nigeria, many studies have attempted to investigate the relationship between government agencies and performance evaluation. Garba (2014), in his study observed that agency model provides a coherent framework which can be solving agency principal problems facing public sector. Carol and Deborah (2003) showed that performance evaluation is now widely used within public sector organization, but there is lack of evidence regarding their usefulness. Suggesting that the use of independent performance measures, could therefore reduce the opportunity for dysfunction behavior while maintaining the incentive to improve the efficiency of public service provision.

In spite of the increasing research on performance evaluation in public sectors Sule (2004), Cristina (2011), Eziyi,(2010) and Davies, (1999), studies have rarely explored the effect of government agencies in performance evaluation. The study attempts to bridge the existing gap by investigating the factors influencing performance evaluation in institutions

## Methodology

The research work employed survey research design. This form of research design is appropriate in the study. They nonetheless, are advantageous for assessing large and small population especially where a small population is to be derived from a large one. The population of the study constitutes the staff of the National Board for Technical Education (NBTE) Kaduna. Through purposive sampling technique, the study selected Ninety (90) staff as sample size. Data were collected through primary and secondary sources.

The face and content validity and reliability of the questionnaire instrument was done by National Board for Technical Education (NBTE) Kaduna . We also examine the purpose and objectives of the study in line with the specific items in the instrument and made necessary modifications in the items. Their input and suggestions were effected.

The data were organized and analyzed around the research questions. The data generated by the researchers were analyzed using the statistical means on five Likert type scale.

$$\text{Formula for mean: } \bar{X} = \frac{\sum Fx}{\sum f}$$

Where  $\sum$  = Summation of the scores

F = Frequency of the scores

X = Scores of the distribution

$\bar{X}$  = means of the distribution

Subjects responded to the statement by ticking one of the five alternatives; strongly Agreed, Agreed, undecided, Disagreed, and strongly disagreed.

Marks are allotted for each SA = 5, A=4, UD = 3, D = 2, SD = 1

$$\frac{5+4 + 3 + 2 + 1}{5} = \frac{15}{5} = 3$$

The cut – off means score is 3.

Any item having a mean score of 3.0 and above is the expression of its positivity or relevance while any item having less than 3.0 is the expression of its negativity or irrelevance.

## Data Presentation and Analysis

### Research Question 1:

To what extent has external interference and pressures affected all aspects of performance evaluation of regulatory agencies?

The data answering this research question were presented in table 1.

Table 1: **Respondents Mean Rating on** the extent external interference and pressures has affected all aspects of performance evaluation of regulatory agencies?

(N=90)				
S/N	The extent external interference and pressures has affected all aspects of performance evaluation of regulatory agencies	$\sum Fx$	$\bar{X}$	Decision
1	To a large extent	345	3.83	Strongly agreed
2	To some extent	374	4.16	Strongly agreed
3	To not extent	365	4.0	Strongly disagreed

Data contained in Table 1 shows staffs' response on the extent external interference and pressures has affected all aspects of performance evaluation of regulatory agencies. The respondents have agreed with two items with the mean responses of 3.83 to 4.16. This shows that external interference and pressures has affected all aspects of performance evaluation of regulatory agencies.

### Research Question 2:

How has variations in admission policies by various Institutions under NBTE and Government affected the work of regulatory agencies in their performance evaluation in Nigeria?

The data answering this research question were presented in table 2.

Table 2: **Respondents Mean Rating on** how has variations in admission policies by various Institutions under NBTE and Government affected the work of regulatory agencies in their performance evaluation in Nigeria?

S/N	The effect of variations in admission policies by various Institutions under NBTE and Government on the work of regulatory agencies in their performance evaluation in Nigeria	$\sum Fx$	$\bar{X}$	Decision
4	Affects improvement in evaluation methodology	336	3.73	Strongly agreed
5	Affects Maintenance of evaluations standards	315	3.5	Strongly agreed
6	Negates institutional infrastructure for evaluation	356	3.95	Strongly agreed

Table 2. Shows staffs response on how has variations in admission policies by various Institutions under NBTE and Government affected the work of regulatory agencies in their performance evaluation in Nigeria. Respondents had agreed with all the items as possible effects of how has variations in admission policies by various Institutions under NBTE and Government affected the work of regulatory agencies in their performance evaluation in Nigeria, as responses ranges from 3.5 to 3.95 on how has variations in admission policies by various Institutions under NBTE and Government affected the work of regulatory agencies in their performance evaluation in Nigeria.

### Research Question 3:

To what extent has the decline in funding affected regular performance evaluation of Institutions under NBTE by regulatory agencies?

