

**COVER SHEET FOR CONTRIBUTION TO NADEOSA-NWU DISTANCE LEARNING AND EDUCATION CONFERENCE 2010**

I am/we are submitting the following contribution to the Programme Committee for consideration for presentation at the conference to be held at the North West-University, Potchefstroom Campus.

**NOTE: Please complete a separate cover sheet for each presentation you are proposing.**

<u>Title of presentation:</u>	<b>Quality Assurance practices in Distance Learning Institute of University of Lagos, Nigeria.</b>
<u>Initials and surnames of ALL authors:</u>	J. C. Iyiegbuniwe and G. C. Alaneme
<u>Number of words</u>	5,221
<u>Sub-topic the paper addresses:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Open Distance Learning and learning technologies for developing contexts.</li> <li>· Curriculum appropriateness: context and impact.</li> <li>· Creating supportive learning environments.</li> <li>· Financing quality distance education.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction</li> <li>2. Relevance of Open and Distance Learning</li> <li>3. Quality Assurance of ODL Programs</li> <li>4. The Unilag Distance Learning Institute</li> <li>5. Purpose of Study</li> <li>6. Research Questions</li> <li>7. Research Method               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.1 Sample</li> <li>7.2 Research Instrument</li> <li>7.3 Research Hypotheses</li> </ol> </li> <li>8. Results               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.1 Demographic Profile of DLI Students</li> <li>8.2 Quality Assessment</li> <li>8.3 Assessment of Faculty</li> <li>8.4 Access to Admission</li> <li>8.5 Student Support</li> <li>8.6 Curriculum and Instruction</li> <li>8.7 Institutional Resources</li> <li>8.8 Students' Learning Outcomes</li> </ol> </li> <li>9. Conclusions</li> <li>10. Bibliography</li> <li>11. Appendix 1</li> </ol>
<b>Details of author to whom feedback must be submitted</b>	
<u>Name:</u>	Joy C. Iyiegbuniwe and Gloria C Alaneme
<u>Institution/organisation:</u>	Distance Learning Institute University of Lagos

	Nigeria.
<u>Postal address:</u>	Distance Learning Institute University of Lagos Nigeria.
<u>Work telephone number:</u>	+234 08023181565
<u>Home telephone number:</u>	+234 08023181565
<u>Fax number:</u>	
<u>Cell/mobile phone number:</u>	+234 08034682255
<u>E-mail:</u>	<a href="mailto:chimeberejoy@yahoo.com">chimeberejoy@yahoo.com</a>

# QUALITY ASSURANCE PRACTICES IN DISTANCE LEARNING INSTITUTE OF UNIVERSITY OF LAGOS, NIGERIA.

By

**Joy C. Iyiegbuniwe and Gloria C. Alaneme**

Distance Learning Institute,  
University of Lagos, Nigeria.

## **Abstract**

The purpose of this study is to critically assess the quality of the programmes of Distance Learning Institute of University of Lagos, Nigeria. This was achieved through a survey of a sample of 300 students drawn using simple random sampling method, out of 2,233 final year students. The instrument is a self-completion questionnaire. The variables were tested for statistical significance with two-tailed t-test at p values of 0.01 and 0.05. It was found that the quality of staff and lecture delivery; access to admission; curriculum and instruction were satisfactory. However, there were mixed feelings on students' orientation; students' counseling; coverage of syllabus before examinations, and learning resources. It is therefore recommended that the institution should improve on the areas where there are mixed feelings.

**Keywords:** Quality Assurance, Curriculum and instruction, Faculty Support, Access, Faculty Satisfaction and Student Satisfaction.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The traditional mode of learning has been the conventional campus based, face-to-face education. Many people were unable to avail of the conventional face-to-face education due to constraints imposed by space and time. Over time advancements in technology has facilitated new forms of learning. Antony and Gnanam (2004) identified the following range of learning modes:

- Distance Education programs that are delivered through satellites, computers, correspondence, or other technological means across national boundaries;
- Twinning arrangements – in which a degree is gained through study in more than one country as result of agreements between institutions in different countries to offer joint programs;

- Study abroad semester or credit earning arrangements similar to the twinning programs;
- Branch or satellite campuses set up by an institution in another country to provide its educational programs to foreign students;
- Sale of proprietary materials such as books, courseware or testing, together with associated services;
- Franchised operations - using a third party to give degree – for example a computer company delivering a university computer science degree;
- Partnerships for overseas offerings where institution A in one country enters into a collaborative arrangement with institution B in another country to provide one or more of its programs to students in B's country;
- Free-standing programs operating outside the country of the provider with or without a combination of the above mentioned arrangements;
- Corporate Universities; and
- Virtual Universities.

