

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROGRAM EVALUATION PURPOSES
AND THE USE OF ITS FINDINGS IN SELECTED CHARTERED
CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITIES IN KENYA**

Harriet Akugizibwe Caroline Kintu

PhD Candidate: Education (Curriculum and Instruction)

Africa International University

Email: hackintu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This is a quantitative study to examine the correlation between Program Evaluation (PE) purposes and the use of PE results in selected Chartered Christian Universities (CCUs) in Kenya.

Methodology: A census of program leaders of 50 accredited, operational and re-evaluated academic programs in three CCUs was carried out. A questionnaire was used for data collection. Correlation and logistic regression analyses were done.

Results: Correlation analysis revealed a strong, positive and significant association between accountability to funders and sponsors purpose and use of evaluation results. There was also a moderate, positive and significant association between program improvement purpose and use of evaluation results. Logistic regression analysis revealed that, sponsor and funder mandates are likely to promote the use of evaluation at $\text{Exp}(B) = .024$, $p \text{ value} = .004$. The findings suggest that, when PE is done for accountability to funders and sponsors, the use of the results is likely to increase by .024 times. Logistic regression analysis also demonstrated that, motivation to improve the program is a more critical determining factor as to whether the evaluation results will be used or not ($p \text{ value of } .012$ and $\text{Exp}(B) = 12.633$). This suggests that when PE is conducted for improvement, the use of the results is likely to increase by 12.633 times. PE conducted for the purpose of program improvement is the most critical purpose. It is likely to increase the use of PE results at least 12 times more than external mandates such as sponsors and funders.

Recommendations: The researcher recommends that, to foster use of evaluation results, institutions should give prominence to PE purpose, more specifically to program improvement as a reason for conducting PE.

Key Words: *Program evaluation, Evaluation use, Evaluation purposes, Accreditation, Program improvement, Accountability, Quality education, Sponsors and Funders, Higher education, Christian universities*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Higher education (HE) in Africa is growing rapidly (Teferra & Altbach, 2003). As universities multiply and students scramble for university education, quality issues arise (Materu, 2007; Teferra & Altbach, 2003). This has led to increased quality control and assurance efforts (Hayward, 2006, p. 27). These trends can be traced globally (Mizikaci, 2006). Governments have called for establishment and implementation of national standards in evaluating institutions, academic programs and the quality of the university education at large. In East Africa, the Inter University Council of East Africa (IUCEA) established by the East African Community (EAC) seeks to ensure that the sporadic expansion of university education does not compromise the quality of education (Inter University Council of East Africa, 2016, p.124-133). Kenya is one of the countries with a high demand for university education. This has led to establishment of many universities with varying modes of delivery. The Commission for University Education (CUE) is responsible for chartering all universities and accrediting all academic programs in Kenya. “The Commission’s challenge is to ensure that these developments do not compromise the quality of university education and training in Kenya” (Commission for University Education 2014-2018 Strategic Plan, p. iv). A major strategy employed is mandatory program evaluation before, during and after implementation of the program.

However, there are concerns with this externally mandated Program Evaluation (PE). The concern is that such evaluation may not be well thought through and could be merely a bureaucratic process and a waste of resources. It could be done only for purposes of accountability to a rigid system with no further meaningful utilization of the results to impact the quality of the programs (Hayward, 2006, 27). Worldwide, in spite of standards and regulations, processes and practices of PE in HE, PE remains a subject of discussion (Palomba & Banta, 1999; Hayward, 2006). External and internal pressure for quality academic programs emphasize monitoring and evaluation of academic programs. The nature and purpose of evaluation is different for different stakeholders such as government, accrediting agencies, institutions, sponsors, funders, employers, students, parents and the public at large. The purpose of PE is determined by the audience who will utilize the evaluation findings (Hayward, 2006, p. 8).

In many countries PE can take the form of program accreditation, program audit or academic review (Unruh & Unruh, 1984, p. 263; Palomba and Banta, 1999, p. 3; Bennett, 2003, p. 7-13;

Hayward, 2006, p. 5, 58). The nature, form or type PE takes is varied depending on the purpose, goal, audience and stage at which the evaluation is carried out. In as much as PE purpose affects all PE processes and procedures, sometimes it has a direct effect on whether the results will be used or not. The purposes of PE can vary from institution to institution, program to program, time to time and even among the different stakeholders (Cole, 2001; Palomba & Banta, 1999, p. 20-21). As such it is beneficial for institutions to dialogue and document “. . . a set of operating principles and guidelines that clarify the purposes and intended uses of assessment information” (Palomba & Banta, 1999, p. 20-21). Effective PE will seek to balance evaluation requirements and institutional and contextual realities. The implication is that, without a clear understanding of the purpose of evaluation, planning and implementing, an effective PE process may be compromised and the process and results of PE may not be effectively utilized. PE purpose is then theorized to be a critical factor in evaluation use.

