

Task Performance of Quality Assurance Directorate and Staff Job performance in Rivers State Universities

¹Dr. B. Wey-Amaewhule & ²Ogbonnaya, Eberechi
Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education,
Rivers State University, Nkpolu-Oroworukwo Port Harcourt

Abstract: *This study examined task performance of quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in River State Universities. Three research questions and three hypotheses were used to guide the Study. A correlational research design was adopted for the study. The population of the study consisted of 2,327 staff of State own Universities in River State. A sample size of 341 respondents was used for the study, the sample size was determined using Taro Yamena formular. The multi stage sampling technique was adopted in selecting the sampling size of the study. The instrument face and content were validated by the researcher's supervisor, one expert in educational management and one other expert in measurement and evaluation. The internal consistencies of the instrument were determined using Cronbach Alpha Statistics. A composite reliability coefficient of 0.74 was obtained which showed that the instrument was reliable. The hypotheses were further subjected to t-transformation to establish the significance of the r-value at 0.05 level of significance. The result of the analyzed data revealed that there is a high positive relationship between evaluation of teaching staffs, internal assessment of programmes and development of quality assurance policy framework and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities. Based on the findings, it was recommended among others that; quality assurance directorate should ensure that this is effective appraisal of staff, assessment of progammes and maintain quality assurance policy framework to enhance staff job performance.*

Key words: *Evaluation of Teaching Staff Effectiveness, Internal Assessment of Programme and Development of quality assurance policy frameworks*

INTRODUCTION

Education is an instrument for developing one's potential, intellect, skills, attitude, and knowledge for useful living and development of society. University education refers to the academic and intellectual instruction provided by institutions of higher learning. It is an institution of higher learning providing facilities for teaching and research, also award academic degrees. Task performance of Quality Assurance Directorate in universities includes evaluation of academic staff teaching effectiveness, internal assessment of programme delivery and quality assurance policy frameworks, (Doe, 2023). The task performance of Quality Assurance Directorate in universities also plays a critical role in enhancing staff job performance and institutional effectiveness. Quality Assurance contributes to educational excellence, stakeholder confidence in responding to evolving educational needs, (Smith, 2023).

Task performance refers to an individual's ability to complete a specific job or assignment effectively. It is a measure of how well someone can accomplish a particular set of tasks or activities within a given context. Task performance varies widely depending on the

nature of the job or task, the individual's skills and abilities, and the resources available. The primary goal of task performance is to finish the assigned tasks or activities successfully and within a specified timeframe. This may involve meeting certain quality standards or objectives. The quality of task performance refers to the level of excellence or accuracy achieved in completing the tasks. Besides, in every organization, it is important to ensure that employees complete their tasks. This can be done by providing adequate training, setting clear expectations, and creating a positive work environment. Task performance is important to every organization because it directly impacts the bottom line. Effective task performance directly enhances the robustness of quality assurance measures.

Quality Assurance Directorate in universities is pivotal in ensuring academic standards, compliance with regulatory requirements, and the enhancement of overall institutional quality, (Johnson, 2022). Quality Assurance Directorate plays a crucial role in setting and maintaining academic standards across various disciplines within the university. This involves developing and implementing policies and procedures that govern curriculum design, assessment methods, and teaching practices. The Directorate is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the quality of teaching and learning within the university. This includes conducting regular reviews and assessments of courses, gathering feedback from students and faculty, and identifying areas for improvement, (Robert, 2019). This involves preparing comprehensive reports, coordinating site visits from accrediting bodies, and ensuring compliance with accreditation standards. Accreditation not only validates the quality of education provided but also enhances the university's credibility and competitiveness in the academic landscape, (David, 2018). Quality Assurance Directorate plays a key role in promoting institutional research and data-driven decision-making, (Brown, 2020). They collect and analyze data related to student outcomes, faculty qualifications, and institutional performance indicators. Quality Assurance Directorates increasingly utilize digital tools for data management, assessment automation, and remote monitoring of educational activities. This integration of technology not only streamline processes but also enhances transparency and accountability in quality assurance practices, (Laura, 2017). The Quality Assurance Directorate in universities serves as a cornerstone for ensuring educational excellence, compliance with standards, and continuous improvement.