As at now, technology is integrated into almost all forms of education. Hence, the distinction between the various forms of education outlined above becomes blurred; meaning that there is increasing convergence among them. In the words of Antony and Gnanam (2004), “this convergence has resulted in the use of more broad-based term, distributed learning”. They emphasized that, “Distributed learning can occur either on or off campus, providing students with greater flexibility and eliminating time as a barrier to learning”. In this context, distance learning is a subset of distributed learning focusing on students who may be separated in time and space from their peers and the instructor. “It is a system and a process that connects learners with distributed learning resources. It takes a wide variety of forms and the use of electronic media is not necessarily required”.

Distance education is a global phenomenon, (Antony and Gnanam, 2004). In the United States of America (USA) many universities are very active in distance education, providing distance learning opportunities through online courses. The proportion of Universities in USA with distance learning programs grew from 34% in 1977\1978 to about 50% in 1999/2000 (Salmi 2000) with significant activity in online courses that are offered globally. Some universities come together and float

programs online by contributing courses to the partnership that would make up various combinations for the programs. There are also corporate universities, significant among which are those of Motorola and International Business Machines (IBM). In Australia, nearly 14% of university students study at a distance (Jones, 2000), and the Australian Government has plans to extend education and skills training to developing countries via the internet. The Open University in the United Kingdom represents 21% of all part-time higher education students in the UK. Open University courses are available throughout Europe and by means of partnership agreements with other institutions in many other parts of the world. Many Dutch universities provide electronic learning environments while in Japan about 34% of higher education institutions use internet for on-line learning. India has ten open universities and about sixty-two distance learning directorates in traditional universities, some of which have gone global with overseas study centers. In less developed countries, distance learning programs are present on smaller scale. In Thailand and Turkey, the national open universities enroll respectively about 41 and 38 percent of the total higher education student population in the home country. As developing countries improve their communication capabilities and internet facilities, their effort at global distance learning increases. In Nigeria, distance education in higher education predates conventional face-to-face higher education. It is on record that many Nigerian pioneer university graduates earned their degrees, against great odds through home study and correspondence education from the prestigious external studies system of the University of London and were subsequently admitted into elite professions such as Law and accountancy (Ramon-Yusuf, 2010). The University of Lagos established its distance education unit in 1974 which was named Correspondence and Open Studies Unit (COSU), as the first dual mode University in Nigeria. The unit was up graded to the status of an Institute in 1979 with the name changed to Correspondence and Open Studies Institute (COSIT) and later in 2004 adopted the name Distance Learning Institute (DLI). Other distance education efforts in Nigeria are the Distance Learning Centre (DLC) of University of Ibadan established in 1988; University of Abuja; Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife; University of Maiduguri; Federal Open University of Technology, Yola; and the National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN) established in (2002).

## 2. RELEVANCE OF OPEN AND DISTANCE LEARNING (ODL)

It is pertinent to highlight the relevance of ODL. The conventional school system provides face-to-face teacher–student interaction, scheduled studies at definite locations and time. Laudable as the formal school is, it does not meet the needs and expectations of some potential learners. It has limitations imposed by lack of space and its time schedules. In Nigeria the available openings for admission are extremely inadequate for the number of qualified applicants into the Nigerian University system (104 Universities) for each admission cycle (see table I).

**Table I: University admission in Nigeria.**

Year	No. of Application	No. of Admission	Admission as Percentage of Application
1999	418,292	64,368	19.35
2000	416,318	45,760	11
2001	749,419	90,769	12.12
2002	994,380	51,845	5.22
2003	1,046,950	105,157	10.05
2004	841,878	12,492	14.55
2005	916,371	65,492	7.1

**Source: Statistics of Education in Nigeria 1999 - 2005**

In another dimension, candidates admitted into full time studies may not have the financial resources to fund full time studies. The proportion of potential higher education candidates denied learning opportunity has increased in recent years due to dwindling public funding of education on one hand and rising cost of living on the other hand. The foregoing explains why most young Nigerians start work after secondary school education with the hope to go to a tertiary institution in future. Employment dynamics may eventually make a full time higher education study difficult, if not impossible.