1.1 Statement of Problem

“The ultimate worth and value of evaluation can be judged in terms of their utility and usefulness in informing policy and practice . . .” (Leahy, 2009, p. 80). However, there are growing discussions in the literature about whether, and to what extent evaluations are utilized (UNESCO, 2016; McDavid et al., 2013). This research is concerned about the low utilisation of PE results and the factors that affect the use of evaluation findings. This concern of inquiry accrues from the growing criticisms of the quality of academic programs in HE in Africa and increasing investment in quality assurance mechanisms. Increasing regulation of university education is enforced through accreditation, accountability and other quality improvement mechanisms. This has resulted in lots of academic PEs and a huge database of evaluation results. However, there is limited use of such results to inform policy and practice (UNESCO, 2016, p. 29; McDavid et al., 2013, p. 38). Low use of PE results is a concern because of its implications. When PE results are not used optimally, efforts for improved quality of education are compromised. Concerns about depreciating quality of academic programs are already in public domain. For instance, in 2016 and 2017, the CUE conducted audits in universities in Kenya. Quality issues were raised which amount to poor quality delivery thus poor quality programs (Mukhwana et al., 2016, p. 31-33; Nyaigotti-Chacha, 2017). Poor quality educational programs lead to half-baked graduates. These graduates go into the work environment with low

employability skills and capabilities. This compromises the development of the individuals, families, societies and nations at large and thus failure to achieve the overall purpose of education. Questions arise as to whether or to what extent the process of planning for evaluation gives proper attention to the reasons why evaluation is being done, the kind of information needed and how the evaluation findings are to be used (Slimmer, 1981, p. 39).

Theoretical conceptions point out that the motivation of doing evaluation determines not only the processes, methods and procedures but also the use or non-use of the results (Cole, 2001). However, minimal studies have investigated the reason for doing evaluation as a potential influencer of the use or non-use of the results in HE in Africa and specifically in Kenya. Hayward's research (2006) established the major reasons for doing evaluation in HE in Africa. The study was done from the perspective of accrediting bodies in six countries (excluding Kenya). However, the study did not seek to find out how the different reasons for doing evaluation affected the use of the results. Myhlhousen-Leak's qualitative study done in the American context found a relationship between PE purpose and utilisation in the teacher training programs she studied (Myhlhousen-Leak, 2011).

Considering the above, the contribution of the motivations for evaluation on the use or non-use of the results remains a concern in Africa. Are the evaluations carried out and used for the ultimate and underlying purpose of ensuring the quality of education or merely for the purpose of accreditation and accountability requirements? Are evaluations utilised only for external purposes (accreditation and accountability) or are they also utilised for internal purposes (program improvement)? This study therefore, inquired into the use and non-use or limited use of PE results and how evaluation motives contribute to the same.

1.2 Objective of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine how PE purposes affect the use or non-use of PE results.

1.3 Research Question

How does the purpose of doing PE affect use or non-use of PE results in selected CCUs in Kenya?

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Drawing from social accountability theory, Cole's Value-Goal oriented and Stufflebeam's Context, Input, Process, Product models, the researcher interrogated the effect of PE purpose on use or non-use of PE results. The theoretical statement of this current study is that the initiator of evaluation tends to specify the purpose of evaluation, which in turn is likely to determine the use or non-use of the results. The purpose of doing evaluation tends to determine the evaluation approach and model which in turn affects use, but it sometimes has a direct relationship with the use or non-use of the results. The PE purpose is conceived from the evaluation initiator who could be external or internal.