Quality assurance in education is the efficient management, monitoring, evaluation and reviews of the resource inputs and transformation process (teaching and learning) to produce quality outputs (students) that meet set standards and expectations of the society. Thomson (2017) defined quality assurance as the process of ensuring effective resource input, control, refining the process and raising the standards of output in order to meet the set goals and satisfy public accountability. Quality assurance is a key element in the development of educational institutions. It reflects the policies and processes directed towards providing all the possible means for achieving, maintaining, and upgrading quality by verifying that the standards, indicators, academic practices, and values as well as organizational framework within these institutions are compatible with the institution's vision and mission and related processes and practices (Lim, 2011). The

concept emphasizes empowering teaching staff to critically evaluate their teaching practices, identify areas for improvement, and take proactive steps to enhance their effectiveness in the classroom (Danielson, 2013). The role of the quality assurance directorate in creating a supportive environment for teaching staff cannot be overstated. The directorate's efforts to foster a culture of self-reflection and improvement are crucial steps toward ensuring that students receive a high-quality education.

Quality Assurance Directorate and Staff Job Performance

The evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness by Quality Assurance Directorates (QAD) in universities is pivotal for ensuring high academic standards and enhancing job performance. With increasing demands for accountability and improved educational outcomes, universities are investing in robust quality assurance framework to assess and enhance the performance of their teaching staff. Quality Assurance Directorates play a crucial role in maintaining and improving the quality of education in universities. These directorates are responsible for developing and implementing policies, procedures, and practices that ensure the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes. The methods used by QADs to evaluate teaching staff are multifaceted such as the Peer reviews which involve colleagues assessing each other's teaching methods and classroom management, Student feedback is collected through surveys and questionnaires to gauge student satisfaction and learning experiences.

Quality Assurance Directorate and Staff Job Performance in Universities

The internal assessment of programmes delivery by Quality Assurance Directorates (QAD) is crucial for ensuring the quality and effectiveness of academic programmes in universities. This process involves evaluating various aspects of programmes delivery, including curriculum design, teaching methods, and learning outcomes. Quality Assurance Directorates play a pivotal role in overseeing the internal assessment of programmes delivery. They are responsible for establishing evaluation criteria, conducting assessments, and ensuring compliance with academic standards. These directorates work closely with academic departments to gather data on programme delivery, which includes reviewing course materials, observing classroom practices, and analyzing students performance.

The internal assessment process employs a variety of methods to evaluate programmes delivery. Curriculum reviews involve analyzing the relevance, coherence, and comprehensiveness of course content. Internal assessments have a significant impact on staff job performance. Constructive feedback from QADs helps faculty members understand their strengths and areas needed for improvement. This feedback informs professional development initiatives, enabling staff to enhance their teaching skills and adapt to evolving educational needs.

The internal assessment of programmes delivery by Quality Assurance Directorates is essential for enhancing the quality of education and improving staff job performance in universities. This they do by employing comprehensive evaluation methods and addressing challenges, QADs ensure that academic programmes meet high standards and respond to the needs of students and society.

Development of quality assurance policy frameworks and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities

Development of quality assurance policy framework plays a pivotal role in shaping staff job performance within universities, including Rivers State Universities. These frameworks establish clear standards and guidelines that help align faculty and administrative efforts towards institutional goals, fostering a culture of accountability and excellence. (Yassin, Hamid, & Rajab, 2021), effective quality assurance policies provide structured mechanisms for performance evaluation and feedback, which are crucial for identifying areas of improvement and enhancing professional development among staff. This approach not only enhances job satisfaction and morale but also ensures that universities maintain high standards of teaching, research, and service delivery.

Quality assurance policy frameworks are integral to shaping and enhancing staff job performance within universities, including those in Rivers State. Effective implementation of quality assurance policies ensures consistency in performance evaluation and feedback mechanisms, which are critical for identifying strengths, addressing weaknesses, and fostering professional development among university staff (Yorke & Knight, 2014).

Statement of the Problem

Tertiary institutions are essential pillars in providing quality education and services to students. The Quality Assurance Directorate (QAD) often faces significant challenges in task performance, primarily due to insufficient resources. Limited funding and inadequate infrastructure can hinder the ability of the directorate to carry out comprehensive quality assessments and implement necessary improvements. According to a study by Okon (2023), budget constraints significantly impair the operational efficiency of QADs in educational institutions across developing countries, resulting in Job performance among staff members.