The above factors indicate that an important relevance of ODL is to widen the access of Nigerians to higher education. The government is concerned with this objective because of the need to provide adequate number of educated and skilled persons to pursue development objectives. Hence, in the National Policy on Education (2004) section 92, the importance of open and distance education was highlighted. Phipps et al. (1998) summarize the relevance of ODL education under four factors:

1. The emergence of life-long learning which goes on beyond school–age education;
2. Effort to make education more learner-centered: instruction is largely self-directed, it is more focused and purposeful, and it employs the appropriate level of teacher mediation;
3. The desire to provide access to higher education irrespective of where a student lives since learning does not have to take place in the classroom;
4. The development of “knowledge media” which describes the convergence of telecommunications, computing, and learning or cognitive science, and includes the capturing, storing, imparting, sharing, accessing, and creation of knowledge.

### **3. QUALITY ASSURANCE OF ODL PROGRAMS**

Phipps et al. (1998) define Quality Assurance in distance learning as “the means by which the institutions or providers get their program goals and measure results”. They add that the process reviews academic context, pedagogic techniques, resources and support services to see how they combine to enhance the learning environment and ensure student academic achievement. Gandhe (2009) asserts that quality in education has five components: exceptional high standards, perfection and consistency, fitness for purpose, value for money, and transformation capabilities.

Irrespective of the fact that ODL, in the global context, is no longer just augmenting but may displace school–age, and face-to-face learning, there are reservations about ODL education. Olojede (2008) observed that there is the possibility that the graduates of ODL programs are perceived as inferior to those produced in the conventional higher education system. To meet the laudable objectives and government expectations in ODL programs, it is important that the public in general and employers in particular see ODL graduates as comparable in quality as the graduates of conventional face-to-face programs.

Wang (2006) echoed assertions by Fernandez and Lampikoski that client satisfaction is a good indicator of quality, while Blfer (2000) claims that students

satisfaction is a key criterion for institutions to determine quality in distance education. This idea is affirmed by Moore (2000) in asserting that “students Satisfaction is the most important factor for continuing education as it reflects learners’ evaluation of the quality of all aspects of the educational programs”. Furthermore, he identified the following five pillars constituting the Sloan-C- Quality Framework:

- Learning Effectiveness – demonstrates that Learners who complete the programme receive education that represent the distinctive quality of the institution;
- Access - provides means for all qualified and motivated students to complete courses, degrees or programs in their discipline of choice;
- Student Satisfaction - all students who complete a course express satisfaction with course rigour and fairness, lecture and peer interaction, and support services;
- Faculty Satisfaction - indicates that Lecturers find the program personally rewarding and professionally beneficial;
- Cost Effectiveness - enables institutions to offer their best educational value to learners.

Similarly, Accreditation and Assuring Quality in Distance Education by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation: CHEA (2000) has distilled its standards with focus on seven fundamental elements: (1) institution mission; (2) institutional organizational Structure; (3) institutional resources; (4) curriculum and instructions; (5) faculty support; (6) students support; and (7) student learning outcomes (CHEA 2002). Similarly, Wang (2006) concludes that though accreditation agencies vary in their benchmarks governing quality standards for distance education, they have uniformly emphasized these elements: (1) strong institution commitments; (2) adequate curriculum and instruction; (3) sufficient faculty support; (4) ample student support; (5) consistent learning outcome assessment.

#### **4. THE UNILAG DISTANCE LEARNING INSTITUTE (DLI)**

The University of Lagos (UNILAG) was established by an Act of the Federal Parliament in April 1962. The primary objective of UNILAG at its inception was the preparation of professionals for the manpower needs of the country. Because of its cosmopolitan environment, the university was also required to provide facilities for part-time studies in such fields as Business Administration, Accounting, Law and Education through Correspondence and Distance Education.

