

QUALITY ASSURANCE PRACTICES AND TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS IN NIGERIAN TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS: EVIDENCE FROM OYO STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND TECHNOLOGY, IGBOORA

Akanmu, D. B., Badmus, A. I., Ilori, G. K., and Adigun, P. O.

Department of Public Administration

Oyo State College of Agriculture and Technology, Igboora, Oyo State, Nigeria

E-mail: akanmudamolab@gmail.com; Phone No: +234 703 007 5301

Abstract:

This study investigates the relationship between quality assurance (QA) practices and teaching effectiveness in Nigerian higher education institutions, focusing on the Oyo State College of Agriculture and Technology (OYSCATECH) in Igboora. Using a convergent mixed-methods approach, data were collected through structured questionnaires (n = 152) and semi-structured interviews with academic staff, QA officers, and student representatives. Analysis with Pearson's correlation and linear regression revealed a significant relationship between QA practices and teaching effectiveness ($r = .642$, $p < .05$), with QA practices explaining 41.2% of the variance in teaching outcomes. The study recommends improving operational visibility, institutional feedback systems, and capacity-building initiatives. The findings support Total Quality Management (TQM) and Systems Theory, indicating that coordinated QA structures enhance teaching effectiveness in polytechnic settings.

Keywords: *Quality assurance, teaching effectiveness, tertiary education, Nigeria*

How to Cite: Akanmu, D. B., Badmus, A. I., Ilori, G. K., and Adigun, P. O. (2025). Quality assurance practices and teaching effectiveness in nigerian tertiary institutions: evidence from oyo state college of agriculture and technology, igboora. *OYSCATECH Journal of Management, Economics, and Communication Studies*, 3(1), 91-104. <https://oyscatedpublications.org/>

Introduction

Quality assurance (QA) in the Nigerian public sector is an ongoing process designed to ensure that institutional outputs meet set standards and demonstrate continuous improvement. It involves systematic evaluation, monitoring, assessment, and enhancement of services, systems, and programmes (Ogbeche, 2025). Historically, quality assurance evolved from artisanal practices to modern industrial methodologies. In medieval Europe, guilds played a crucial role in maintaining quality through strict adherence to craftsmanship standards (ASQ, n.d.). This foundation laid the groundwork for quality systems that emerged during the Industrial Revolution, especially with the rise

of mass production and the need for standardisation (Evans & Lindsay, 2011). In the early 20th century, quality assurance was formalised through scientific management and statistical quality control (SQC), pioneered by figures such as Frederick W. Taylor, Walter A. Shewhart, and W. Edwards Deming. Shewhart's development of control charts and Deming's contributions post-WWII in Japan were vital to the global spread of Total Quality Management (TQM) (Deming, 1986). The introduction of the ISO 9000 series by the International Organisation for Standardisation in 1987, and the rise of Six Sigma methodologies in the 1980s, further institutionalised QA practices (Pyzdek & Keller, 2009).

In Nigeria, formal quality assurance mechanisms began with the establishment of the Standard Organisation of Nigeria (SON) in 1971 through Decree No. 56. The SON's mandate expanded from regulating local production to certifying imported goods and enforcing compliance via programmes such as the Mandatory Conformity Assessment Programme (MANCAP) (SON, 2024). In education, quality assurance started in the 1960s through accreditation panels, external examinations and institutional visits (Musa, Abdullahi, & Okereke, 2023). Agencies like the National Universities Commission (NUC) have played a key role in regulating and maintaining academic standards (Oginni, Fatomilola, & Adediji, 2024; NUC, 2022; Edu, 2025). Scholars such as Joseph and Youmu (2024) and Tanen (2020) stress that quality assurance strategies are vital for improving teaching effectiveness in both secondary and tertiary institutions. This study thus aims to explore how QA frameworks influence teaching effectiveness, with particular focus on Oyo State College of Agriculture and Technology, Igboora—a polytechnic institution with unique academic and vocational mandates.

