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Executive Summary
This paper has two parts, Part One examines management, Inspection and Supervision for delivery of Quality Basic education and Part Two examines the same for delivery of Quality Higher education. It is evident that Basic education is managed, supervised and inspected in line with directives of the Education Act No 25 of 1978 and amendment Act No 10 of 1995, while technical evaluation, regulation, accreditation and quality assurance refer to the terms commonly used in Higher Education whose management is under the Tanzania Commission for Universities (TCU), a legal body established by the Universities Act No. 7 of 2005.

Part One, therefore, provides an analysis of how the Inspectorate, management and supervisory bodies within the basic education level are expected to operate in implementing the requirements of the Education Act, how they operate and the challenges they face in executing the roles assigned to them. Part two, on the other hand, provides an analysis of the various processes of regulation, accreditation and quality assurance in Higher education. It is therefore obvious that the TCU has dual roles of accreditation and regulatory, roles that should in the long run be separated for more effective performance.

In the current situation the Inspectorate, being a department within the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training may face some problems that are normally associated with a huge bureaucracy that may jeopardise efficiency and impact and it would be desirable to be transformed into an autonomous body with experts providing quality assurance, support, advice and objective recommendations as the law requires. The TCU on the other hand enjoys such autonomy notwithstanding the challenges it faces, including the need to have in place more regulations for it to provide quality services.

Management of schools
Leadership:
In principle leadership is involved in creating, communicating and delivering the vision and mission of the school, taking account of the concerns and aspirations of all the stakeholders in the school including the pupils.

Management:
Management is involved in planning, organisation, directing, supervising, monitoring and evaluating the whole school development plan implementation. Appropriate leadership by the head teacher and effective management by the school committee and the head teacher will enhance the potential of creating a successful school.

Supervision
Supervision refers to the act of overseeing the work of the school and providing professional guidance and advice to teachers. Supervision is a collaborative course of action where the supervisor works with the head of school, teachers and the school committee/board to improve pedagogical and administrative activities at school.
Provision of quality Education:

This means ensuring that the school adheres to set standards and demonstrates high standards of teaching, learning and management through personal modelling by the Head of the institution or school who is the overall supervisor of teaching standards at the school level.

Inspection

The critical role of inspection as one of the dominant strategies for monitoring and improving the performance of education system in schools cannot be overemphasized. Inspection is concerned, in the main, with the improvement of standards and quality of education and should be an integral part of a school improvement program. In many countries where inspectoral system of supervision of schools is conducted, the responsibility for inspection lies with the Inspectorates. School inspection practices, in Tanzania are associated with numerous problems which, as a result, force attempts to improve education quality into the background.

This paper examines the roles assigned to the Inspectorate and analyses the problems associated with the inspection of schools in Tanzania and also provides alternative strategies for improving the practice of school inspection. Included in the paper are some fundamental assumptions underpinning the practice of inspection, recent attempts by the government to improve school inspection, and the major challenges that the Government and the school inspection system need to address.
PART ONE

Management, Inspection and Supervision for Effective Delivery of Quality Basic Education

By

Joseph S. Mmbando
Director, Kifai Modern secondary School –Kiluvya DSM

1. Policies and structures

1.1 Purposes of Inspection, an Overview:

Many countries have some inspectorate system with similar roles and responsibilities. Some make a clear distinction between Inspection and supervision and in some cases these are considered to be the responsibility of the Inspectorate. In Tanzania supervision is considered to be the duty of the Head Teacher / Head of School or Principal of the College. It is a role that is played by the manager of schools involving the Ward Education Coordinator and the District Education Officers.

- In Tanzania the purposes of inspection is to ensure that the school complies with the provisions of the Education Act and to ascertain whether that school is being properly and efficiently managed.

- In Britain, the major purpose of inspection is “to collect a range of evidence, match the evidence against a statutory set of criteria, arrive at judgments and make the judgment known to the public”

- Scotland, cites the following three reasons for conducting school inspection. These are to:
  (a) Report on the effectiveness of education in schools and other educational Institutions and to recommend action for improvement;
  (b) Evaluate the arrangements for assuring quality in schools; and
  (c) provide frank and objective advice to the higher education authorities and to ensure that educational initiatives are implemented effectively.

Therefore, overall, inspection is concerned, in the main, with the improvement of standards and quality of education and should be an integral part of a school improvement program. The rational for this improvement is three fold:

(a) The universal recognition of the right of every child in every classroom, in every school to receive a high quality education appropriate to their needs and aptitudes as stipulated in the Constitution;

(b) The effectiveness in education system is a key influence on economic well-being of every nation; and

(c) The recognition of the need to equip students with the kind of education that will enable them to contribute to increasingly complex and changing society as stated in Tanzania Development Vision 2025 (P.19).
2.0 Current situation: Management

2.1 The Inspectorate:

In Tanzania, the Inspectorate operates as a department within the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training is headed by the Chief Inspector of Schools. The department is divided into three sections dealing with the Administration of the Department, Coordination of Basic – Primary Education inspection, Secondary and Teacher Training. Each section is headed by an Assistant Director. In the field, the Inspectorate is divided into Zones that combine more than one Region; Seven as at 1978 but by 2009 Eleven Zones, a sub-division necessitated by the growing number of schools.

The Zones are divided into Districts which are the same as the Local Government Authorities. The Zones and Districts are headed by a Zonal and District Chief Inspector of Schools, respectively. By this arrangement, the Zones are answerable to the Ministry Headquarters and the Districts are answerable to the Zone but are managed centrally from MoEVT HQ. There is therefore no Regional Inspectorate despite the fact that the Region is a recognized education administrative level. The question to ask ourselves is when will the creation of new zones stop and stabilize? From the management point of view, creating new offices strains the budgets and causes distortions in efficiency.

2.2 Management of Schools

The management of schools, pre-primary, primary, Non-Formal and Adult Education and Secondary are under the Prime Ministers’ Office Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG). To facilitate links with the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training, the Government appointed a Deputy Permanent Secretary responsible for Primary and Secondary Education, and a Coordinator for Secondary Education in the PMO-RALG. Likewise DEOs to take charge of Secondary Education have been appointed and posted to Local Government Authorities (LGAs).

2.3 Why Inspect Schools?

According to Wilcox & Gray (1994), Inspection, as a mode of monitoring education, offers the following major benefits:

- It gives inspectors an opportunity to observe classrooms and, thereby, a better basis for discussing the development of the school with head teachers;
- It gives school inspectors an opportunity to learn about the schools, the head teachers, the teachers, the curriculum, and the students and indicates which way forward;
- It can be a potential learning experience for those involved;
- It should provide useful information for parents in their choice of schools;
- It leads to a better understanding of schools;
- It enhances staff cooperation and public recognition that the school is basically on the right track; and
- If conducted properly it can boost staff morale;

2.4 Assumptions Underlying School Inspection

Inspection is built upon a number of assumptions and ideas about schools. The following four basic assumptions underlie school inspection:
(i) Inspection is an effective and cost-effective method for improving schools;

(ii) The inspection process leads to a set of recommendations which describe the main areas requiring improvement of specific to the school inspected;

(iii) Improvement of schools through inspection can be gauged from the extent to which the recommendations are implemented; and

(iv) From the Inspection report, those in authority (the Commissioner for Education and LGA) have the opportunity to know and understand the objectives and goals of the school so well that they can assume superior academic and professional roles over teachers and pupils in the school.