The Distance Learning Institute, University of Lagos, Nigeria started in 1974. It was then known as Correspondence and Open Studies Unit (COSU), the purpose of which was to produce University graduates who could not be absorbed in the regular program due to maturity and for those who already are gainfully employed but who desire to acquire the Bachelors Degree, which they missed before employment or which is needed for improvement in job performance at their current position. The COSU metamorphosed to Correspondence and Open Studies Institute (COSIT) in 1983 when it was granted some measure of autonomy by the Senate of the University. The name of the Institute was in 2004 changed to Distance Learning Institute (DLI). The institute offers bachelors degrees in Business Administration, Accounting, Science Education, as well as Diploma in Library Information Science, and Diploma in Mass Communication. Efforts are being made to include degree programs in other disciplines.

DLI, as now constituted with an enhanced status as that of a college, has its own Academic Board, Management Board, and is empowered to formulate policies, employ its staff and be responsible for academic programs, examinations as well as supervise its day-to-day affairs.

## **5. PURPOSE OF STUDY**

Olojede's (2008) observation that there is the possibility that the graduates of ODL programs are perceived as inferior to those produced in the conventional higher education system underlines the critical requirement that quality assessment is done for an ODL programme. In view of this concern for quality assurance, the purpose of this study is to assess the Programs of Distance Learning Institute (DLI) of the University of Lagos, Nigeria. The attainment of this purpose is attempted in this study through a survey of a sample of final year students drawn from the different

programs offered by the institute. This approach is anchored on the observation of Belfer (2000) that “student satisfaction is a key criterion for institutions to determine quality in distance education”.

## **6. RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

Following from the above research purpose, the following research questions are addressed in this study:

- What are the demographic characteristics of the students currently enrolled in the DLI programs?
- What is the assessment of the DLI students of the teaching staff (faculty) of the DLI programs?
- What are the views of the DLI students on access to admission into the DLI programs?
- What is the assessment of the DLI students of the quality of support received by them on the DLI programs?
- What is the assessment of the DLI students of the quality of the curriculum and instruction of the DLI programs?
- What is the perception of DLI students of the adequacy of the resources committed to DLI programs by the University of Lagos; and
- What is the assessment of the DLI students of the learning outcomes experienced by them in the DLI programs.

## **7. RESEARCH METHOD**

### **7.1. Sample**

The student population of DLI is 10,472, spread as follows: 100 level 2,155; 200 level 1,855 ; 300 level 1,725 ; 400 level 3,426 ; and 500 level 2,233. In view of the objective of this study it was decided that the sample for the study is selected from the 500 level students because they have enough experience of the program to

make an assessment of it. A sample of three hundred (300) students was drawn. The study used simple

random sampling method. The students were assigned numbers linked to their university matriculation number. The selected students were picked by the use of random number generator software. The survey instrument was administered at the lecture of each of the sampled classes. Two hundred and thirty (230) respondents representing 77% of the sample size were received.

## **7.2. Research Instrument**

The survey instrument was self-completed questionnaire administered on the sampled students. The questionnaire contains sixty-five 5-point Likert type formatted statements. The respondents were required to indicate their degree of agreement with the statements: (1) Strongly Agree; (2) Agree; (3) Not Sure (4) Disagree; (5) Strongly Disagree. The reliability coefficient of the questionnaire is 0.85.

## **7.3. Research Hypotheses**

It is pertinent to determine if a particular statement is statistically significant and whether the respondents agree or disagree with the statement. In this regard, it was necessary to establish the threshold that separates agreement from disagreement. Boundaries for each statement (scaled 1 to 5) was calculated by dividing the serial width (4) by the number of response options (5) and found to be 0.8 (Bozkaya and Erdem Aydin, 2008). Based on this calculation, boundaries for the response options are as follows:

$$1 = 1 + 0.8 = 1.80$$

$$2 = 1.8 + 0.8 = 2.60$$

$$3 = 2.6 + 0.8 = 3.40$$

$$4 = 3.4 + 0.8 = 4.20$$

$$5 = 4.2 + 0.8 = 5.00$$

The value of 3.41 is the threshold value. Mean values significantly less than 3.41 imply agreement with the statement while mean values significantly greater than or equal to 3.41 imply disagreement with the statement. For all the statements, the hypotheses tested are:

$$H_0: \mu = 3.41; \quad \text{and} \quad H_1: \mu \neq 3.41.$$

The variables (statements) were tested for statistical significance with two – tailed t tests (p values are reported for 95 percent and 99 percent confidence levels). To ensure the validity of the use of t – tests, one sample Chi square test for normality was done on all the response data. The results of the tests for normality are statistically significant at p – value of 0.0000, for all the variables. See appendix I for results of the Chi square statistical test.