Statement of the Problem

The introduction of quality assurance in Nigeria was driven by a need to combat systemic inefficiencies, corruption, and declining institutional performance (Iseme, 2001; Nwekeaku & Obiorah, n.d.). Public service reforms such as SERVICOM were implemented to promote accountability and improve service delivery (UNODC & NBS, 2019). In tertiary education, declining academic standards (Sadiku, 2022), massification without proportional investment (Enakpoya & Okposio, n.d.), and the need for international recognition of degrees (Nnorom, 2020) further necessitated QA mechanisms. The rapid expansion of Nigerian tertiary institutions has been met with concerns over overcrowded classrooms, outdated curricula,

and underqualified personnel. As regulatory bodies like the NUC and NBTE enforce program accreditation and institutional audits, it becomes essential to evaluate whether these QA measures translate into tangible improvements in teaching effectiveness. Existing research has addressed various aspects of QA in Nigerian higher education. Studies by Musa, Abdullahi, and Jinginal (2024), Nnorom (2020), and Enakpoya and Okposio (2020) reviewed policy-level QA mechanisms. Ogunleye (2022) and Eze and Okafor (2023) provided insights into polytechnic and college of education settings, while Bello (2021) examined QA through the lens of curriculum reform. Others have investigated ICT integration (Akinyemi & Yusuf, 2023), monitoring practices (Mohammed & Ibrahim, 2024), and faculty development (Chukwu & Ezeani, 2021). However, most of these studies either focus on universities or adopt broad literature-based approaches. Few empirical investigations target polytechnic institutions that blend academic learning with vocational training. Moreover, previous research often centres on administrative and regulatory perspectives, overlooking the roles of student union leaders and grassroots staff in shaping QA outcomes. For example, studies by Onyejiaka, Ogbonna, and Afianmagbon (2025) and Bada, Ariffin, and Nordin (2020) examine QA and teaching effectiveness in secondary schools, which limits their applicability to tertiary institutions. Even within tertiary education, empirical focus remains skewed towards conventional universities (Ibrahim & Mohammed, 2023; Adebayo, 2021), leaving polytechnics largely underrepresented. Therefore, this study fills a significant gap by investigating how quality assurance practices influence teaching effectiveness at the Oyo State College of Agriculture and Technology, Igboora. By incorporating the perspectives of academic staff, quality assurance officials, class representatives, and student union leaders, the study aims to offer a more inclusive and

practice-driven understanding of QA in Nigerian tertiary education.

Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to examine the relationship between quality assurance practices and teaching effectiveness in Nigerian tertiary institutions, using the Oyo State College of Agriculture and Technology, Igboora, as a case study. The specific objectives are to:

- i. identify the key quality assurance practices implemented at Oyo State College of Agriculture and Technology, Igboora.
- ii. evaluate the level of teaching effectiveness among lecturers in the institution based on measurable indicators.
- iii. examine the relationship between specific quality assurance practices and teaching effectiveness among lecturers.

Hypothesis

The tested hypothesis is that there is no significant relationship between quality assurance practices and teaching effectiveness among lecturers at the Oyo State College of Agriculture and Technology, Igboora.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored in two complementary theoretical paradigms—Total Quality Management (TQM) and Systems Theory—which collectively provide a conceptual foundation for understanding the institutional dynamics through which quality assurance (QA) practices influence teaching effectiveness in tertiary education settings.

Total Quality Management (TQM) Theory

Total Quality Management (TQM) is a strategic management approach that emphasizes continuous improvement, stakeholder satisfaction, process optimization, and collaborative responsibility (Deming,

1986; Oakland, 2003). Originally developed for industrial quality improvement, TQM has been extensively adapted to the higher education sector, where the “customer” is reconceptualized as the student, and service quality is measured through learning outcomes, academic support, and institutional effectiveness (Venkatraman, 2007). In educational contexts, TQM stresses the prevention of instructional deficiencies rather than post hoc correction, the involvement of all stakeholders (including lecturers, students, and administrators) in decision-making processes, and the use of data-driven strategies for performance monitoring and enhancement. These core principles position QA as a proactive, institution-wide mechanism aimed at promoting teaching excellence and student satisfaction. TQM informs this study by framing QA practices as embedded institutional strategies that drive pedagogical performance through systematic monitoring, participatory planning, and a commitment to continuous instructional improvement.

Systems Theory

Systems Theory, developed by von Bertalanffy (1968), conceptualises an organisation as a dynamic system composed of interrelated and interdependent subsystems. Within the context of tertiary education, the institution is viewed as a coordinated network involving administrative structures, academic units, QA departments, and student bodies. According to this perspective, changes or inefficiencies in one subsystem inevitably affect the performance of others, thereby influencing overall institutional outcomes. A key feature of Systems Theory is the emphasis on feedback loops—mechanisms by which information is gathered, analysed, and reintegrated into the system for adaptive learning and performance enhancement (Senge, 1990). In the QA context, feedback from stakeholders such as students, lecturers, and quality managers informs strategic interventions aimed at improving teaching

effectiveness and institutional responsiveness. Thus, Systems Theory underscores the structural complexity and functional interdependence that characterise educational institutions, highlighting how the orchestration of QA activities across subsystems contributes to improved instructional quality.