2.1.1 Social Accountability Theory

Social accountability theory suggests that service providers, such as HE institutions, must be accountable for their performance and conduct. They should be held accountable to see if they are delivering quality services and if the services are delivered efficiently, effectively and fairly. Social accountability theory suggests that accountability relies on direct or indirect engagement of the constituency of stakeholders and encourages good governance, development, effectiveness and empowerment. Key components of social accountability include participatory policy making and planning, participatory budget setting, participatory expense tracking, and participatory monitoring and evaluating of performance and impact. Social accountability is a major reason for doing evaluation. It is a vehicle to improve programs and in turn improve the society. An area of social accountability that is directly applied to this study is participatory monitoring and evaluating of implementation, impact, performance, and services. This monitoring and evaluation is often based on the value referents selected by the constituency stakeholders themselves. Although social accountability has mostly been applied in the public sector, its principles and approaches have also been applied in the private sector (Melana et al., 2004).

The different types of accountability (Alkin and Christie, 2013) can be traced in evaluation literature and practice. For instance, in Kenya, institution and program accreditation by the government through CUE is mandatory. In such a context, social accountability is a major drive for evaluation. Guidelines for presenting a program for accreditation require that the program has a purpose, goals and objectives. This is goal accountability. Accreditation is based on two main

approaches, including the “Standard-Based” Approach and the “Fitness for Purpose” Approach. The “Standard-Based” Approach is “. . . conformity to set requirements. In this case, quality is measured against pre-defined standards. It focuses on standards and the extent to which they are being met” (Commission for Higher Education Handbook, 2008, 13). A program will be judged accountable and be accredited only if it meets the pre-determined CUE process standards. This relates to process accountability. Though intended for accreditation, this kind of requirement also relates to PE done for accountability. Accredited programs must remain accountable to the accrediting agency. The “Fitness for Purpose” Approach “. . . assumes that quality is equal to goals, purpose and objectives set by the institution. Evaluation is to measure achievement of the institutional set of goals and objectives” (Commission for Higher Education Handbook, 2008, 13). This relates to outcome accountability.

Social accountability generates structured knowledge about institutions or programs to inform decision making. It is mostly in relation to government mandated agencies such as CUE in Kenya. It could also be in relation to other stakeholders such as founders, sponsors, funders and other upper level institutional and program managers (Alkin & Christie, 2013). Social accountability relates to this study’s independent (PE purpose) and dependent (use or non-use of evaluation) variables. In this study, social accountability is applied to the constituency initiators such as the sponsors and funders, institution and department. It provides the rationale for evaluation. Monitoring and evaluation rely on direct or indirect engagement of the constituency stakeholders. When constituency members participate in monitoring and evaluating, they determine the indicators and the reason for doing the evaluation. The monitoring and evaluation is impact and performance focused (Melana et al., 2004). As such the purpose of doing evaluation is theorized to affect use of the results. This study sought to empirically investigate this conceptualized association.

2.1.2 Stufflebeam’s Context, Input, Process, Product Evaluation Model (1970s)

The CIPP model emphasizes stakeholders using evaluation results to make decisions for program improvement and give evidence for accountability. It guides decision making at all program levels and thus encourages use of evaluation results. In this model, PE is a cyclical and continuous process. It is not a product but a process aimed at continued improvement of the program. Improvement of programs happens as evaluators continually provide information to

decision makers, who use the information to invest in programs that are more effective. The model engages stakeholders as decision makers to focus the evaluation so it can yield relevant data for accountability and decision making. Evaluation is carried out at four levels, including the context, inputs, process, and product. The context evaluation can also be referred to as needs analysis. Input level evaluates the planning phase. Process evaluation involves evaluating the implementation of the program in order to make program improvements. The product evaluation level evaluates the success of the program as implied by the outcomes. Actual program outcomes are compared with intended outcomes (Stufflebeam, 2001; Alkin & Christie, 2013; Otunga et al., 2011; Frye & Hemmer, 2013; Saylor et al., 1981).

A major strength of the CIPP model is its emphasis on the context and formative evaluation. The model also provides summative information. It engages key decision making stakeholders with their different perspectives. It encourages a more comprehensive evaluation done at the four levels. Of interest is its fostering of use of evaluation information. These attributes place it highly as a use-oriented model. In spite, of its strength, it is difficult to implement and more expensive to maintain, as compared to other models. It is also criticized for ignoring the political nature of decision making (Otunga et al., 2011; Frye & Hemmer, 2013). Stufflebeam's view of evaluation as a use-oriented process aimed at continuous improvement of the program through providing information for decision making and accountability, informs the current study's independent (motivation for evaluation, including accountability to sponsors and funders and program improvement), and dependant (use of evaluation information) variables (Stufflebeam, 2001; Alkin & Christie, 2013).