## **8. RESULTS**

### **8.1. Demographic Profile of DLI Students.**

The Section A of the questionnaire sought to determine the demographic profile of DLI students. The median age range of the students is 25 – 30 years which has 47 percent of the students sampled. The age brackets in order of importance are 31 – 35 years with 24 percent; 36 – 40 years 13 percent; greater than 40 years with 10 percent; and 21 – 24 years with 6 percent.

Most of the students (92percent) are employed, fifty – six percent hold senior job positions, while 33 percent and 13 percent hold middle and junior job positions, respectively.

In terms of entry qualifications; majority of the students hold Secondary School Certificate (SSC), while 31 percent are Ordinary National Diploma (OND) graduates. This finding indicates that SSC and OND holders are the typical catchment for the DLI programme. Higher National Diploma (HND) and Bachelors degree graduates constitute 7 percent, respectively.

### **8.2. Quality Assessment**

Quality of the DLI programme is assessed in this study in six dimensions: the Faculty (Teachers); Access to Admission, Student Support; Curriculum and Instruction; Institutional Resources; and Students' Learning Outcomes. The results of the statistical tests (t-test) are shown in appendix II.

### 8.3. Assessment of Faculty

The quality of the teaching staff including tutorial masters was assessed in the following dimensions: Adequacy of the number of faculty; Academic Qualifications; Academic experience; Personality; Empathy for Students; Lecture delivery; Integrity; Regularity of lecture attendance; Punctuality at Lecture; and Knowledge of the courses taught. The respondents have very positive perception of the faculty in all the ten dimensions. All the variables are highly statistically significant at p-value of 0.000. These findings indicate very positive quality for the DLI programme because the quality of faculty is a very important selling point for a distance learning programme.

**ONE SAMPLE t-test OF STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT OF FACULTY**

VARIABLE	df	MEAN	STD.DEV.	t-value	Asymp.Sig.(2-ailed)
QUALITY OF FACULTY					
Adequacy of Lecturers	217	2.0229	0.9997	-20.485	0.000**
Academic Qualification	220	1.8824	0.9069	-25.042	0.000**
Academic Experience	210	1.9431	0.9495	-22.441	0.000**
Personality	217	2.1422	0.8918	-20.989	0.000**
Empathy for Students	215	2.6713	1.0015	-10.840	0.000**
Lecture Delivery	221	2.3108	0.9922	-16.507	0.000**
Integrity	221	2.0811	0.9761	-20.286	0.000**

Regularity of Lecture Attendance	222	2.4529	1.0890	-13.125	0.000**
Punctuality at Lecture	220	2.8416	2.3717	-3.563	0.000**
Knowledge of Courses Taught	222	2.1166	1.8319	-10.544	0.000**

\*\* Statistically significant at 0.01 probability level; and \* Statistically significant at 0.05 probability level

#### 8.4. Access to Admission

One of the objectives of the DLI programme is to widen access to university admission, particularly to people in employment. This area of concern is assessed along the following dimensions: Inability to access full-time study; Being in full-time employment; Being “too old” for full-time study; and Inability to access scholarship. All these variables are statistically significant at p-value of 0.000. Of particular significance is the finding that the principal reason for choosing distance learning for the typical DLI student is being in full time employment. The respondents disagreed that the other variables are not reasons for their enrolling in DLI programme. These findings show that DLI is actually giving access to university education to people who do not have access to full-time study.

#### ONE SAMPLE t-test OF STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT OF ACCESS TO ADMISSION

ACCESS TO ADMISSION					
Not able to access full-time programme	203	3.8808	1.5370	3.706	0.000**
Have full-time employment	217	2.2248	1.6377	-10.686	0.000**
Incomplete full-time entry qualification	204	4.3610	1.3455	10.120	0.000**
Too old for full-time programme	220	4.104	1.4595	7.070	0.000**
Non-Availability of Scholarship	221	4.1216	1.4825	7.152	0.000**

\*\* Statistically significant at 0.01 probability level; and \* Statistically significant at 0.05 probability level

#### 8.5. Student Support

Student support is a key ingredient of success of a distance learning programme. In this study, student support has been assessed in the following dimensions: Availability of course materials; Lecture-Student interaction; Students' counseling. All the variables are statistically significant at p-value of 0.01, except two variables: (1) Students' Orientation (P is 0.480) and (2) Students' counseling (P is 0.075). These findings show that though there are elements of students' support, two key ingredients of students support as indicated above are not given adequate attention.