2.5 Legal Basis for the Inspection of Schools in Tanzania

The Education Act No. 25 of 1978 section 41 – 44 and the Education (amendment) Act No. 10 of 1995 sections 31 – 32 establishes the legal basis for the Inspection of Schools in Tanzania. The Education Act states the following:

Section 41:
(1) The Minister shall appoint, by name or office, public officers each of whom shall perform the functions of an inspector of schools

(2) The Minister shall after consultation with the Commissioner make regulations with respect to which offices shall automatically perform the functions of an inspector or which officers are authorised by the Act or under any written law to visit a school in order to carry out their lawful functions.

Section 42:
(1) The Commissioner shall cause every school to be inspected by an inspector for the purposes of ensuring that:
• a school complies with this Act and
• Ascertaining whether that school is being properly and efficiently conducted.

(2) Every inspector shall make a report to the Commissioner in respect of every school inspected and with regard to such matters as the Commissioner may require him to report upon.

(3) Where an inspector reports to the Commissioner, on an inspection of a local education authority school made by him, he shall send a copy of that report to the manager of the school and to any other local authority responsible for the school.

(4) Subject to section 44 every inspector shall make appropriate recommendations to the head of school as to methods or ways of rectifying the observed problems during the inspection and after so doing make a follow up on the report.

(5) Subject to subsection (3), every manager or local authority to which the copy of the report is sent, shall react appropriately to such a report.

Section 43:
For the purpose of section 42 the Commissioner and any inspector may:

(a) at all reasonable times enter the premises of any school, or any place in which it is reasonably suspected that a school is conducted.

(b) enter any premises upon which he has reason to suspect that an offence against this Act has been or is being committed;
(c) after entering the premises of any school, require any manager or teacher to produce any book, document or other article or to furnish any information relating to the administration or management of or teaching or activities in the school;

(d) remove for further examination any book, document or other article which he has reason to suspect is evidence of the commission of an offence under this Act or of grounds for cancellation of the registration of the school or of any teacher in the school;

(e) do such other things or acts as may be necessary for the furtherance of the purpose of inspection.

Section 44:

(1) If it appears to the Commissioner that any provisions of this Act have not been complied with in any school or that any school is not being properly or efficiently conducted, he may, without prejudice to any other powers vested in him by this Act, by notice in writing under this hand addressed to the manager, head of school, give to him such directions as he may specify in the notice so as to secure compliance with that provision or the more efficient conduct of the school.

(2) The Commissioner may specify in the notice any period of time within which the directions contained in it must be complied with.

(3) The Commissioner may in his discretion in any particular case cause a copy of the notice to be sent to any person or body of persons connected with the management or administration of the school concerned.

These legal statements not only confer upon the inspector the necessary authority to carry out his or her duties, but also define the obligations and manner of performing these duties as a responsible professional.

The main purpose of such legal provision for school inspection is:

To enable the Minister of Education and Vocational Training as a representative of the government and the people to satisfy himself that educational standards are being maintained or improved, and that the schools and colleges are being conducted in accordance with national aims and policies. Seen from a legal standpoint, therefore, inspection is an instrument with which the political and administrative authorities maintain a necessary contact with schools, teachers, and the community.

3.0 Concept of Inspection

As noted by some education stakeholders:

i) Inspection can be conceptualized as overseeing, which involves directing, controlling, reporting, commanding, and other such activities that emphasize the task at hand and assess the extent to which particular objectives have been accomplished within the bounds set by those in authority for their subordinates.

Or

ii) that inspection is an old concept in management whose basic concept is that of autocratic management aimed at catching the workers red-handed; a fault-finding attitude in management, and a one-time fact-finding activity. Therefore, in Tanzania, school inspection seems to be viewed as a process of checking other people's work to ensure that bureaucratic regulations and procedures are followed and that loyalty to the higher authorities are maintained. However, this view of inspection overlooks the
professional interests and needs of the teaching personnel. Inspection process conducted with this view in mind may not be effective in facilitating educational quality or in improving teaching and learning in educational institutions.

3.1 Reasons for School Inspection

School inspection is conducted for the following six major reasons:

- To have an overview of the quality of education, based on agreed all-round performance indicators of the performance of an educational institution and to report back to the educational institutions to enable them plan improvement strategies;
- To supervise the implementation of school curriculum;
- To help diagnose the problems and shortcomings in the implementation of the curriculum;
- To identify some of the discipline problems encountered in schools;
- To monitor and to improve teaching and learning in schools; and
- To provide guidance to schools on how they can improve.

The purposes of inspection may be prompted by the following four major factors (Inspectors Handbook 2009):

(a) An approved inspection plan and work programs at National, Zonal and District levels; i.e. Whole-school Inspection
(b) Inspectors’ personal initiatives i.e. Visits to schools
(c) Investigating adverse reports or anonymous correspondence from the stakeholders and or school managers asking for inspection i.e. Special Inspection; and
(d) Follow-up inspection emanating from concerns indicated in the previous inspection report.

3.2 Objectives of the Inspectorate

As elucidated in the Inspectors’ Handbook, the Inspectorate has the following two major complementary objectives:

(a) Quality assurance, achieved through the inspections of institutions and reporting on these inspections to the institutions, School Managers and to the Ministries and
(b) Quality development, achieved through the advisory services provided during inspection, the provision of staff development opportunities or short seminars, and the development of teaching and learning materials.

As is the case, the primary school Inspectors are generalists, charged with inspecting all areas of curriculum and the Inspectors for Secondary Schools and Teachers’ Training Colleges are basically subject inspectors, who have both general and specialist areas and are recruited to offer advisory services to teachers on teaching of the various subject in the schools.
3.3 Challenges and Improvement proposals with the Current Inspection Practices

There are many challenges that are encountered within the present system of school inspection. The problems are those associated with the following major areas/categories:

(a) **Professionalism**: The major concerns are those associated with unprofessional conduct of some school inspectors which, has had serious implications for teaching and learning to the extent that some hostility has developed between teachers and inspectors. Some of the negative consequences to effective delivery of quality education include:

- Poor relationship between inspectors and teachers;
- The tendency of teachers to mistrust school inspectors;
- Teachers have regarded inspection as a stressful experience due to fear of the unknown;
- Education standards can be compromised when teachers are not given a chance to disapprove inappropriate recommendations given by inspectors;
- Lack of sufficient teacher support during and after inspection;

In such situations, School inspectors should endeavour to be as professional as possible in their inspection practices. This includes an attempt to:

- (a) Provide objective judgments of teacher and head teacher performance
- (b) Establish a friendly and interactive atmosphere with teachers and head teachers
- (c) Cultivate a harmonious working relationship with teachers and heads teachers

(b) **Attitudes and commitment**: Over the years, school inspectors have had general negative attitude toward inspection and a decided lack of commitment and positive approach to inspection. The general negativity toward and the lack of commitment to inspection may be attributed to the lack of appropriate incentives associated with inspectorial role of school inspectors. There seems to be a lack of recognition for inspectorial role by the higher government authorities. Because of apparent lack of incentives, there is a lack of commitment and initiatives on the part of school inspectors to their inspectorial roles which has further led to the inspectors performing inadequately. **Inspectors feel that they have been left out of the major education reforms and plans such as PEDP and SEDP in which although, the inspectorate is given the list of duties summarized below, no corresponding funding and capacity building initiatives have come by.**

*To carry out school inspection by:*

- Monitoring the delivery of, and adherence to, stipulated curriculum;
- Ensuring efficiency and quality in education provision.
- Evaluating the implementation of the PEDP by assessing education achievements, promoting school improvement, and advising all stakeholders in education.
- Providing feedback to LGAs and MoEVT, supporting education agencies, school owners, managers and administrators at all levels.
- Ensuring that every school is inspected at a minimum, every two years.
- Advising school committees on how they can govern effectively and democratically.
- Building the capacity of LGAs, village, mtaa, ward and school authorities to efficiently and effectively deliver a good quality of primary education.
- Advising schools in the development of the Whole School Development Plans.
- Monitoring, reviewing and evaluating PEDP activities and overall progress.
- Collecting and communicating education information to all stakeholders.

(c) Feedback and Follow-Up
Productive feedback and follow-up initiatives relative to inspection are lacking in the education system. Opportunities for follow-up regarding recommendations based on inspection, such as the need for in-service training of teachers are badly lacking. Moreover, because school inspectors are not members of the school, their attempts to provide follow-up initiatives, for example, in facilitating in-service training programs based on their recommendations, are highly limited. Therefore, there does not seem to be a sure mechanism for ensuring that improvement initiatives will be undertaken. Furthermore, because of lack of follow-up, there is no way of ensuring that inspection will contribute to school development in a cost-effective way.

As stipulated in the Education Act, there is need to facilitate appropriate follow-up after inspection of schools to ensure that schools implement suggested changes for improvement. This follow-up should be undertaken within a specified period of time to determine the extent to which the recommendations are implemented. Conclusions of the follow-up should be published and copies availed to the major stakeholders. Further to this, the Inspectorate should endeavor to establish appropriate post-inspection action plan which should be tabled with the key stakeholders in the management of the schools. Once an inspection is over, the school needs management support to move forward. Inspectors are the best people for further advice rather than someone coming in from outside.

(d) Collaboration
Since school inspectors have tended to evaluate teachers based mainly on their own perceptions of teacher performance, teacher involvement on matters regarding school inspection has been very minimal. Opportunities for collaboration through meaningful dialogue between teachers and inspectors, especially after inspections, are highly limited.

Inspection should be taken positively by all parties involved. It should not be regarded as policing the school management or the teachers. Teachers should be made part and parcel of inspectorial activities and should in my view be informed about the inspection process, in particular, the following aspects:

(a) When to expect an inspection (they should not be taken by surprise);
(b) The nature, type, and purpose of inspection;
(c) Evaluation format;
(d) the outcome of the Inspection;
(e) Commendable aspects of the teachers’ performance; and
(f) Areas of improvement and strategies for making the improvements.

In this collaboration, teachers’ feelings, views, aspirations, and attitudes toward inspection results should be considered.
3.4 Pre-Service and In-Service Training

Currently, courses specifically regarding school inspection after an Inspector is appointed are haphazard and not sustained. Similarly, in-service training opportunities for school inspectors on school inspection are lacking and inadequate due to financial constraints. In this case, training for inspectors to keep them abreast of developments in education, to improve their professional skills, and to enjoy the respect and esteem of the teaching profession were highly lacking.

Where and when school inspectors are untrained, they are unable to monitor and to evaluate educational programs effectively.

There is need for a thorough in-service training of inspectors in the principles and techniques of objective supervision and evaluation and in procedures of fostering self-evaluation by teachers.

In-service training is important in creating awareness on the part of inspectors and teachers regarding their respective roles in inspection and in facilitating healthy human relations. Similarly, the training and development of the school inspectors on a systematic basis is critical so that they are able to meet effectively the new challenges of education and shoulder with confidence new responsibilities they are required to perform in a reforming education system.

The Government should endeavor to facilitate inspectors’ study visits to other countries on exchange programs to enable them acquire additional knowledge about inspection. There is also an urgent need for Universities and teachers colleges involved in pre-service training of teachers to include courses on principles and techniques of supervision and inspection as a component of their training programs for aspiring teachers to enlighten them about school inspection. Through training and professional approach to the job, inspectors of schools can provide leadership and serve as agents of change.

3.5 Focus of Inspection

School inspection in many cases seems to lack proper, appropriate, and uniform foci. It has been noted that school inspectors have the tendency to focus on school buildings and administrative systems rather than on teaching and learning, with minimal attention to the identification and improvement of educational standards. Also that even where inspections have been carried out, school inspectors have tended to focus on buildings and rarely get down studying the greater details of the day-to-day lives of students, the way the teacher teaches.

3.5.1 Control vs Service

The present inspection system is control-oriented rather than service-oriented and tends to focus on maintaining status quo by regulating institutional functions and by ensuring that bureaucratic rules and regulations are adhered to. There is therefore, need to identify, to define and to have consistent and appropriate foci or key features or performance indicators relative to school inspection process. Major ingredients of inspection process of a school may be described adequately in terms of the following thirteen discrete features:

(a) Major outputs, such as the standards of student achievements in the national examinations;
(b) Quality of teaching and learning;
(c) School contexts, such as motto, vision, and development plans and targets;
(d) Parental concerns and involvement in school development;
(e) School enrolment;
(f) School data and indicators;
(g) School’s efficiency i.e., the standards of financial planning and management;
(h) Pupils’ personal development and behavior;
(i) subjects of the curriculum;
(j) Accommodation;
(k) Staffing;
(l) Instructional resources;
(m) Planning and organization of school functions; and
(n) Assessment in classrooms.

3.5.2 Classroom observation, in particular, should be given a great deal of emphasis in the future practice of school inspection. School inspectors, who are expected to be experienced teachers, should be more involved in direct observation of classes to enable them make judgments about the quality of teaching and learning based on the evidence they collect in the schools.

Three major reasons for having consistent performance indicators or foci regarding school inspection can be identified. These are to:

(a) Identify areas for detailed investigation;
(b) Provide a basis for measuring the performance of the school against a set of defined criteria; and
(b) Enable school managers to facilitate decisions regarding strengths and shortcomings in the school’s performance.