2.1.3 Cole's Value-Goal Oriented Evaluation Model

Cole's model though created within the African context and with Christian ministry training in mind, has generalizable principles and is therefore applicable in other settings. It can guide evaluation of programs with different value referents, both Christian and non-Christian. According to Cole, like Stufflebeam, evaluation is a process rather than an event. It is a value-oriented measure of the worth and success of a program in relation to its goals and objectives. Cole describes the process of evaluation in terms of the three major parts and three key components that show what it means to do an evaluation. The three major parts of evaluation are descriptive data, criteria of measurement and judgment (Cole, 2001, p. 307-321). The three key

components include “The goals and the objectives of the programme; the planned line of action; and the process of programme implementation” (Cole, 2001, p. 321). An evaluation process and design should incorporate these major parts and components.

Cole emphasizes the role of PE purpose and values in the evaluation process. Evaluation is seen as value-driven. Value referents used in PE are related to the purpose of evaluation and in so doing to the utilization of evaluation. Different values are held by different assessors and users, thus affecting evaluation purpose and use. For instance, accrediting bodies and constituent members or stakeholders may hold different values. Cole demonstrates this concept quite well in reference to his two types of values: accrediting agency-driven values and constituency-driven values (Cole, 2001, p. 328). Accrediting agency-driven values are “context-free and are judged on the bases of absolute or relative standards of measurement” (Cole, 2001, p. 328). Constituency-driven values are context-determined (Cole, 2001, p. 328). Values clarify the purpose of PE (Cole, 2001, p. 329). When the purpose of evaluation is determined then the value referents are predictable. If for instance, the purpose of PE is accreditation, then accrediting agency-driven values will be adopted. If on the other hand, the purpose of PE is accountability to founders, sponsors or funders, then constituency-driven values will be adopted. This value and purpose relationship ties in with the uses to which the evaluation will be put. Cole demonstrates the inter-play of the key components of evaluation in his checklist design.

Cole’s check-list design gives direction to the evaluation process, value referents (criteria), and even to the utilization of evaluation. This model could be labeled a value-goal oriented evaluation model. It has two parts, including the basics and the options. The basics part has 3 components which he regards as basic to any form of evaluation or any evaluation design that one may adopt. The basic component includes the objective of evaluation, program philosophy and program purpose, and goals and objectives. The objective of evaluation part has to do with clarifying the purpose of evaluation (Cole, 2001, p. 342). “Clarification of the objective of an evaluation helps to give direction to the exercise itself, as well as to the utilization of the results of an evaluation” (Cole, 2001, 342). This suggests that, the purpose of evaluation directs the process and outcome of evaluation.

This model is adaptable to different contexts and different kinds of evaluations, depending on PE purpose and thus the value referents. The options component in the model allows for such

dynamism and adaptability. However, its emphasis on goals could lead to ignoring unintended outcomes and intervening variables that affect learning. The main challenge with it is in relation to the difficulty of measuring values. Cole put forward his model in the African context for institutions training for Christian ministry (Cole, 2001). It is thus an inspiration to the current study focusing on institutions that train for Christian ministry within the African context. The model emphasizes purpose, values, goals and use of evaluation. The purpose of evaluation is foundational in evaluation. The value referents clarify the purpose, which determines all the other elements of evaluation, including the use to which evaluation will be put. Cole's model provided insights for this study as it sought to find out the role of the objective of evaluation in use or non-use of evaluation results. This is against the backdrop that Cole assumes that the objective of evaluation directs the process of evaluation and the use of the results. This researcher attempted to empirically study this conceptualized relationship motivated by Cole's writing.

2.2 Empirical Review

PE use is largely defined by the purposes and context of evaluation. Evaluation use and related theories have contributed to the development of different approaches to evaluation. The various approaches developed are designed to help provide needed information for the stakeholders who will use the data in their different contexts. The purpose and use of evaluation then needs to be clearly defined and use must be intentional (Myhlhousen-Leak, 2011, p. 3-4). However, there are still “. . . difficulties in defining use, planning for use, and implementing use as a part of the assessment process” (Myhlhousen-Leak, 2011, p. 3-4). As such the lack of, or existence of such procedures may affect utilization, regardless of the purpose of evaluation. Myhlhousen-Leak points out that, “For evaluation to be most useful, users' information needs should shape practice. Practice should emerge from the evaluative purposes (i.e., improvement and accountability), which identify applicable approaches and define evaluative roles suggesting appropriate methods for an evaluation” (Myhlhousen-Leak, 2011, p. 35).