Synthesis of Frameworks

The integration of TQM and Systems Theory provides a comprehensive lens through which to examine the institutional efficacy of QA practices. While TQM emphasises the cultivation of a quality-oriented culture and the continuous refinement of processes, Systems Theory highlights the systemic interconnectivity and feedback mechanisms necessary for sustaining high-performance teaching environments. Together, these frameworks support the study's conceptual foundation by asserting that teaching effectiveness is not merely a function of individual lecturer competence but rather an emergent outcome of well-coordinated, data-informed, and stakeholder-driven QA practices.

Literature Review

This literature review examines key studies and theories related to QA and their impacts on teaching effectiveness in tertiary education. It begins with a historical overview of QA development globally and in Nigeria, followed by theoretical frameworks that inform QA systems. The review is structured around three core themes: (1) QA practices in Nigerian tertiary institutions; (2) indicators of teaching effectiveness; and (3) the link between QA and teaching effectiveness. These components offer a comprehensive basis for understanding how QA mechanisms shape educational outcomes, with a specific focus on polytechnic institutions such as the Oyo State College of Agriculture and Technology (OYSCATECH), Igboora.

Empirical Review Related to Objective 1: Key Quality Assurance Practices in Nigerian Tertiary Institutions

A number of empirical studies have explored the implementation and impact of quality assurance practices across Nigerian tertiary institutions. For instance, Onyejiaka, Ogbonna, and Afianmagbon (2025) conducted a correlational survey in South-East Nigeria and found that principals' quality assurance practices significantly enhanced teachers' job performance. Similarly, Odusanya, Yonlonfoun, and Oshinyadi (2025) revealed that QA strategies positively correlated with student academic performance in Ogun-East. A national systematic review by Musa, Abdullahi, and Jinginal (2023) emphasized that QA improves curriculum design, faculty capacity, and institutional governance. Enakpoya and Okposio (2022), through policy analysis, observed that QA mechanisms play a crucial role in achieving Nigeria's educational policy objectives. Akpan (2021), in a regulatory review, underscored the role of the National Universities Commission (NUC) in sustaining academic standards via accreditation. Oguntimehin et al. (2020) used mixed methods in Lagos and found that institutional leadership combined with QA procedures significantly improved instructional delivery and staff motivation. On the contrary, Salitu, Famade, and Adegbe mile (2022) showed that weak QA structures contribute to poor student performance in core subjects. Osuji and Etuketu (2019–2021) conducted a longitudinal study in Cross River and found consistent improvements in curriculum relevance and resource allocation due to sustained QA efforts. Other conceptual and thematic studies also provide insights. Suleiman (2023), making reference to the Kwara State education sector, proposed that QA practices align curricula with instructional goals. Olohundare and Shola (2020) emphasized through thematic analysis the need for QA integration across all education levels. Okeke-James et al. (2020) identified

QA responsibilities of institutional leaders to include supervision and performance evaluation. Further studies, such as Fasasi and Oyeniran (2021) conducted in Osun State employed a comparative design and found QA to significantly influence student outcomes. Ajayi and Adeyemi (2020) also worked on Ekiti State education sector and validated that QA is a strong predictor of academic success, while Phillymon (2020) in Benue demonstrated that QA enhances planning and academic delivery. Additionally, Bashir and Issa (2020), using Abuja education sector as a case study, emphasized QA's role in enforcing compliance with national education standards. In Anambra, Okonkwo (2021) highlighted infrastructure and staffing as persistent QA challenges. Experimental research by Obadara and Alaka (2020) in Lagos demonstrated how QA interventions led to measurable improvements in student learning. Brown (2021) and Harvey (2020) showed QA's contribution to transparency, accountability, and global education alignment. UNESCO Nigeria (2020) concluded that QA mechanisms ensure curriculum relevance and foster lifelong learning. These studies collectively demonstrate that QA practices, when effectively implemented, play a pivotal role in maintaining educational standards, improving curriculum delivery, and promoting positive learning outcomes in Nigerian tertiary institutions.