3.6 Inspectorate Autonomy
The Inspectorate overall, lacks autonomy to execute its services and, consequently, it is unable to implement recommendations based on inspections. All in all what school inspectors do is to inspect schools, point out mistakes, make recommendations, and pass them to the School Committees or boards of governors, district education Managers, and Regional Education Offices for impending implementation.

In the current circumstances, there is need to open a frank debate on the issue of the Inspectorates’ autonomy. As an education quality audit arm of the Government and working on behalf of the clientele i.e. the parents and students, it needs to have adequate autonomy to discharge effectively its duties.

3.7 Transport
School inspectors are often faced with the problem of lack of transport, especially for those inspectors deployed in rural areas. This problem is aggravated by the fact that some schools are located in areas that are very remote to be reached by school inspectors.
Further to this, there is a lack of sufficient funds, especially traveling and subsistence allowances, provided to inspectors to meet expenses associated with transport and accommodation. Indeed, the problem of lack of transport had affected regular and efficient inspection of schools in different parts of the country.

4.0 Planning the Inspection
School inspection practices have been marked by yearly planning in some cases, plans for inspection of schools have been ambitious and, consequently, they are seldom carried out. Similarly, there is an on-going debate on whether schools should be informed prior to an inspection or this should remain impromptu (see 3.3 d. above). In effect, inspections have remained irregular and that some schools and teachers were visited and supervised more frequently than others. Lack of appropriate funding is the root cause of unimplemented Inspection Plans.

4.1 Departmental, Zonal and District levels
There is a need to make prior planning regarding the following major areas relative to the inspection of schools:
   (a) Annual costed work plans for inspection visits;
   (b) Work program;
   (c) Transport;
   (d) Type of inspection;
   (e) Purpose of inspection;
   (f) Inspector roles; and
   (g) Briefing meetings of inspection teams.

4.2 School level planning
Schools on the other hand, should endeavor to prepare the following documents in readiness for inspection:
   (a) Pre-inspection analysis of the school curriculum, staffing, costs, and results;
   (b) School statistics on enrolment;
   (c) Individual teachers’ timetables;
   (d) School internal audit and review report;
   (e) School mission, motto, aims, and development;
   (f) Past examination performance;
   (g) List and addresses of school committee and Board Of Governors members; and
   (h) Records of school indiscipline.

There are three major benefits of pre-inspection preparation, especially by schools:
(a) It provides the school with an opportunity to engage in review process;
(b) It enables the inspection to be based on the evidence provided on the school; and
(c) It puts teachers on their toes to prepare adequately for inspectors’ visits. The preparation process of inspection has the potential of bringing the whole staff together and also improves
the school and certain aspects of their work. School inspection is expensive and has serious implications for funding of public education.

5.0 Bottlenecks to efficient inspectoral activities:

There is in place criteria for various operations within the Inspectorate. The question at hand is that these are not respected or adhered to and overtime, undesirable elements have been allowed to take root thus affecting the credibility of the Inspectorate. The irony for example, is that those recruited as inspectors work with peers who know them very well, are aware of their competencies and or weaknesses they possess as professionals. When the underperforming teacher then becomes an ‘inspector’ then the inspectorate looses out authority.

One of the major bottlenecks to efficiency in the Inspectorate is the human resource; are those appointed the best for the job? Do they possess the requisite professional qualities to be able to inspect others? Is the Inspectorate seen as any other department or is it seen as a truly ‘supporting’ cadre of experts in teaching, management, supervision, leadership, monitoring and evaluation? These are critical issues to be addressed for the creation of a vibrant inspectorate for practical quality assurance not merely routine school inspection visits.

5.1 Education System

Tanzania’s inspectoral system is highly bureaucratic and shares with all other aspects of the education bureaucracy, a top-down, hierarchical, character. Inspectors on the ground sometimes cannot take decisions on matters regarding inspection of schools before consulting the higher authorities who may have little or no knowledge about the situation on the ground. This and other challenges related to management have implications in the delivery of quality basic education. The Inspectorate is a centralized department of MoEVT that works within a decentralized school management system. It is obvious that decision making lapse would necessarily occur, where the inspector would wait for clearance from above while the manager makes such decisions at the site. Some of the challenges are as follows:

5.1.1 Inspector Recruitment, Selection, and Deployment

Although there is clear policy of identifying suitable candidates to be recruited as school inspectors based on education levels, teaching experience and track record, there is evidence from the field that despite the clear policy, unsuitable personnel find their way into the Inspectorate. Often teachers complain that some inspectors seem to be highly incompetent and are unable to apply desired practices of school inspection and to distinguish between effective and ineffective schools.

When the Inspectorate has to deploy some inspectors in areas very remote from their areas of expertise and experience without initial induction, consequently, they do not advise teachers adequately.

Recruitment should be of people with right qualities from among serving teachers and should be based on the following major criteria:

(a) At least 5 years of teaching experience in either primary, secondary, or teachers college;
(b) An understanding of the national educational goals and objectives;
(c) A sound understanding of the educational system;
(d) Superior teaching and supervisory skills;
(e) Proven integrity and commitment;
(f) Ability to win the respect and confidence of the people with whom they work;
(g) The capacity to contribute to the nation of new policy and the improvement of educational system as a whole;
(h) Proven academic and professional proficiency; and
(i) Ability to understand and work with and through the community, for example with parents.

5.1.2 Adequacy of Inspection

School inspection as currently done is highly inadequate and consequently, it does not meet the needs of schools, teachers, head teachers, students, and parents. In general, some schools are rarely ever inspected. Further to this, due to very few days spent in a school and a small number of inspectors in the team, the amount of observation of classroom teaching by inspectors is uneven and disturbingly small.

There inspectors do not spend sufficient time for adequate and meaningful inspection of schools and consequently, school inspectors do not seem to obtain a true picture of the state of schools and to reflect on the outcomes of inspection. The time spent by inspectors to offer professional support to teachers in schools was usually negligible, that inspectors spent most of their time solving administrative problems with head teachers, and that teachers were never helped as adequately as they should. Due to paucity of time at the disposal of school inspectors, the school inspections, wherever held, have become superficial and a mere formality. Also, because of inadequate time, the inspectors experience the following two major constraints:

(a) They hardly devote their attention to the follow-up action of the inspection reports with the result that the very purpose of the inspection gets defeated and

(b) They find it difficult to maintain themselves abreast with the latest development in their subject areas.

Implementation of Work plans in sample Zones and LGAs: July 2009 – June 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of schools</th>
<th>Insp. Target</th>
<th>% Of Number of schools</th>
<th>Inspected</th>
<th>% of target</th>
<th>% of number of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>9782</td>
<td>3996</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3163</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from this data that the number of schools targeted for inspection is below the 50% norm and that the level of implementation in view of the total number of schools is below 20%. This has implications with regard to support to some of the schools would be in every five years while the expected frequency is two years.