In current literature, the major purposes that drive academic PE include: accreditation, accountability, program and service improvement, decision making, measure of achievement of institutional goals/program effectiveness, marketing the program and institution, and resource mobilisation and allocation (Palomba & Banta, 1999; Hayward, 2006; Eisner, 1979;

Myhlhousen-Leak, 2011). However, most institutions carry out PE as a requirement for accreditation and accountability (Myhlhousen-Leak, 2011, p. 43; Hayward, 2006, p. 27). With such a mindset the activity is intended to meet external requirements and the results may not necessarily be used for internal program improvement. Questions arise for contexts like Africa where PE is mandatory for most HE institutions. In such contexts, one asks questions such as: is PE carried out as a mere accreditation requirement; or are there other viable purposes for which institutions carry out PE? Are evaluation results utilized for internal program and institutional benefits leading to quality programs? If the results are not utilized, PE becomes a mere “fulfilling of all righteousness.” Such practices lead to gaps in policy and practice; effectiveness of quality assurance mechanisms at external and internal levels; and evaluation utilization. In view of the above discussion, it is imperative that relevant and informed policies, practices, standards and criteria on purpose and use of PE be determined and translated into workable and effective PE practice in HE in Africa (McDavid, 2013; Hayward, 2006; Materu, 2007). Unless such a challenge is successfully tackled, the quality of university programs will remain a mirage.

One of the requirements for all universities in most African countries is government accreditation of institutions and academic programs (Hayward, 2006, p. 18). Government established agencies carry out program audits and/or accreditation. Requirements to maintain and enhance the quality of programs follow. However, such PE is in most cases externally driven and externally focused. This introduces a tension in PE purposes between externally driven accreditation and accountability needs and internally driven needs for improvement (Ott, 2017, p. 191). This is a possible explanation of the fact that, in spite of monitoring and evaluation of programs through accreditation, accountability and improvement mechanisms and requirements, the quality of academic programs in universities continues to be in question. Without noticeable quality improvements in programs there will continue to be legitimate questions about the purpose/function and utilization of PE processes and findings.

2.2.1 Major Forms and Purposes of PE in HE in Africa

Due to major international efforts to persuade governments to improve the quality of education, significant changes have taken place in the last few decades in the basic understanding of the purpose of education as well as in its monitoring (UNESCO, 2016, p. 21). Monitoring of the quality of education and specifically PE is driven by various motives. In many African

universities, PE takes three forms which manifest the drive for PE on the continent. These include program accreditation, which relates to accreditation, program audit, which relates to accountability and program review, which relates to program improvement (Hayward, 2006).

2.2.1.1 Program Evaluation for Accreditation

Accreditation is a quality assurance and control process. It involves self-evaluation (by the institution) and external evaluation (peer review and site visits by government or other accrediting body) of the quality of an institution and/or academic program. The evaluation is in terms of externally predetermined standards and criteria as set by the government, and/or accrediting body. The accreditation process leads to judgment as to whether or not an institution or program meets the set standards and thus qualifies for a given status. Judgment usually leads to accreditation or denial of accreditation (Commission for Higher Education Handbook, 2008; Abeya, 2014, p. 51; Materu, 2007, Hayward, 2006, p. 5, 58). Global, regional and national standards all influence evaluation of educational programs at both policy and practice levels and thus the nature and purpose of evaluation. In Africa, there are national agencies that set standards and monitor PE. By 2014, twenty-one African countries had legally established such agencies (Okebukola & Fonteyne, 2014, p. 77-79). In Kenya, and several other African countries, all university programs go through program accreditation before launching and re-accreditation after a stated cycle. Accreditation of an academic program is preceded by PE (Commission for Higher Education Handbook, 2008, p. 8; Hayward, 2006, p. 15). This kind of PE is done solely for purposes of accreditation. Questions arise about the extent to which accreditation leads to quality programs.