**ONE SAMPLE t-test OF STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS' SUPPORT**

STUDENT SUPPORT					
Availability of course materials	220	3.0814	1.8248	-2.677	0.008**
Lecturer-Student Interaction (Face-to- Face)	215	2.8426	1.1465	-7.273	0.000**
Students' Interactivity (eg. Study Groups)	222	2.0673	2.0090	-9.981	0.000**
Students' Orientation	210	3.5877	3.6509	0.707	0.480
Availability of Course Adviser	216	2.2166	2.5026	-7.025	0.000**
Access to Course Adviser	223	1.6027	1.8408	-14.695	0.000**
Quality of Course Materials	220	3.0814	1.8248	-2.677	0.008**
Availability of Students' Counseling	219	3.8818	3.9128	1.789	0.075

\*\* Statistically significant at 0.01 probability level; and \* Statistically significant at 0.05 probability level

**8.6. Curriculum and Instruction**

Curriculum and instruction were assessed along the following seven dimensions: (1) Regularity of Face-to-Face lectures; (2) the extent to which lectures and tutorials cover the syllabus; (3) the Rigor of the programme; (4) the Breath of the Curriculum; (5) the Adequacy of Lecture Delivery; (6) Adequacy of Lectures' response to questions during lectures and tutorials; and (7) Completion of lectures and tutorials

before examination. Respondents agreed that all these variables are satisfactory except (1) the adequacy of the coverage of the syllabus; and (2) full coverage of lectures and tutorials before examinations. This expression of dissatisfaction with coverage of lectures and tutorials emanates from the observation that the DLI programme has the characteristics of part-time studies than a distance learning programme. Hence, the emphasis placed on face-to-face lectures and tutorials.

#### ONE SAMPLE t-test OF STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION:					
Face-to- Face lectures are regular	223	2.5938	2.2984	-5.315	0.000**
Lectures/Tutorials cover syllabus	219	3.7000	2.6051	1.651	0.100
Programme is rigorous	201	2.9406	3.0118	-2.215	0.028*
Breath of curriculum is adequate	212	2.9765	3.1230	-2.021	0.045*
Lecture delivery is adequate	222	2.5919	3.1849	-3.836	0.000**
Lecturers' response to questions is adequate	222	2.7534	3.2752	-2.994	0.003**
Lectures/Tutorials completed before examinations	223	3.5045	3.2379	0.437	0.663

\*\* Statistically significant at 0.01 probability level; and \* Statistically significant at 0.05 probability level

### 8.7. Institutional Resources

The adequacy of resources committed to a distance learning programme is a very important indicator of the students' learning outcomes and their satisfaction with the programme. In this study, the adequacy of institutional resources committed to DLI was assessed in terms of the following nine factors: (1) Library stock of books; (2) Library stock of journals; (3) Library opening hours; (4) Size of lecture classrooms; (5) Conducive lecture classrooms; (6) Computer Laboratory; (7) Students' Common room; (8) Students' Cafeteria; and (9) Facilities for Disabled Students. The

respondents expressed mixed feeling with the institutional provisions on the following factors: (1) Library stock of books; (2) the conduciveness of the lecture classrooms; (3) Computer Laboratory; (4) Students' Cafeteria; (5) Students' Common room. These findings suggest unsatisfactory commitment of resources by the university to the DLI programmes.

**ONE SAMPLE t-test OF STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES**

INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES:					
Library stock of books is adequate	221	3.1577	4.1036	-0.916	0.361
Library stock of journals is adequate	221	3.0856	2.1498	-2.248	0.026*
Library-opening hours gives easy access	221	2.5991	2.2099	-5.467	0.000**
Lecture classrooms provide adequate space	220	3.9683	4.2259	1.961	0.050*
Lecture classrooms are conducive to learning	220	3.5882	2.5258	1.049	0.295
Computer Laboratory is adequate	221	3.5360	3.8789	0.484	0.629
Students' Common Room is adequate	222	3.7578	4.0587	1.280	0.202
Cafeteria services are adequate	213	3.6075	4.1208	0.701	0.484
Facilities for Disabled students are adequate	206	4.3092	4.2735	3.027	0.003**

\*\* Statistically significant at 0.01 probability level; and \* Statistically significant at 0.05 probability level

**8.8. Students' Learning Outcomes**

The ultimate dimension of the assessment of a distance learning programme is the Students' Learning outcomes. This was carried out in this study by determining the degree of satisfaction of the respondents on three factors; (1) Fairness of grading of examinations scripts, assignments and term papers; (2) Rate of progression in the programme; and (3) Current Academic Standing (performance in the last semester examination). The respondents had mixed feeling with the evaluation of their work.