5.2 Resources for inspection

5.2.1 Resourcing School inspection

School inspection, especially in rural areas, has been frustrated by the lack of essential facilities, such as office accommodation, clerical services and support staff for school inspectors, funds, equipment, and stationery. Perennial shortage of stationery and inadequate secretarial services also make it difficult for the inspectors to prepare meaningful reports.
There is need to provide adequate resources, such as funds, to facilitate inspectorial services. Additionally, school inspectors should be provided with more and adequate facilities, such as office accommodation and secretarial services to enable them serve effectively. Because inspectors are in the field for much of their time and because record-keeping is essential to the success of their inspectorial functions, an adequate secretarial support is very necessary.

5.2.2 Current State of the Inspectorate (July 2009 – June 2010): a sample of 7 zones with 78 LGAs shows the following picture:

- **Staffing**: Needs 1033 inspectors, has 737 and shortage of 296; which is 28.6%;
- **Transport**: Needs 104 cars, has 73 a shortage of 31; which is 29.8%;
- **Computers**: Needs 135, has 110 a shortage of 25; which is 18.5%
- **Printers**: needs 124, has 82 a shortage of 42; which is 33.8%
- **Photocopiers**: needs 92, has 76 a shortage of 16; which is 17.4%
- **Fax machines**: needs 86, has 62 a shortage of 24; which is 27.9%

5.3 Inspection Reports

As required by law, school inspectors are expected to prepare inspection reports with detailed recommendations and to avail the reports to the school authorities, to take any necessary action. The quality and substance of semi-annual and annual report is highly inadequate. The poor quality of presentation is a reflection of poor office accommodation, clerical services and support staff in inspectors’ offices. This has become a historical problem since the 1978 inception and there are no obvious plans to deal with this systemic problem.

There is need to refine procedures and formats for reporting findings of inspection to make them meaningful and credible. Current reports are overloaded with numbers and without adequate analysis by inspectors.

5.4 Evaluating the Inspection

There is a general lack of appropriate post-inspection evaluation by school inspectors at the end of each inspection to determine the views of head teachers and other school personnel regarding the practice and process of inspection. In my view this is a serious weakness of the current system. For effective delivery of quality education, Monitoring and evaluation is important for feedback to the system. It provides cause for improvement of the system and creates a healthy work relationship between inspectors and the schools.

5.5 Inspectorate-University Partnerships

There does not seem to be a clear formal link between the Universities and the Inspectorate section of the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training. Because of the lack of Inspectorate - university collaboration, the school Inspection is not a topic in University teacher training and as such the Inspectorate may only involve university teaching personnel as facilitators during inspector in-service training programs on individual basis at an agreed-upon cost. In the early induction courses the University was involved by as of now this is not the case.
There is need to facilitate partnerships between the local universities and the Inspectorate to enable university faculty to assist with in-service training, especially of school inspectors as facilitators. Such partnerships may also enable university teaching staff to collaborate with school inspectors in conducting studies relevant to inspection in schools and colleges that can feed into the teacher training process.

5.6 Inspectors’ Handbook.

The Ministry has written an Inspectors’ Handbook 2009. The handbook provides guidance not only to inspectors but also to other stakeholders, including heads of schools, school managers and other education personnel. It is a reliable source of information with regard to the Education Act and supports all education providers by creating awareness about what is expected of them in providing good quality education services.

It provides indicators stipulated in the National Basic Education Standards for Basic Education, highlights the standard conduct of inspections, the requirements of the Education Act, and above all it describes the scope of work and operational schedules to be used by Inspectors. These are intended to ensure uniformity of action and judgement of quality of work observed during inspection. It is emphasised that uniformity of judgement is a very important attribute because Inspectors work in schools with diverse localities and settings.

6.0 Summary and Conclusion: Which Way Forward?

To summarize, there are numerous deficiencies in the practice of school inspection in Tanzania to-day. Of particular importance is the fact that school inspectors themselves are poorly supported and trained. The reports they produce are rarely used in planning by LGAs and therefore do not contribute to quality improvements. The serious issue is that the schools have numerous deficiencies, mostly requiring more investments and when funds are unavailable for such activities nothing moves forward at the desired pace.

If the intent of the current education reforms embodied in PEDP and SEDP is to provide high quality education, then strategies must be addressed now that will attempt to address the present shortcomings in the practice of school inspection. These should include, among others, the following:

(a) monitoring continuously the conduct of school inspection and the quality of its reports;
(b) Facilitating ongoing consultation with the key stakeholders on matters regarding quality assurance;
(c) Keeping education quality and the quality culture at the top of educational agenda;
(d) Developing the right attitudes to the “quality culture” to secure the most effective education possible and the best value for public investment;
(e) Reducing the impasse associated with bureaucratic procedures in the current practice of implementing inspection recommendations now leading to non-implementation;
(f) Developing most cost-effective ways to facilitate inspection.

Additionally, all the stakeholders should regard inspection system as an important means to improve the efficiency of the system of education; as an
instrument for realizing the goals of educational development; and as a tool of supervision.

Therefore, a rethink of management arrangements for the inspection of schools is needed urgently. The arrangements must meet the following four important criteria:

(a) The quantity and quality of inspection must meet the national educational standards;
(b) Cost-effectiveness in the inspection practices and procedures;
(c) The change must be systematic and far-reaching; and
(d) The new approaches must be characterized by an attempt to deal with the myriad problems comprehensively. In other words, if monitoring is to provide a positive input into improving the quality of education, assessment of deficiencies needs to be turned into advice for improvement.

Successful initiatives will depend on an endeavor to involve all the key players at different levels of thinking through how inspection practices can be adapted to local circumstances and situations. When all the key stakeholders are participants in the inspection process, there is likelihood of facilitating quality and accountability.

Superior inspection must mean a better basis for school improvement. The one question that the Inspectorate needs to address is: Will the inspection practices and procedures put in place help to facilitate standards of education in general and teaching and learning in schools in particular?

6.1 Policy Implications

The proposed strategies toward the improvement of school inspection system in Tanzania highlighted in this paper are addressed mainly to the policy makers in general, and to the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training. It should rethink school inspection with a view to providing and adhering to a clearly written policy regarding inspection of schools which states, among other things, the frequency of inspection, appointment procedures for school inspectors, induction programs for inspectors, and provisions for incentives and rewards for the inspectors. Funding the Inspectorate should be a major concern and utilizing the products of inspections with regard to identified deficiencies of the schools would be of great benefit.

6.2 Practice

Quality assurance should seek explicitly to evaluate the link between the schools’ development strategies and the outcomes achieved. There is need on the part of the Inspectorate to strengthen the existing mechanisms of ensuring educational quality, for example, through the following strategies:

(a) Ensuring that learning resources in operation are relevant, comprehensive, and are put into effective use;
(b) Facilitating sharing of positive trends across schools;
(c) Encouraging inspectors to be open, critical, and able to keep abreast with the changes taking place in the field of education to-day, e.g., being familiar with all aspects of curriculum design, planning, evaluation, review, and use of ICT;
(d) Encouraging inspectors to be able to learn from teachers, to comprehend the circumstances under which a given school operates, and to give the necessary advice;
(e) Encouraging inspectors to be positive in their approaches to school inspection by accepting positive opinions from teachers; and
(f) Encouraging parents to “continue to provide the necessary physical facilities in educational institutions through organized fund-raising meetings.