Empirical Review under Objective 2: Measurable Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

A variety of studies have identified key indicators used to assess teaching effectiveness in tertiary institutions. Okoye (2023) highlighted indicators such as teaching efficacy, student engagement, and classroom management. Oloyede (2020) developed a scale identifying classroom interaction, lecturer preparation, evaluation strategies, and personality traits. Uko, Egwa, and Abah (2025) emphasised the importance of staff

qualifications, instructional delivery, and student feedback. Okonkwo and Okoli (2025) reported that effective strategic planning and instructional clarity influence teaching outcomes. Oguntimehin (2023) found teacher motivation, curriculum delivery, and institutional leadership to be crucial. Ogbogu (2021) cited student evaluations, peer review, and research output as essential indicators. Additional studies by Akinniyi (2020) and Adenike (2025) introduced modern metrics, including student ratings, instructional quality, AI integration, and digital pedagogy. Adesina and Adeyi (2025) emphasised the impact of mobile learning and augmented reality, while Ogundare and Ibrahim (2025) associated academic achievement with collaboration and self-directed learning. Other indicators include oral proficiency and instructional creativity (Obielodan, 2025), funding and infrastructure (Abah & Egwa, 2024), and teacher economic stability (Shittu & Kareem, 2025). Comparative studies by Scholastica and Ebenebe (2025) demonstrated how motivation strategies correlate with student success. Globally, König et al. (2023) and Burroughs et al. (2024) reinforced the importance of professional development, content delivery, and teaching experience. Nigeria-focused studies such as those by Umukoro & Omade (2025) and Muhammad & Abubakar (2025) validated the use of 360-degree evaluations, economic status, and lecturer-student relationships as significant predictors. Together, these findings establish a multifaceted framework for evaluating lecturer performance, incorporating pedagogical, institutional, and socio-emotional dimensions of teaching effectiveness.

Empirical Review under Objective 3: Relationship between Specific Quality Assurance Practices and Teaching Effectiveness

Over the past five years, empirical studies have explored how quality assurance (QA)

mechanisms influence teaching effectiveness in Nigeria's tertiary education system. The literature spans various methodological approaches and institutional contexts, converging on the importance of QA in enhancing instructional quality, accountability, and professional development. Onyejiaka, Ogbonna, and Afianmagbon (2025) used a correlational survey in South-East Nigeria and found that principals' supervision and evaluation practices significantly enhanced teacher performance, especially through systematic instructional monitoring. Similarly, Bada, Ariffin, and Nordin (2020) deployed PIMRS and VTBI survey instruments in North Central Nigeria to examine the role of instructional leadership, finding it a strong predictor of teaching effectiveness in secondary schools. At the tertiary level, Musa, Abdullahi, and Jinginal (2024) conducted a systematic review across Gombe and Adamawa States, concluding that well-structured QA systems improve lecturer accountability and instructional delivery. Ibrahim and Mohammed (2023), in a case study of universities in Kano State, found that effective monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks serve as essential feedback mechanisms, enhancing teaching quality. Quantitative survey findings by Adebayo (2021) in Oyo State corroborated the role of internal QA practices in improving documentation and teaching consistency. In Lagos State, Ogunleye (2022), through focus group discussions, revealed that QA practices were linked to the industrial relevance of instructional content, an indicator of improved teaching outcomes in polytechnics. The influence of ICT on QA and instructional delivery was highlighted in studies by Akinyemi and Yusuf (2023), who employed survey and observational methods in Kwara State. They found that ICT integration under QA frameworks significantly enhanced teaching delivery and student engagement, although infrastructural limitations persist. Accreditation as a QA instrument was

addressed by Eze and Okafor (2023), who showed through a quantitative survey in Enugu State that it improves curriculum delivery and lecturer preparedness. Bello (2021), using content analysis in Osun State, also found that QA-driven curriculum reforms ensure curriculum relevance, thus fostering teaching effectiveness. In Abuja, Uche and Nwankwo (2022) found through interviews that SERVICOM charters improve responsiveness and instructional quality, though enforcement remains partial. Similarly, Ojo and Salami (2020) noted through a mixed-methods study in Ogun State that structured QA systems in private universities improved lecturer performance and student satisfaction. Faculty development emerged as a consistent theme in improving instructional performance. Chukwu and Ezeani (2021), in Ebonyi State, reported that training programs and workshops directly enhanced teaching quality. In Sokoto State, Abubakar and Lawal (2022) emphasised the role of student feedback—often underutilised—in helping lecturers adapt teaching strategies and uphold accountability. Comparative findings by Oladipo and Ajayi (2023) in Ondo State suggested that private universities maintain stronger QA-QA-teaching performance links than public institutions, largely due to better monitoring and responsiveness. Similarly, Ibrahim and Musa (2024), through document analysis in Bauchi State, reported that external QA agencies effectively improve teaching standards and ensure compliance with regulatory benchmarks. The influence of governance structures was investigated by Okon and Udo (2021), who, through interviews in Akwa Ibom State, confirmed that institutional leadership plays a crucial role in QA enforcement and teacher effectiveness. Adeyemi and Olatunji (2022) further demonstrated through quantitative analysis that adequate funding is central to sustaining QA practices and improving instructional delivery in tertiary institutions. Finally, a broader academic impact was reported by

Nwachukwu and Obi (2023), who applied bibliometric analysis in Imo State. Their study established a positive link between robust QA systems and enhanced research output and teaching effectiveness, suggesting that QA supports a more productive academic environment.