However overall they expressed satisfaction with the progression in their study and considered their academic standing satisfactory.

**ONE SAMPLE t-test OF STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS' LEARNING OUTCOMES**

STUDENTS' LEARNING OUTCOMES					
Grading of examination scripts, assignment and term papers is just and honest	205	3.2816	3.7258	-0.495	0.621
Making steady progress in the programme	220	2.3937	2.7624	-5.470	0.000**
Last Semester Result was satisfactory	205	2.9806	2.9217	-2.110	0.036*

\*\* Statistically significant at 0.01 probability level; and \* Statistically significant at 0.05 probability level

**9. CONCLUSIONS**

The above findings lead to the following conclusions:

- The Distance Learning Programme of the University of Lagos has adequate academic staffing. The students of the programme are satisfied with the quality of the staff and the quality of lecture delivery.
- The programme provides wider access to university admission to people who, being employed, has no access to full time study.
- The students are satisfied with some aspects of students' support but expressed mixed feeling with provisions for (1) students' orientation; and (2) students' counseling.
- The students expressed satisfaction with the curriculum and quality of instruction of the DLI programme but had mixed feeling about the inadequate coverage of the syllabus before the conduct of examinations.
- The students are generally dissatisfied with institutional provision of learning resources.

- Generally, the students are satisfied with the learning experience they have received from the DLI.

These conclusions provide basis for management decisions on improvements to be made on the DLI programme. Of particular importance is that students support, institutional resource allocation, and coverage of the syllabus (before examinations) should be improved.

## 10. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Antony, S. & Gnanam, A (2004). Quality assurance in distance education: The challenges to be addressed. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Netherland Higher Education 47. 147-160 2004.

Belfer, K. (2000): A Learner Centered assessment of quality for online education: Course Climate World Conference on Educational Multimedia. Hyper media and Telecommunications 2000(1). 1265-1267.

Bozkaya, M & Erdem-Aydin, I. “The Relationship between Teacher Immediacy Behaviors and Learners “Perceptions of Social Presence and Satisfaction in Open and Distance Education: The case of Anadolu, University Open Education Faculty”, The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, Vol7, Issue 3, July 2008, 64-70.

Gandhe, S.K. (2009) Quality Assurance in Open and Distance Learning in India. Symbiosis Center for Distance Learning, India.

Moore, J.C. (Ed) (2000). Elements of quality: The Sloan-C Framework, Need ham, M.A: Sloan Center for online Education.

Olojede, A. A. (2008) Issues and Challenges in Enhancing Quality Assurance in Open and Distance Learning in Nigeria. A paper presented at the Fifth Pan Commonwealth Forum on Open Learning (Pets) in London (13-17 July 2008)

Phipps, R. A: Wellman, J.V. and Merisotos, J. P. (1998). Assuring Quality in Distance Learning: A Preliminary Review. A Report prepared for the Council for Higher Education Accreditation by the Institute for Higher Education Policy Washington, DC.

Pityana, N.B. (2004) Open Distance Learning in Africa: Access Quality, Success. Draft only.

Prasad, V.S. and Antony S. (2000) Best Practices Benchmarking in Higher Education for Quality Enhancement (University News), New Delhi.

Ramon-Yusuff, S. (2010): Open and Distance Education in Nigeria: The Way Forward for Dual-

Mode Institutions. A Paper Presented at a One-day Advocacy Seminar for Management Staff of the University of Lagos, 27 May, 2010.

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (1998). Accreditation and Assuring Quality in

ID-246.Distance Learning. CHEA Monograph C I-Series

<http://www.chea.org/pdf/mono-1-1accred-distance-02.pdf?pub>

Wang, Q. I. (2006). Quality Assurance-best Practices for assessing online programs.