6.3 Roles and responsibilities of all levels (national, regional, zonal, district) in view of Decentralization by Devolution (D by D)

The principle of decentralisation is based on the fact that control and management of resources for the provision of services are best attained at the level where they are consumed. However, it is of critical importance that clear mechanisms for devolving functions and resources are taken to the lower levels. The Decentralisation by Devolution Model (D by D) of management of public service was adopted in 1998. The process consists of four main steps:

(i) **Political Decentralisation**: This is the establishment of a Council as local political body and involves devolving decision making powers and rules setting to Local Council.

(ii) **Fiscal Decentralisation**:

   Provides Councils with discretionary powers to levy local taxes and to create a local financial base for development. However the Central Government supports local governments by providing unconditional grants.

   Local Councils are thereby empowered by the Local Government Finance Act 1982, to draft their own development plans, prioritize and spend monies generated from local levies and taxes as well as from the government Grants.

(iii) **Administrative Decentralisation**:

   • Involves de-linking local authority staff from respective technical/parent ministries and making them accountable to Councils. This is a concept that has not been understood clearly and the need for substantial capacity building is evident.

   • Local Councils are allowed to recruit their own personnel with appropriate technical skills, and

   • Operate as a body cooperate that may sue or be sued.

6.4 Roles and Responsibilities of Levels

6.4.1 The roles of PMO-RALG are:

• Enabling LGAs to provide quality services;
• Managing the critical interfaces with Ministries and Development Partners and LGAs;
• Formulating policies;
• Providing sound advice on policy and planning;
• Providing quality information;
• Harmonising Organisational development and systems;
• Providing legal support and advice, and
• Monitoring support provided to LGAs by Regional Secretariats and regional affairs.
• Champion D by D and create the necessary conditions for LGAs to deliver quality services efficiently and equitably;
• Manage the critical interfaces between itself and LGAs with Central, Sector, and Administrative Ministries, as well as Development Partners; and
• Demonstrate, organisational learning and the empowerment of all employees to fulfil their maximum potential.

6.4.2 The Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT) core functions are:
• Policy Formulation;
• Quality Assurance;
• Formulation of National Standards;
• Monitoring and Evaluation;
• Formulation of Laws and Regulations;
• Solicit Education Sector wide resource support.

6.4.3 Role of Regional Secretariat are:
• Coordinate the provision of Basic Education;
• Translate Sector policies into operational strategies;
• Advice LGAs on technical operational issues;
• Provide technical support to LGAs;
• Monitor and evaluate performance at the LGAs level; and
• Prepare Regional performance reports.

6.4.4 The roles and functions of LGAs are to:
• Translate sector policies into plans of actions;
• Provide operational guidelines and instructions to WDCs;
• Consolidate Ward development plans to develop Council plans;
• Ensure equitable allocation and distribution of human, material and financial resources within the LGAs;
• Prepare annual recurrent and development operational budgets;
• Provide planning technical assistance to WDCs;
• Stimulate community participation in self help activities by providing human, material and financial support;
• Create conducive working environment for LGAs staff;
• Monitor and evaluate performance at the grassroot level; and
• Prepare Council progress reports.

6.4.5 Roles and functions of WDCs are to:
• Consolidate priorities from the service delivery institutions in the Ward;
• Sensitize the community to participate in self help activities;
• Locate suitable space for school infrastructure construction;
• Locate and distribute equitably support from the Council;
• Coordinate service delivery activities in the Ward;
• Consolidate operational reports from service provider institutions (schools, health centres, agriculture centres etc.); and
• Monitor and evaluate performance at the school level.

Finally, a fundamental pre-requisite for inspection and support services to achieve continuous improvement in their performance is a system for routinely monitoring the effectiveness of their impact on schools. This may require expert external evaluation of the inspectorate that would provide insights on the situation and way forward.
PART TWO
Management, Inspection and Supervision for effective delivery of 
Quality Higher Education
by
Dr. Christine Hongoke, Tanzania Commission for Universities

1.0 Introduction
Higher education as a purposeful system identifies itself with quality and quantity of its inputs and outputs. ‘Quality’ extends further to also take care of processes, that is, teaching-learning and research activities in higher education institutions. Based on this typology then, quality in higher education can be defined based on each of the academic system factors, in which case, it is considered in terms of input, process and output. In evaluating each of these factors, the quality of an educational system can be recognized.

The necessity of quality assurance in higher education is recognized and accepted world over. It is urgent in Tanzania at this time more than ever before due to the impact of globalization, fast growth of higher education sub-sector, increasing number of academic degrees offered by these institutions and penetration of foreign programmes into the higher education market as legitimized by cross-border higher education arrangement.

Expansion of higher education in Tanzania is demonstrated by increasing number of public and private universities and university colleges from three in 1995 to 33 in 2010. This fast growth poses challenges to the system in terms of meeting stakeholders’ expectations on matters of quality of the graduates from these institutions.

Realizing some of the challenges brought by policy reforms of 1990s, the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania established the Higher Education Accreditation Council in 1995 in order to:

• oversee the promotion of the objectives of higher education;
• process applications for permission to establish and manage higher education institutions;
• coordinate and ensure fair play in the selection and enrolment of students and
• monitor the quality of higher education by evaluating, comparing and equating academic programmes and awards obtained from inside and outside the country.

The HEAC was in operation up to July 2005 when it was succeeded by the Tanzania Commission for Universities established by the Universities Act No.7 of 2005. This is a regulatory body with expanded roles.

2.0 Management, inspection and supervision
The terms “inspection” and “supervision” are not commonly used in Higher and Technical Education. The common terms used are, technical evaluation, regulation, accreditation and quality assurance. The regulation of higher education in terms of registration, accreditation and quality assurance is the prerogative of the Tanzania Commission for Universities, a legal body established by the Universities Act No. 7 of 2005. Registration of a higher education
institution is preceded by a technical evaluation and based on the technical report an institution is granted the deserved registration certificate.

Accreditation is a continuous process which involves technical evaluation and assessment of an institution, programmes, teaching and learning environment, inputs and processes. Quality assurance is a systematic, structured and continuous attention to quality in order to maintain and improve the effectiveness of the system being observed or the delivery process and its output. Accreditation is some kind of a ‘barometer’ that depends on quality assurance to measure the status and credibility of an institution.

3.0 Accreditation practice in Tanzania

The higher education sector is ceaselessly being pressured to respond to national and global demands. As such, higher education providers need both institutional and programme accreditation as a condition for them to operate legitimately and credibly. Accreditation is therefore, both the process and ultimate proof, approval or certification granted to an institution by a relevant authority representing the interests of the stakeholders, attesting to possession by the institution of programmes and quality assurance mechanisms that guarantee the attainment of appropriate educational standards and qualification.