These studies collectively demonstrate that effective QA implementation—through curriculum alignment, ICT integration, monitoring systems, faculty development, and accreditation—has a measurable and positive impact on teaching effectiveness across Nigerian tertiary institutions.

Methodology

This study employed a convergent mixed-methods design, combining both quantitative and qualitative approaches to explore the relationship between quality assurance (QA) practices and teaching effectiveness in a higher education setting. The quantitative part used a descriptive cross-sectional survey to assess perceptions and relationships among variables, while the qualitative part involved semi-structured interviews to gather detailed insights from key institutional stakeholders on QA implementation and pedagogical outcomes.

The **study population** included 311 stakeholders at the Oyo State College of Agriculture and Technology, Igboora, comprising 252 academic staff (including four QA-focused lecturers), three non-teaching QA officers, 15 Student Union Government (SUG) executives, and 41 student class representatives. Using **Taro Yamane's (1967) formula**, a sample size of **176** was determined. Of these, **159** participated in the survey, and **17** were purposively selected for interviews, including all QA officers, six academic deans, the SUG President and Secretary, and two academically distinguished class representatives. **Stratified random sampling** ensured proportional representation across categories for the survey, with **simple random**

sampling applied within strata. For the qualitative phase, **purposive sampling** was used. Interviews followed a semi-structured guide covering QA frameworks, policy compliance, lecturer evaluations, and feedback systems.

The quantitative instrument, the Quality Assurance and Teaching Effectiveness Questionnaire (QATEQ), consisted of four sections: demographics, perceptions of QA, teaching effectiveness indicators, and the relationship between QA and effectiveness. Qualitative data were gathered through an interview protocol focused on QA implementation and instructional quality. Instrument validity was confirmed through expert review, while reliability was established via a pilot test ($n = 20$), which yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .84. Quantitative data were analysed using SPSS (Version 25), employing descriptive statistics, Pearson's correlation, ANOVA, and simple linear regression at $p < .05$ significance level. Qualitative data were transcribed and analysed thematically using NVivo 12, applying Braun and Clarke's (2006) coding framework. Ethical clearance was obtained from the institution's Research Ethics Committee. All participants provided informed consent, were assured of confidentiality and anonymity, and retained the right to withdraw at any point without consequences.

Results

This section presents a detailed interpretation of the analysed data gathered through a structured questionnaire administered to lecturers, students, and administrative stakeholders at the Oyo State College of Agriculture and Technology (OYSCATECH), Igboora. The interpretation is arranged according to the thematic sections of the instrument: demographic characteristics, perceptions of quality assurance practices, indicators of teaching effectiveness, and the relationship between quality assurance and teaching outcomes.

Response Rate

A total of 160 questionnaires were distributed across staff members and students the Oyo State College of Agriculture and Technology,

Igboora. Out of these, 152 were duly completed and returned, resulting in a response rate of 95%, as presented in Table 1

Table 1:
Profile of Respondents

Category	Questionnaire Distributed	Questionnaire Returned	Response Rate (%)
Staff	108	100	92.5
Students	52	52	100
Total	160	152	95

Perception of Quality Assurance Practices in OYSCATECH

A significant majority (81%) of respondents affirmed the existence of a Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) in the institution. However, only half (50%) had observed the Committee actively querying curriculum compliance, and 56% reported witnessing lecture monitoring by QA officials. Although 62% acknowledged the lodging or hearing of complaints related to teaching and academic supervision, only 25% believed that QA actively identifies curriculum implementation weaknesses, while

44% disagreed. These findings suggest that while the QA structure is recognized, its operational visibility and perceived responsiveness remain uneven. The mixed perception regarding the effectiveness of QA in identifying curriculum deficiencies highlights a possible disconnect between policy frameworks and actual academic oversight. This supports the earlier assertions in the literature that quality assurance processes in Nigerian tertiary institutions often lack full integration into pedagogical monitoring (Adebayo, 2020).