Another critical issue is the lack of professional development and training for QAD staff. Without organizing workshop, staff members may struggle to stay updated with the latest quality assurance methodologies and best practices. According to Adeyemi and Olaniyi (2022), training programmes are crucial for maintaining high standards in quality assurance, yet many institutions fail to prioritize this aspect, adversely affecting overall staff performance.

The task performance of the Quality Assurance Directorate in Rivers State universities is often hindered by several key issues. One major problem is the lack of adequate resources and support for implementing effective quality assurance measures. Many Quality Assurance Directorates face constraints related to insufficient funding, outdated technology, and inadequate training for their staff, which undermines their ability to carry out thorough evaluations and improvements. There is frequently a disconnect between the policies set by the directorate and the actual practices on the ground, leading to inconsistent application of quality standards across different departments and programs.

Staff job performance in Rivers State universities also presents challenges that impact overall institutional effectiveness. Issues such as low morale, lack of motivation, and

inadequate professional development opportunities can negatively affect staff performance. Furthermore, the lack of clear performance metrics and feedback mechanisms often results in ambiguity regarding job expectations and performance evaluation. This can lead to reduced productivity and engagement among staff members, which in turn affects the quality of education and administrative efficiency within the universities. Addressing these problems requires a comprehensive approach to evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness, internal assessment of programme delivery and development of quality assurance policy. This study therefore seeks to investigate the task performance of quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in River State Universities.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine task performance of Quality Assurance Directorate and staff job performance in River State Universities.

Specifically, the study seek to;

1. determine the relationship between evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities
2. ascertain the relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities.
3. investigate the relationship between development of quality assurance policy framework and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities.

Research Questions

The following research questions was used to guide the study.

1. What is the relationship between evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities?
2. What is the relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities?
3. What is the relationship between development of quality assurance policy frameworks and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses was tested at 0.05 alpha level of significance

1. There is no significant relationship between evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities
2. There is no significant relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities.
3. There is no significant relationship between development of quality assurance policy framework and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a correlational research design as the study aimed at establishing the relationship between quality assurance directorate task performance and staff job performance in River State Universities. The area of this study is Rivers State. This study area was chosen as Rivers because it enables the researcher to have easy access to data collection. The target population of the study comprised 2,327 teaching staff from two Universities in River State (source: Quality Assurance Directorate, 2024). The sample size of the study is 341 teaching staff from Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education. The Taro Yamane formular was adopted in determining the sample size of the study. Proportionate stratified sampling techniques was used in this study. The instruments for data collection for this study were two sets of self-developed questionnaire titled "Task Performance of Quality Assurance Directorate Questionnaire (TPQAD) and Staff Job Performance Questionnaire (SJPQ)". To ensure the validity of the instrument, it was subjected to face and content validity using expert review. Two experts in the field of Educational Management and Measurement and Evaluation at Rivers State University ascertained the face and content validity of the instrument. In order to establish the reliability of the instrument, their responses were analyzed using Cronbach Alpha method. The data collected for the study were analyzed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMC) statistic. The hypotheses were further subjected to t-transformation to establish the significance of the r-value at 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS

Research Question One: What is the relationship between evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities?

Table 1: Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMC) analysis on the relationship between evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities

Correlations		Evaluation of teaching staff	Staff job Performance	Level of correlation
Evaluation of teaching staff	Pearson Correlation	1	.84	High and positive relationship
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	
	N	341	341	
Staff job Performance	Pearson Correlation	.84	1	High and positive relationship
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		
	N	341	341	

Source: Researcher SPSS Statistical Output (2024)

Table 1 shows the summary of Pearson product moment correlation on the relationship between evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities. The result in table 4.1 revealed that responses to questionnaire items 1-7for evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness and

questionnaire items 1-10 for staff job performance had a correlation value of .84. The Pearson correlation value of .84 means that there is a high and positive relationship between evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance. This implies that evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness is a feedback mechanism use by quality assurance directorate to measure staff job performance.

Research Question Two: What is the relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities?