Hayward reported that, in the countries studied, accreditation led to quality improvement as institutions tried to comply with the standards set by accrediting bodies before site visits (Hayward, 2006, p. 23-24). Though accreditation of programs is mandatory in Kenya, there are still issues with the quality of those programs. Accreditation is a top-down kind of PE and gives the impression of over reliance on the requirement to comply with externally set standards and criteria leading to minimum quality improvement (Hayward, 2006, p. 53). This may be a result of inaccurate view of the role and purpose of PE in the education process. In many cases, PE may be viewed and carried out mostly as a requirement for accreditation and accountability and not as a necessity for program quality improvement. Such a view of the function of PE could

affect the practice of evaluation and the usefulness of the process and outcomes of evaluation, not to mention the wastage of resources invested in it (SUNY University Faculty Senate, 2012, p. 16-22; Glasman & Nevo, 1988, p. 37; Eisner, 1979, p. 179). It can also be a hindrance to the growth of a culture of quality assurance in HE. The scenario calls for a balance between external requirements and internal goals, needs and realities.

2.2.1.2 Program Evaluation for Accountability

Hayward established that, “Accountability is one of the most important potential contributions of accreditation” (Hayward, 2006, p. 40). This is an interesting relationship between different purposes of evaluation. After accreditation, institutions are responsible for improvement and quality assurance through ongoing evaluation of the accredited programs. Accreditation then assures accountability. Accountability is not only required by accrediting bodies but by a host of many other stakeholders. PE is used to provide information used for accountability (Hayward, 2006, p. 40; Materu, 2007, p. xv). Governments, governing boards, legislators, founders, funders, sponsors and other stakeholders are interested in finding out if their investments are yielding positive results. Therefore, they require institutions to give accountability. This is in agreement with social accountability theory. Generally, in Africa, PE for accountability takes the form of program audit. “It is an evaluation and assessment of an institution or its programs in relation to its own mission, goals, and stated standards. The assessors are looking primarily at the success of the institution in achieving its goals” (Hayward, 2006, p. 5). This is for accountability to both internal and external stakeholders such as current and prospective students, the public, funders, sponsors, and governments. This is evaluation for others (those the institution is accountable to). It points out the strengths and weaknesses and conclusions and judgments about the program (Unruh & Unruh, 1984, p. 279; Sawyer, 1992, p. 2). “Accountability is about institutions taking responsibility for the service they provide and the public money they spend” (Abeya, 2014, p. 45). They also need to guarantee current and future students about the quality of their programs (Abeya, 2014, p. 46). Accountability enhances program performance because it involves critical reviews of the programs. Accountability also serves as a regulatory mechanism as evaluations must be done in accordance with certain criteria and standards and reports must be given to the relevant audiences (Abeya, 2014, p. 46). Accountability may not guarantee quality, especially if it fosters evaluation to merely “fulfilling all righteousness.” For the most part it is believed to

provide assurance about the standard and quality of programs in HE. It is possible, however, that in the process of seeking accountability, program quality may be improved.

2.2.1.3 Program Evaluation for Program Improvement

PE for improvement in Africa tends to take the form of academic reviews. An academic review is a self-study intended to establish the successes, weaknesses and needs of the programs and use the results to make recommendations for improvement of the program and its quality. Academic reviews are a common part of the quality assurance process in many African countries (Hayward, 2006, p. 16). If any program is to be improved, evaluation must be done first. Evaluation will not only show evidence of improvement but will also highlight weak areas that need improvement (Cole, 2001, p. 313). Academic review practices on the African scene are similar to global trends. Muradov's study of improvement-oriented program evaluations in selected institutions in USA identified similar characteristics of such evaluations (see Muradov, 2001, p. 59-61). PE for improvement tends to focus on the internal audience and standards (Sawer, 1992, p. 2-3). It gives an objective basis for making decisions about the program. Such decisions may include continuation, modification, or discontinuation of the program. It may determine allocation of resources; approval or improvement of the curriculum; implementation procedures; the instructional methods, and student learning assessment. Action may involve activities such as revision of the curriculum, modification and improvement of materials used in the teaching and learning process (Sawer, 1992; Eisner, 1979; Palomba & Banta, 1999; Suskie, 2009; Unruh and Unruh, 1984; Bennet, 2003).

In view of the three functions of PE above, it can thus be concluded that in USA and some African countries the major purposes that drive PE include accreditation, accountability and improvement. Accreditation can be identified as prevalent in the selected CCUs in Kenya but the prevalence of accountability to sponsors and funders and program improvement purposes is unclear. In several African countries it can be concluded that, the nature, form or type PE takes is varied, depending on the purpose, goal, audience and stage at which the evaluation is carried out.