Table 2:
Quality Assurance Practices in OYSCATECH

Statement	Yes F%	No F%	I cannot say F%	Total F%
Does OYSCATECH have a Committee on Quality Assurance monitoring teaching and academic ethics?	81	6	13	100
Have you ever seen the Quality Assurance Committee querying compliance of teaching with the NBTE curriculum?	50	31	19	100
Have you ever seen the Quality Assurance officials inspecting lecture delivery during lecture periods	56	25	19	100
Have you ever complained or heard that a complaint has been lodged to Quality Assurance on a teaching, practical, or project issue?	62	38		100
Quality Assurance identifies weaknesses in the implemented curriculum activities by department.	25	44	31	100

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness in OYSCATECH

Respondents exhibited a high level of agreement on the relevance of specific indicators for evaluating teaching effectiveness. A resounding 100% agreed that direct classroom observation could reveal teaching performance, while 94% acknowledged punctuality as a valid indicator. Additionally, 88% linked CGPA and examination results to teaching quality, and

81% supported the use of lesson plans and NBTE-aligned materials in assessing instructional effectiveness. This widespread agreement underscores a shared institutional understanding of teaching effectiveness metrics, corroborating established pedagogical models that advocate for both output-based (student performance) and process-based (classroom behavior and planning) assessments (Senge, 1990; Deming, 1986).

Table 3:
Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness in OYSCATECH

Statement	Agree F (%)	Disagree F (%)	I cannot say F (%)	Total F (%)
CGPA/Examination Results/Performance of Students can reveal teaching effectiveness	88%	12	-	100
Observation during the lecture period can reveal teaching effectiveness	100	-	-	100
Punctuality of lecturers in class can reveal teaching effectiveness	94	6	-	100
Compliance of lesson plan and instructional materials with NBTE specifications can be used to evaluate teaching effectiveness	81	13	6	100
Student learning outcomes, test scores, assignments, retention, and graduation rates can measure teaching effectiveness	88	12	-	100

Relationship between QA Practices and Teaching Effectiveness in OYSCATECH

Lecturers' responses indicate strong positive perceptions of the influence of QA practices on teaching quality. Specifically, 74% agreed that classroom visits by QA officials improve punctuality and content alignment with the NBTE curriculum. Similarly, 75% affirmed that the identification of curricular weaknesses has improved instructional delivery. While 62% noted that QA-led training has enhanced teaching capacity, a noteworthy 25% were

undecided, indicating a potential area for enhancement.

The overall perception that the establishment of a QAC has improved teaching effectiveness (81% agreement) reinforces the argument that institutionalized QA structures can promote accountability and continuous improvement. However, the findings also highlight the need for more robust faculty development initiatives and transparent feedback systems to maximize impact.

Table 4:
Relationship between QA Practices and Teaching Effectiveness in OYSCATECH

Statement	Agree F (%)	Disagree F (%)	I cannot say F (%)	Total F (%)
Questions	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)
Using the school timetable to make scheduled and unscheduled visits to the classroom by Quality Assurance Officials has led to punctuality of lecturers.	74	13	13	100
Ensuring compliance with the NBTE curriculum by the Quality Assurance Officials has led to teaching appropriate content of the courses to students in OYSCATECH.	74	13	13	100
Identification of weakness in the implemented curriculum activities by Quality Assurance has led to teaching seasonal courses and content in OYSCATECH.	75	6	29	100
Training organised by Quality Assurance has improved the teaching capacity of lecturers in OYSCATECH.	62	13	25	100
The establishment of the Quality Assurance Committee has indeed led to more effective teaching in OYSCATECH.	81	9%	10	100

Students' Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness in OYSCATECH

Students generally rated teaching performance positively. For instance, 94% indicated that lecturers effectively engage students during class sessions, and 59% agreed that instructional clarity led to improved comprehension. However, feedback on assignments and assessments emerged as a notable challenge—only 59% rated feedback

as excellent, while up to 70% (based on inconsistent data entries) rated it lower, suggesting dissatisfaction in this area. Although 100% of students rated their class CGPA as “excellent,” such unanimity raises concerns about data validity or response bias. Nonetheless, the generally favourable assessment of lecturers’ instructional delivery (with 76% rating it as excellent) reflects positively on the institution’s teaching quality.

Table 5:
Students' Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness in OYSCATECH

Questions	Excellent F (%)	Good F (%)	Fair F (%)	Poor F (%)	Total F (%)
Rate the results and CGPA of your class member over the last session	100	-	-	-	100
Lecturers always teach well, and most students understand	76	9	15	-	100
Lecturers engage students during class sessions	94%		6	-	100
Lecturers provide timely feedback on assignments and assessments.	59	23	18	-	100
Rate the overall instructional delivery of lecturers in your department.	76	12	12	-	100

Interview Findings

Responses from Quality Assurance Committee Members

Question 1: Roles and Functions of the Quality Assurance Unit

Response 1: The Quality Assurance (QA) Committee at Oyo State College of Agriculture and Technology (OYSCATECH) performs a multi-faceted oversight role aimed at enhancing academic quality. Members described their unit as an "inspectorate body" responsible for improving teaching and research standards across the institution. Their duties include conducting both scheduled and unscheduled visits to classrooms, laboratories, and other academic facilities to ensure compliance with curriculum standards, academic board regulations, and institutional policies. Additionally, the committee is tasked with proposing strategic plans and innovations, receiving and investigating complaints of misconduct—such as extortion, harassment, and exploitation—and identifying weaknesses in curriculum implementation. In cases of non-compliance or poor performance, the QA committee recommends appropriate sanctions to college management.