Tanzania Commission for Universities (TCU), recognizes that accreditation being a multi-layered process of quality assurance involves several players. In order for it to proceed smoothly and effectively, the following operational principles are taken into account:

♦ Participatory-approach is adopted when developing criteria and procedures for quality assurance where all universities are involved or consulted.

♦ Quality assurance is based on a mix of self-evaluation at institutional level and external or independent assessment follows to verify the self-assessment report of an institution.

♦ External quality assurance focuses on improvement rather than on punitive measures.

♦ Any technical report is forwarded to the institution for feedback from the management on the objectivity of the report before the final report is submitted to the Commission for deliberations.

The process of accreditation, be it of a programme or of an entire institution, typically involves the following three major activities:

♦ Conduct by the management of the institution/programme of a self-study exercise using the accrediting organisation’s set of expectations about quality (criteria, standards) as its guide and submission of a report about the same.

♦ Report review and site visits by a team of external peers selected by the accrediting organisation to verify the report through observation, interviews and discussion, and submission of an assessment report including recommendations.

♦ The accrediting authority, guided by a set of expectations about quality and integrity, reviews the assessment report and recommendations, makes a judgement, and communicates its verdict to the institution and interested parties.
Delivery of quality higher education is crucial for any university institution and the nation. There is always the need to adopt a cautious approach in assessing institutions since quality, with its internal and external demand is multi-dimensional. It is simultaneously technical and political and has become a central component of the emerging new relationship between higher education institutions, the government and society as a whole.

3.1 Pre-requisites for institutional accreditation in Tanzania

The Tanzania Commission for Universities (TCU) supports the view that the primary responsibility for the provision of appropriate quality assurance mechanisms rests with the institutions themselves. So, as a starting point every university and university college is supposed to:

- prepare a Charter which constitutes rules and statutes being the legal instruments for the establishment and running of the institution;
- prepare their internal academic, general and special regulations, including *inter alia*, internal quality assessment procedures;
- get clearance from their respective Senates and/or Academic Committees as the case may be, before submitting them to the Tanzania Commission for Universities for validation and approval.
- A standard form requesting for TCU registration and grant of charter is used by the institution to submit the above documents and a fee is charged for the application.
- Conduct self-assessment study of the institutions, prepare and submit to the TCU the resulting report which will form the basis for the TCU to conduct an external assessment leading to the institution’s deserved stage of registration.

3.2 Registration and accreditation of existing institutions.

The procedure is stipulated in the Universities (Chartering, registration and Accreditation procedures) Regulation, 2006 issued in accordance with Section 62 of the Universities Act, No. 7 of 2005 and published in the Government Gazette No. 39 of 21st April 2006.

- It requires TCU to re-register all the institutions.
- all public universities and colleges whose Acts have been repealed by the Universities Act have been accorded top priority over private universities which were previously registered by the former HEAC.
- Each existing institution conducted its self-evaluation and submitted the report to the TCU. The report formed the basis for the external evaluation.
- In the group of public universities there were three categories:
  (a) Existing universities- at the level of accreditation, e.g. the University of Dar es Salaam, Sokoine University of Agriculture and the Open University of Tanzania.
  (b) Universities which were established through the transformation of non-university level institutions eg. The State University of Zanzibar and Mzumbe University.
Constituent College aspiring to transform into full-fledged universities e.g. Muhimbili University College of Health Sciences (MU CHS) into Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences (MUHAS). And the University College of Lands and Architectural Studies (UCLAS) into Ardhi University (AU).

TCU conducted an external evaluation of all public universities and their constituent colleges in October 2006. In March 2008, seven public universities were granted Charters by the President of the United Republic of Tanzania.

3.3 The First External Technical evaluation of Public Universities

TCU ensures that accreditation exercise is always conducted in a top-rate professional manner because quality higher education is key to the university being in a competitive edge and achieving corporate excellence through benchmarking its graduates internationally with top class professionals. The first ETE for public universities was conducted in two phases, first from 2nd-13th October 2006 and 5th-9th November 2006. Members of the external evaluation Committee (ETEC) included senior academicians as well as former and current chief executives of universities or quality assurance regulatory bodies drawn from Tanzania, Uganda, Lesotho and Tanzania.

1. For universities and colleges with large campuses the 7-member ETEC was split into two sub-teams in order for them to be able to visit as many departments and units as possible.
2. At each institution, the evaluation focused on the entire spectrum of academic life and engagement, research, public service and administrative functions, including governance issues, status of resources, adequacy, relevance, scope and internal quality assurance policies and mechanisms for academic and research programmes.

The ETEC provided specific recommendations for further improvement of the teaching–learning environment and other matters for each institution. Other recommendations were to facilitate the TCU to make decisions on deserved registration status and whether or not a charter should be granted to the institution.

3.4 Determining the institution’s registration status

Under the TCU the accreditation process is punctuated by three stages as follows:

- Stage 1: Provisional Registration (Provisional License);
- Stage 2: Full Registration and Grant of Charter and;
- Stage 3: Accreditation.

It should be stated here that the above stages are as stipulated by law. In practice, a Charter as a legal tool to enable the university to operate legally may be granted to an institution as early as the first stage. In the context of Tanzania, the accreditation stage is what matters for a university to demonstrate maturity and excellence.

4.0 Programme validation and accreditation

(a) Universities and colleges are responsible for designing and implementing their programmes.

(b) All universities and colleges are required by law to ensure that their programmes and matching awards:

- are relevant to the full development of the holders’ potentials,
respond to the stakeholders’ needs and in line with the national requirements;
facilitate the mobility and profession in education, training and career paths of the holder.
conform in terms of standard and objectives to the requirements of the University’s definitions of award and may be achieved by a variety of ways using different learning modes.
facilitate student mobility between programmes and institutions and them to transfer credits when moving to another programme or institution with comparable modes of operation such as those using modular or end of semester / examination system or those using credit or unit system.

The TCU provides guidelines for designing curricula and harmonizing programmes. Institutions on their part are expected to adhere to the guidelines and to allocate the resources necessary for implementation of the curricula to ensure the achievement of programme outcomes.

4.1 Why conduct Self-assessment?

Self-assessment as part of the accreditation process is an activity in which an institution evaluates itself with regard to:
♦ adequacy of its mission, goals and objectives
♦ appropriateness, sufficiency and utilisation of its resources
♦ usefulness, integrity and effectiveness of its processes and the extent to which it is achieving its intended outcomes.

The main objectives of such a self-assessment exercise are to:
♦ assure the general public, students and other stakeholders that the institution has the integrity, quality and effectiveness to meet its stated objectives.
♦ serve as an institutional guide for improving quality and effectiveness in the delivery of educational programmes.
♦ demonstrate to an external agency, in this case a regulatory body that the institution is ready for accreditation or re-accreditation.