International Journal of e-learning April1, 2006 USA.

<http://www.the free library.com/Quality + assurance-best+ practices+ for+ assessing+ online+ p>

## APPENDIX I

**ONE SAMPLE KOLMOGROV – SMIRNOV (K-S) TEST FOR NORMALITY**

VARIABLE	Df	MEAN	STD.DEV.	t-value	Asymp.Sig.(2-tailed)
<b>QUALITY OF FACULTY</b>					
Adequacy of Lecturers	218	2.0229	0.9997	4.402	0.000**
Academic Qualification	221	1.8824	0.9069	4.177	0.000**
Academic Experience	211	1.9431	0.9495	4.438	0.000**
Personality	218	2.1422	0.8918	4.864	0.000**
Empathy for Students	216	2.6713	1.0015	3.586	0.000**
Lecture Delivery	222	2-3108	0.9922	5.389	0.000**
Integrity	222	2.0811	0.9761	4.587	0.000**
Regularity of Lecture Attendance	223	2.4529	1.0890	4.852	0.000**
Punctuality at Lecture	221	2.8416	2.3717	3.959	0.000**
Knowledge of Courses Taught	223	2.1166	1.8319	5.301	0.000**
<b>ACCESS TO ADMISSION</b>					
Not able to access full-time programme	204	3.8808	1.5370	3.718	0.000**
Have full-time employment	218	2.2248	-1.580	3.786	0,000**
Incomplete full-time entry qualification	205	4,3610	1.3455	4.475	0.000**
Too old for full-time programme	221	4.104	1.4595	17.358	0.000**
Non-Availability of Scholarship	222	4.1216	1.4825	17.303	0.000**
<b>STUDENT SUPPORT</b>					

Availability of course materials	221	3.0814	1.8248	2.903	0.000**
Lecturer-Student Interaction (Face-to- Face)	216	2.8426	1.1465	2.998	0.000**
Students' Interactivity (eg. Study Groups)	223	2.0673	2.0090	4.787	0.000**
Students' Orientation	211	3.5877	3.6509	5.007	0.000**
Availability of Course Adviser	217	2.2166	2.5026	4.617	0.000**
Access to Course Adviser	224	1.6027	1.8408	5.563	0.000**
Quality of Course Materials	221	3-0814	1.8248	2.903	0.000**
Availability of Students' Counseling	220	3.8818	3.9128	5.681	0.000**
CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION:					
Face-to- Face lectures are regular	224	2.5938	2.2984	3.652	0.000**
Lectures/Tutorials cover syllabus	220	3.7000	2-6051	4.514	0.000**
Programme is rigorous	202	2.9406	3.0118	4.590	0.000**
Breath of curriculum is adequate	213	2.9765	3.1300	4.605	0.000**
Lecture delivery is adequate	223	2.5919	3.1849	4.897	0.000**
Lecturers' response to questions is adequate	223	2.7534	3.2752	4.516	0.000**
Lectures/Tutorials completed before examinations	224	3.5045	3.2379	4.687	0.000**
INSTITUTIONAN RESOURCES:					
Library stock of books is adequate	222	3.1577	4.1036	4.734	0.000**
Library stock of journals is adequate	222	3.0856	2.1498	3.363	0.000**

Library-opening hours gives easy access	222	2.5991	2.2099	3.496	0.000**
Lecture classrooms provide adequate space	221	3.9683	4.2259	5.865	0.000**
Lecture classrooms are conducive to learning	221	3.5882	2.5258	4.216	0.000**
Computer Laboratory is adequate	222	3.5360	3.8789	5.191	0.000**
Students' Common Room is adequate	223	3.7578	4.0587	5.537	0.000**
Cafeteria services are adequate	214	3.6075	4.1208	5.311	0.000**
Facilities for Disabled students are adequate	207	4.3092	4.2735	6.131	0.000**
STUDENTS' LEARNING OUTCOMES;					
Grading of examination scripts, assignment and term papers is just and honest	206	3.2816	3.7258	4.556	0.000**
Making steady progress in the programme	221	2.3937	2.7624	4.864	0.000**
Last Semester Result was satisfactory	206	2.9806	2.9217	4.731	0.000**

\*\* Statistically significant at 0.01 probability level; and \* Statistically significant at 0.05 probability level