Analysis of data related to this research question is shown in table 3.

**Table 3: Respondents Mean rating on** what extent has the decline in funding affected regular performance evaluation of Institutions under NBTE by regulatory agencies

S/N	The extent has the decline in funding affected regular performance evaluation of Institutions under NBTE by regulatory agencies?	$\sum Fx$	$\bar{X}$	Decision
7	To a large extent .	337	3.74	Strongly agreed
8	To some extent	310	3.45	Strongly agreed
9	To no extent	335	3.7	Strongly agreed

Table 3. Shows staffs' responses on the extent, the decline in funding affected regular performance evaluation of Institutions under NBTE by regulatory agencies. Respondents had agreed with all the items as part of the extent the decline in funding has affected regular performance evaluation of Institutions under NBTE by regulatory agencies. Responses were between 3.45 to 3.74

### Conclusion

Based on the analysis, the paper concludes that external interference and pressures has affected all aspects of performance evaluation of regulatory agencies; Decline in funding has affected regular performance evaluation of Institutions under NBTE by regulatory agencies to a large extent. In addition, variations in admission policies by various Institutions under NBTE and Government have affected the work of regulatory agencies in their performance evaluation in Nigeria.

### Recommendations

Based on the conclusion, the following recommendations are made:

- (1) There is need for a well designed institutional structure to be adopted to sustain performance. Developing of structure involves participatory approach through allocation of task responsibility and authority within the institution. To ensure performance of various groups within the system, there is need to decentralize decision making by distributing responsibilities and authority amongst the various levels of hierarchy in order to achieve integration for sustainability of the system.
- (2) Government and education stakeholders should put in place best way(s) of assessing the performance and the actions of the staff working in the system. Reward and incentive systems for staff must be functional based on:
  - (a) Payment of staff salaries and allowances promptly
  - (b) Encouragement of a peaceful academic environment that is void of fraudulent.
  - (c) Provision of adequate fund for research and publications.
  - (d) Making available enough academic materials for teaching and research.

### REFERENCES

- Azih, N. and Ejeka, C.A (2015). A critical analysis of National Board for Technical Education old and new curriculum in office technology and management for sustainable development. British journal of education B(9): 41-50 Retrieved from (www.eajournals.org)



- Basse, B. E. and Benjamin J. I. (2009). A case for performance management in the public sector In Nigeria. International Journal of business and management 4(4) Retrieved from [www.ecsnet.org/journal.html](http://www.ecsnet.org/journal.html)
- Boyne, G.A. and Chen, A (2007). Performance targets and public service improvement: Journal of public administration research and theory 17(3) 455-477
- Carol, P. and Deborah, W. (2003). The use and usefulness of performance measure in the public Sector
- Davies I.C. ( 1999). Evaluation and performance management in Government: Sage publication London thousand Oaks and New Delhi 5(2): 150-159
- Eziyi, O.I. (2010). An assessment of the role of Government agencies in public-private partnerships housing delivery in Nigeria: Journal of construction in developing countries 15(2), 23-48
- Heinrich, C. (2003). Measuring public sector performance and forthcoming in Peter, BG and Pierre, J (eds). Handbook of public administration, Thousand Oaks, Ca, Sage
- Idemobi, E.I. and Onyeizugbe, C. (2011). Performance management as a imperative for effective performance in Delta State of Nigerian public owned organization: sacha journal of policy and strategic studies, 1 (2) : 46-54
- Judg, C. (2003); 5 steps to a performance evaluation system. Fam pract manage 2003 March 10(3): 43-48. Retrieved from [www.rafp.org/fpm/2003/0300/p43.html](http://www.rafp.org/fpm/2003/0300/p43.html)
- Junaidu, B.M. and Aminu, M.M. (2015). Public service in Nigeria – an overview of function service in Nigeria – an overview of functions international political science association and code of conduct. Global journal of politics and law research: 3(1) 61-69
- Koike, O. and Kabashima, H. (2008). Performance evaluation and good Government in Asia international political science association
- Natalie, J. W. and James S.B. (2006). Evaluating executive performance in the public sector. Journal of international public sector management network 7(1), retrieved from <http://www.opm.gov/strategiccomp/html/history1.asp>
- National Board for Technical Education (NBTE) (2012). Quality assurance unit. Retrieved from <http://www.nbte.gov.ng> October 2016
- Retrieved from <http://www.ifac.org> *theviewspaper.net/education-system-of-india-its-functions-drawbacks-and-its-contributionen.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education\_in\_India*  
[www.ugc.ac.in/pub/heindia.pdf](http://www.ugc.ac.in/pub/heindia.pdf)