Question 2: Frequency and Nature of Teaching Evaluation

Response 2: Teaching activities at OYSCATECH are evaluated continuously. QA officers conduct daily classroom visits to verify lecturer attendance, monitor curriculum adherence, and assess overall instructional delivery. This routine surveillance is perceived as a proactive measure to uphold academic standards.

Question 3: Curriculum Deficiencies and Recommendations

Response 3: Committee members affirmed that they have, on multiple occasions, identified deficiencies in departmental curriculum implementation. They noted that such findings are formally communicated to

Heads of Departments (HODs) along with actionable recommendations for improvement.

Question 4: Impact of Quality Assurance on Teaching Effectiveness

Response 4: According to QA officers, their efforts have had a measurable impact on instructional quality. They observed that lecturers now demonstrate greater punctuality and adherence to the National Board for Technical Education (NBTE) curriculum. Additionally, the enforcement of sanctions against erring staff has reportedly fostered a culture of accountability and improved pedagogical outcomes.

Perspectives from Academic Deans

Question: In your opinion, how effective is the current QA system in improving teaching quality?

Response: Deans of various faculties echoed the sentiments of the QA Committee. They affirmed that the existing QA framework has positively influenced teaching quality through routine classroom monitoring, performance assessments, and disciplinary recommendations. According to one dean, "The QA committee has directly improved teaching standards by keeping staff performance under constant review."

Students and Student Union Government (SUG) Perspectives

Question 1: Awareness and Visibility of QA Activities

Students and SUG executive committee displayed a high level of awareness regarding QA operations within the institution. One student remarked, "I have seen them several times during lecture periods observing and asking questions from both students and lecturers."

Question 5: Perceived Impact on Teaching Effectiveness

The presence of QA officials is viewed as a positive influence. Students noted instances where lecturers who failed to show up for

classes were queried, suggesting that QA monitoring has increased lecturers accountability. However, some students indicated that QA evaluations rarely involved direct comparison of instructional materials with curriculum benchmarks. Instead, QA officers were more frequently observed inspecting examination processes.

Class Representatives' Observations

Response: Class representatives reported noticeable improvements in student academic performance over the past two semesters. They

attributed this partly to the recent introduction of general mid-semester tests, which they believe have motivated students to study more consistently. While some representatives could not definitively link improved academic outcomes to QA initiatives, they acknowledged the Committee's active presence in classrooms and examination venues. One noted, "Although I cannot say for sure, the QA team frequently comes to inspect and interact with students, which may be contributing to the overall improvement."

RESULTS

Table 6:

Descriptive Analysis

Acknowledgement of QA Committee Existence.	QA monitoring improved punctuality	Classroom observation indicates teaching effectiveness	CGPA and exam results to teaching quality.
81%	74%	100%	88%

Table 7:

Pearson Correlation between QA Practices and Teaching Effectiveness

Variable 1	Variable 2	r	p-value
Quality Assurance Practices	Teaching Effectiveness	.642	< .001

*Note: Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 8:

Simple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Teaching Effectiveness from QA Practices

Predictor Variable	B	SE B	β (Beta)	t	P
Quality Assurance Practices	0.56	0.07	0.64	7.84	< .001

Model Summary:

- $R = .642$, $R^2 = .412$, Adjusted $R^2 = .407$

- $F(1, 150) = 61.46$, $p < .001$

Interpretation: QA practices significantly predict 41.2% of the variance in teaching effectiveness.

Discussion

Findings affirm the positive influence of QA mechanisms on teaching effectiveness, aligning with TQM principles and Systems

Theory. The presence of QA Committees, routine classroom monitoring, and training were linked with improved lecturer punctuality and curriculum adherence (Eze &

Okafor, 2023; Ogunleye, 2022). However, issues such as inadequate feedback systems and occasional lack of curriculum alignment highlight implementation gaps. These findings echo similar concerns noted in previous studies (Bello, 2021; Musa et al., 2023). The need for regular training and digital QA tools is essential to address these gaps.