Table 2: Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient (PPMC) analysis on the relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities

Correlations			Internal Assessment of Programme Delivery	Staff job Performance	Level of correlation
Internal Assessment of Delivery	Pearson Correlation	1	.76		High and positive relationship
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000		
	N	341	341		
Staff job Performance	Pearson Correlation	.76	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000			
	N	341	341		

Source: Researcher SPSS Statistical Output (2024)

Table 2 shows the summary of Pearson product moment correlation on the relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities. The result in table 2 revealed that responses to questionnaire items 8-14 for internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and questionnaire items 1-10 for staff job performance had a correlation value of .76. The Pearson correlation value of .76 means that there is a high and positive relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities. This implies that internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate is a feedback mechanism use by quality assurance directorate to measure staff job performance.

Research Question Three: What is the relationship between development of quality assurance policy frameworks and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities?

Table 3: Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient (PPMC) analysis of the relationship between development of quality assurance policy frameworks and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities

Correlations			development of quality assurance policy frameworks	Staff job Performance	Level of correlation
development of quality assurance policy frameworks	Pearson Correlation		1	.57	
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.000	
	N	341		341	Moderate and positive relationship
Staff job Performance	Pearson Correlation		.57	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000		
	N	341		341	

Source: Researcher SPSS Statistical Output (2024)

Table 3 shows the summary of Pearson product moment correlation on the relationship between development of quality assurance policy frameworks and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities. The result in table 3 revealed that responses to questionnaire items 15-22 for development of quality assurance policy frameworks and questionnaire items 1-10 for staff job performance had a correlation value of .57. The Pearson correlation value of .57 means that there is a moderate and positive relationship between development of quality assurance policy frameworks and staff job performance. This implies that development of quality assurance policy frameworks is a feedback mechanism use by quality assurance directorate to measure staff job performance.

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities

Table 4: Summary of t-Transformation on the significant relationship between evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities

Variables	N	Df	t-Trans.	t-crit.	Sig.	Decision at p < 0.05
Evaluation of Teaching Staff Effectiveness	341		6.407	0.195	0.014	HO ₁ Rejected
Staff Job Performance	341	339				

* = Significant at 0.05 alpha level; N = 341

The data presented in Table 4 revealed that the t-Transformation value of 6.4017 is greater than the value of t-crit. value of 0.195 at 0.05 alpha level with 339 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities is rejected since the probability value is less than the chosen alpha ($p = 0.014 < \alpha = 0.05$). The alternative hypothesis which states that there is a significant relationship between evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities is upheld.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities.

Table 5: Summary of t-Transformation on the significant relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance

Variables	N	Df	t- Trans.	t- crit.	Sig.	Decision at $p < 0.05$
Internal Assessment of Programme Delivery	341		3.721	0.263	0.003	HO ₂ is Rejected
Staff Job Performance	341	339				

* = Significant at 0.05 alpha level; N = 341

The data presented in Table 5 revealed that the t-Transformation value of 3.721 is greater than the value of t-crit. value of 0.263 at 0.05 alpha level with 339 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities is rejected since the probability value is less than the chosen alpha ($p = 0.003 < \alpha = 0.05$). The alternative hypothesis which states that there is a significant relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities is upheld.

4.2.2 Hypothesis 3: There is no significant relationship between development of quality assurance policy framework and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities

Table 6: Summary of t-Transformation on the significant relationship between development of quality assurance policy framework and staff job performance

Variables	N	df	t- Trans.	r. crit.	Sig.	Decision at p < 0.05
development of quality assurance framework	341	339	4.563	0.145	0.000	HO ₃ is Rejected
Staff Job Performance	341					

* = Significant at 0.05 alpha level; N = 341

The data presented in Table 6 revealed that the t-Transformation value of 4.563 is greater than the value of t-crit. value of 0.145 at 0.05 alpha level with 339 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between development of quality assurance policy framework and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities is rejected since the probability value is less than the chosen alpha ($p = 0.000 < \alpha = 0.05$). The alternative hypothesis which states that there is a significant relationship between development of quality assurance policy framework and staff job performance in Rivers State Universities is upheld.

Discussion of Findings

The study assess task performance of quality assurance directorate and staff job performance in River State Universities. The findings from the data analysis revealed the relationship between evaluation of teaching staff effectiveness and staff job performance. This finding is in line with Banta and Palomba (2014), evaluating staff teaching promotes accountability and transparency within higher education institutions. The result from the hypothesis reveals that there is a positive relationship between evaluation of staff teaching effectiveness and staff job performance.