Self-assessment may also be conducted for programmes before they are subjected to external peer review. Although the self-study process is demanding and requires substantial commitment of time, energy and resources, it is nevertheless a worthwhile undertaking in that it is likely to enable the institution to achieve the following:
♦ sharpen the focus of its purpose and goals.
♦ provide an opportunity to identify the critical issues and concerns facing the institution and generate new or improved approaches to these issues.
♦ build cohesiveness among academic staff, student body and administration by encouraging participation of all segments in the exercise.
♦ provide an opportunity to identify, develop and refine leadership skills of the management and other key personnel;
establish confidence in and credibility of the institution and its programmes among partners, various government and private agencies, and the public at large.

The Universities Act and subsequent regulations require all universities to undertake self-assessment.

4.2 The importance of Technical visitations or site visits

Site visits play a critical role in the accreditation process. They are meant to provide an opportunity for external reviewers to confirm, expand and elaborate on facts and figures submitted by the institutions in their self-assessment reports. Site visits also provide opportunities for peer reviewers to meet with administrators, staff and students as well as tour facilities (e.g. classrooms, libraries etc) in order to complement or place in context materials already provided.

TCU recognizes that professional skills necessary to practice any professional discipline can be acquired first and foremost from the training institutional facilities that are designed and equipped to stimulate the practice of the profession. The facilities should therefore be adequate in size, well equipped with suitable equipment, machinery and tools, suitably laid out, safe and well maintained. Technical Evaluation or Visitation Teams usually verify to confirm the actual equipment available in laboratories /clinics/studios with those listed in the self assessment report, their use for programme delivery and their safety and management.

If there is sharing of facilities and/or equipment the Technical team is required to indicate if the existing arrangement is satisfactory and if not recommend improvements that can be made.

4.3 Importance of quality assurance in higher education provision

The purpose of higher education is not static but dynamic and evolving. Accordingly, people’s expectations from higher education are constantly changing. It is therefore important for higher education providers to regularly review their facilities, resources and processes in order to determine the degree to which they are still capable of meeting people’s expectations and what measures to take in order to attain a higher degree of people’s satisfaction. In a climate of constant change, continuous effort at improvement promotes an institution’s adaptability, growth and survival.

Demand for quality assurance is firmly on the higher education agenda due to the following factors:

(i) the demand for greater accountability and efficiency in respect of public financing.

(ii) Trends towards mass participation in the face of shrinking resources.

(iii) Greater stakeholder scrutiny of education, training processes and outcomes.

The establishment of the TCU was a signal of Government’s concern with the quality of higher education in a liberalised economy. In fact, according to quality assurance experts ‘the concept of quality assurance seems almost everywhere to have been introduced by the need for government to make universities more accountable for the public funds they consume’ (Massaro 1997:10).
4.4 Does institutional or programme accreditation bring about effective delivery of quality higher education?

Accreditation can be done at institutional as well as at programme level. Both levels are important. Institutional evaluation tends to concentrate on institution wide indicators of quality such as syllabi and curriculum design, policies relating to admissions, examinations grading and graduating as well as organisation structure, material inputs, and physical infrastructure. The culture of an institution, it is usually assumed, has a bearing on the quality of programme being offered within it. A positive shift in the culture of an institution, therefore, will also have an impact on the quality of the programmes being offered.

Programme evaluation, on the other hand, tends to concentrate on the specific programmes in terms of content structure, teaching and learning processes, competence deliverables, resources and management. It is theoretically possible for a poorly endowed and managed institution to offer excellent programmes, although this is unlikely to happen.

TCU is aware of the benefits of both types of evaluation. In order to keep costs within manageable limits, it is proposed to proceed in stages, starting with institutional accreditation.

Questions at TCU have always been around the focus of external quality assurance measure. Should the focus be primarily on the institution or the individual programmes or on both? If on both, should the exercises be carried out simultaneously?

TCU started with institutional assessment of public universities. This was temperature taking, so to say. The exercise needs to move to private universities.

Programmes assessment has also began through a pilot project under the Inter University Council for East Africa in collaboration with German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). Fifteen universities started piloting their programmes using Quality Assurance Tools for Universities in East Africa but for some reasons, two universities namely, Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences (MUHAS) and the Hubert Kairuki Memorial University (HKMU) opted out along the way. Both had registered the Doctor of Medicine (MD) programme for pilot. Thirteen remaining universities and the programmes being assessed regionally are:

i) **University of Dar es Salaam**: Bachelor of Commerce (Accounting) and Bachelor of Science in Wildlife Management and Conservation.

ii) **Mzumbe University**: Bachelor of Business Administration and B.Sc. Information Communication Technology Management;

iii) **Sokoine University of Agriculture**: B.Sc. Agriculture

iv) **Open University of Tanzania**: Bachelor of Science (General)

v) **Ardhi University, Dar es Salaam**: B.Sc. Environmental Engineering

vi) **University of Dodoma**: B.Sc. in Information Communication Technology

vii) **Dar es Salaam University College of Education**: B.Ed.(English Language)

viii) **Mkwawa University College of Education**: B.Ed.(English Language)

ix) **St. Augustine University of Tanzania**: Bachelor of Business Administration

x) **St. John’s University of Tanzania, Dodoma**: Bachelor of Business
The experience gained from the first external technical evaluation of public institutions and the on-going regional project on programme evaluation under the IUCEA have indicated that programme level assessments are closer to academic life and therefore likely to be more effective than institutional level assessment. However, institution-wide assessments can have a larger impact in terms of shifting institutional culture. Since programmes exist within institutions there is a good chance that institution-wide assessment can indirectly also lead to improved programmes. Focusing on both levels simultaneously can be a daunting task. It would require the mobilisation of different sets of teams. Therefore, the costs could be astronomical if one wants to do a thorough professional job.

5.0 TCU Challenges

TCU faces quite a number of challenges but for purposes of this paper I will mention challenges related to internal systems and mechanisms used for accreditation and quality assurance.

(i) Dual role of Inspector and Regulator

First and foremost, TCU as an accreditation body operates in pretty much similar ways to their peer organizations around the world by conducting periodic reviews of curricula in the various academic disciplines, assessing the faculty-to-student ratios, reviewing allowable institutional capacity in terms of number of students and equipment that they must avail for student use, assessing academic staff qualifications etc. However, due to the growing number of universities, both public (State-owned) and private, TCU has both accreditation and regulator roles kind of a Judge and Jury at the same time, which is a bit unusual so to speak. One would expect the dual roles to be separated for effective performance. It is for this reason that TCU engages external peers in most of its evaluation exercises and benchmarks its internal standards with regional standards.

(ii) Systems limitations

Secondly, the Universities Act under which TCU operates is still under review and therefore there are quite a number of regulations that need to be in place. As such TCU continue to issue guidelines which may not always be adhered to the letter by universities.

(iii) Programme Benchmarks

TCU is yet to prepare benchmarks for quite a number of programmes. There are programme benchmarks which have been agreed in some professions through professional bodies and these are used under the East African–wide projects.
6.0 Conclusion

Quality Assurance is essential in an expanding and massified system. For effective delivery of higher education, internal quality assurance and institutional self assessments should be continuous, uninterrupted process and should be conducted even without TCU external evaluation which may be expensive to undertake.