Conclusion

This study concludes that quality assurance practices significantly influence teaching effectiveness at OYSCATECH. The existence of structured QA committees, teaching inspections, and compliance measures leads to improved lecturer performance and better learning outcomes. However, full operational integration, stakeholder feedback mechanisms, and capacity-building must be enhanced for sustained impact.

References

- Abubakar, H., & Lawal, M. (2022). Student feedback as a tool for quality assurance in Nigerian polytechnics. *Journal of Student Affairs and Quality Enhancement*, 2(1), 36–47.
- Adebayo, R. A. (2021). Assessment of internal quality assurance practices in Nigerian universities. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation*, 12(2), 45–58.
- Adeyemi, D., & Olatunji, A. (2022). Funding and quality assurance in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *Journal of Educational Finance and Planning*, 8(1), 22–35.
- Akinyemi, T., & Yusuf, M. (2023). ICT integration and quality assurance in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *Journal of Educational Technology and Innovation*, 6(2), 40–55.
- ASQ. (n.d.). *History of quality*. American Society for Quality. <https://aq.org/quality-resources/history-of-quality>
- Bello, M. A. (2021). Quality assurance and curriculum reform in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies in Africa*, 7(3), 28–41.
- Chukwu, L., & Ezeani, N. (2021). Quality assurance and faculty development in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy*, 5(2), 109–121.
- Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. MIT Press.
- Enakpoya, E., & Okposio, O. C. (2020). Quality assurance mechanisms in Nigerian tertiary institutions: Challenges and way forward. *Nigerian Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 20(1).
- Evans, J. R., & Lindsay, W. M. (2011). *Managing for quality and performance excellence* (8th ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Eze, C. I., & Okafor, G. N. (2023). Impact of accreditation on academic program quality in Nigerian colleges of education. *African Journal of Teacher Education*, 9(2), 90–103.
- Ibrahim, Y., & Musa, T. (2024). Role of external quality assurance agencies in Nigerian higher education. *Journal of Educational Regulation and Accreditation*, 7(1), 51–66.
- Iseme, M. A. (2001). *Total quality management and efficiency in the Nigerian public service: A case study of the Nigeria Civil Service* [Master's thesis, Ahmadu Bello University]. ABU Zaria Repository.
- Mohammed, S., & Ibrahim, A. (2024). Monitoring and evaluation practices in quality assurance units of Nigerian universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 13(1), 122–138.
- Musa, M., Abdullahi, B., & Jinginal, J. (2024). Empirical review of studies on higher education quality assurance in Nigeria. *Kashere Journal of Education*, 5(2).
- Nnorom, U. S. (2020). Quality assurance in tertiary institutions in Nigeria: A driving force for sustainable development. *Asian Journal of Advances in Research*, 3(1), 80–85.

- Nwachukwu, C., & Obi, P. (2023). Quality assurance and research output in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Academic Research and Development*, 9(2), 70–82.
- Oakland, J. S. (2003). *Total quality management: Text with cases* (3rd ed.). Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Ogbeche, M. M. (2025). Internal and external quality assurance practices as predictors of institutional effectiveness of public universities in Cross River State, Nigeria. *British Journal of Education*, 9(6), 41–54. <https://ejournals.org/wp-content/uploads/Internal-and-External-Quality-Assurance-Practices.pdf>
- Ogunleye, A. O. (2022). Stakeholder perceptions of quality assurance in polytechnic education in Nigeria. *Journal of Technical Education and Training*, 5(1), 101–112.
- Ojo, A., & Salami, K. (2020). Challenges of implementing quality assurance in private universities in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Private Education*, 3(1), 75–88.
- Okon, E., & Udo, M. (2021). Quality assurance and institutional governance in Nigerian colleges of education. *Journal of Educational Management*, 6(3), 115–127.
- Oladipo, B., & Ajayi, F. (2023). Comparative study of quality assurance mechanisms in public and private universities. *Nigerian Journal of Comparative Education*, 4(2), 93–106.
- Pyzdek, T., & Keller, P. A. (2009). *The Six Sigma handbook* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.
- Standards Organisation of Nigeria. (2024). *Standards – Standards Organisation of Nigeria*. <https://www.son.gov.ng/standards/>
- Uche, I., & Nwankwo, O. (2022). Effectiveness of SERVICOM in enhancing quality in federal universities. *Nigerian Journal of Public Administration*, 18(1), 67–79.
- UNODC, & National Bureau of Statistics. (2019). *Survey on quality and integrity of public services in Nigeria*. Practical Sampling International. <https://www.unodc.org/documents/nigeria/publications/NQS/Quality-and-Integrity-of-Public-Services-in-Nigeria.pdf>