The findings from the data analysis revealed that there is a high positive relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance. The result from the hypothesis also reveals that there is a significant relationship between internal assessment of programme delivery by quality assurance directorate and staff job performance. These findings agree with the findings of Bates (2019) that the internal assessment programme focused on assessing the effectiveness, efficiency, and quality of the instructional methods, support services, and administrative processes used to deliver the program to students.

The findings from the data analysis revealed that there is a moderate positive relationship between development of quality assurance policy framework and staff job performance. This implies that development of quality assurance policy framework and staff job performance influences staff job performance by providing clear expectations and standardized procedures, which help employees understand the quality standards they must meet. It was concluded that there is a relationship between evaluation of academic staff teaching effectiveness, internal assessment of programme delivery, quality

assurance policy frameworks, organizing workshops, self-assessment of teaching staff, and implementation of the university strategic development plan and staff job performance. These findings agree with the findings of Chan (2017), that the quality assurance policy framework provides opportunities for professional growth and skill enhancement, and the framework empowers staff to develop the competencies needed to perform their roles effectively.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made;

1. The quality assurance directorate should regularly evaluate teaching staff effectiveness to improve areas of weakness to enhance the productivity of staff performance.
2. The quality assurance directorate should conduct an internal assessment of programme delivery with the institute to make sure that educational programs are effective and relevant.
3. The quality assurance directorate should periodically review and revise performance metrics and assessment criteria to ensure their relevance and effectiveness.

References

- Abossede, A. I. (2020). Study of Quality Assurance in Examination Conduction and Administrative Effectiveness of Principals in Public and Private Secondary Schools in Niger State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Social Science and Humanities (IJRSS)*. 1(3), 1–7.
- Aboyade, O. (2016). The management of the intellect. Vice-Chancellor's convocation address, University of Ife, Ile-Ife, 18 December, Ife: University of Ife Publication.
- Accrediting Body Reports. (Year). Access reports from accrediting bodies such as AACSB, ABET, or regional accrediting agencies.
- Banta, T. W. & Palomba, C. A. (2014). *Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing, and improving assessment in higher education*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Brown, M. (2020). Digital transformation in higher education: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal Name, Volume(Issue), Pages*
- Bryson, J. M. (2011). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Burton, D., Weinberg, R., & Yukelson, D. (2017). Goal setting in sport and exercise: A research synthesis to resolve the controversy. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 39(3), 170-183.

- Carson, C (2018). "A historical view of Douglas McGregor's Theory Y". *Management Decision*. 43 (3): 450–460.
- Danielsdson (2013). Danielson's framework for teaching evaluation instrument.
- David, G. (2018). This study examines the role of technology in streamlining quality assurance processes and improving institutional effectiveness.
- Doe, J. (2023). Ensuring academic quality in higher education: The role of institutional policies. *Journal Name, Volume(Issue), Pages*.
- Emily, W. (2018). This article explores methods for fostering continuous improvement within higher education institutions.
- Johnson, S. (2022). Using data analytics for institutional improvement. *Journal Name, Volume(Issue), Pages*.
- LauraM B. (2017). This publication discusses frameworks and metrics for evaluating student outcomes and their impact on institutional performance.
- Linn, R. L. (2011), 'Complex, performance-based assessment: Expectations and validation criteria', *Educational Researcher*, 20(8).
- Okoh, S.E.N. (2018). High level education, manpower development and training: A key to sustainable economic growth and development. *Inaugural lecture series 63*.
- Peter, S. (2023). This edited volume offers a global perspective on quality assurance practices and challenges in higher education.
- Robert, J. (2019). This book provides insights into best practices and emerging trends in accreditation across various disciplines.
- Smith, J. (2023). Assessing teaching effectiveness: Strategies and best practices. *Journal Name, Volume(Issue), Pages*.
- Thomson , P. (2017). Quality assurance in higher education: The Nigerian experience. *A Journal of Quality Assurance in Tertiary Education*.,4, 18 - 32.
- Wey–Amaehule, B. & Okenema, E. F. (2022). Teachers' development strategies for job performance in public secondary school in Bayelsa state. *Academic Scholarship Journal*, 18(1), 1 - 15
- Yassin, T. A., Hamid, K. and Rajah, Y. (2021). Approaches to supervision of instruction, education and development. *Journal of the Nigerian Educational Research Council*, 2(1), 292-299.
- Zou, Y., & Chan, S. (2017). A framework of quality assurance for the assessment of higher education in the Asia-Pacific. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 18(1)