3.0 Research Methodology

In this study the quantitative correlation design was used. Academic programs were the unit of analysis, and program leaders were the respondents. A population census of all 50 approved, operational and re-evaluated academic programs in three selected CCUs was done. Data was collected using a questionnaire. Two major PE purposes including accountability to funders and sponsors, and program improvement were investigated. Though accreditation is a major purpose, it was excluded in the analysis because all programs under study are accredited by CUE. These programs were first identified from CUE website’s list of accredited programs and were verified on the ground through a preliminary investigation. Use of PE results was the dependent variable. One type of use of PE results was investigated in this study, namely instrumental use of PE results. Instrumental use of PE results is when PE results are used to modify an element or component of the program. Descriptive and inferential analysis was carried out. Correlation analyses using Pearson’s Chi square and Cramer’s V were done to establish relationships between PE purposes (independent variable) and use or non-use of PE results (dependent variable). The logistic regression model was used to determine the purpose of PE that is most likely to increase the chances of utilizing PE results.

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Descriptive Analysis: Most Important Reasons for Conducting PE

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of accountability to sponsors and funders and program improvement as motivations in conducting the most recent PE. The results are shown in Table 1 and discussed in the following section.

Table 1: Important Reasons for Conducting the Most Recent Program Evaluation

PE Purpose	Disagree		Agree		Total	
	<i>f</i>	(%)	<i>f</i>	(%)	<i>f</i>	(%)
The purpose of accountability to sponsors and funders was very important in the most recent evaluation	28	68	13	32	41	100
The purpose of improving the program was very important in the most recent evaluation	11	27	30	73	41	100

4.1.1 Program Evaluation for Accountability

As shown in Table 1, majority of the program leaders (68%) did not consider accountability to sponsors and funders to be a very important reason for doing their most recent evaluation. On the other hand, 32% considered accountability to be a very important reason for doing their most recent evaluation. The findings suggest that majority of the program leaders did not consider sponsors and funders as the primary audience of the most recent evaluation. In other words, as self-reported, for most of the programs, the evaluation was not driven by the external accountability mandates.

4.1.2 Program Evaluation for Program Improvement

Majority of the program leaders (73%) considered program improvement to be a very important reason for doing their most recent evaluation while 27% reported the contrary (Table 1). This means that, in doing the evaluation, for majority of the programs, the focus was on gathering information to use for making improvements on the program. They considered themselves (programs, departments and institution) as the primary audience who would use the results. This is consistent with the preceding findings about accountability to funders and sponsors that suggested that the evaluation was not driven by external reasons. The findings suggest that program improvement (73%) is considered to be a more important reason for doing evaluation as compared to accountability to funders and sponsors (32%).

4.2 Correlation Analysis: Relationship between PE Purposes and Use or non-use of PE results

The study focused on the major reasons of doing PE in relation to instrumental use of PE results in selected CCUs in Kenya. Some previous studies established the major reasons of doing evaluation as accreditation, accountability and improvement (Hayward, 2006; Myhlhousen-Leak, 2011). Since all the programs studied were already accredited, this study investigated only accountability to sponsors and funders, and program improvement as independent variables. Pearson Chi-square and Cramer's V tests were used to test hypothesis 1 and 2 to find out if there are significant relationships and make objective statistically supported inferences at the significant level of 0.05.

4.2.1 H₀1: There is no significant relationship between PE done for accountability and instrumental use or non-use of PE results in selected CCUs in Kenya

Program leaders were asked to indicate whether the results of the most recent evaluation of the program they oversee were used to change and/or inform a component or element of the program. Majority of the programs leaders (78%) responded in the affirmative to this question, while 22% reported the contrary. Of the 78% who reported to have used the results, majority (84.4%) indicated that accountability to sponsors and funders was not the motivation for doing PE, while 15.6% indicated that it was a very important motivation. On the other hand, of the 22% who reported not to have used the results, majority (89%) indicated that accountability to funders and sponsors was the motivation for doing PE, while 11% said it was not. It appears that accountability to sponsors and funders as a motivation for doing evaluation tends not to encourage use of the results to modify an element or component of the program. To determine if the observed variances in use of evaluation results by accountability to funders and sponsors purpose of PE are of statistical significance, a Chi square test was done. The results in Table 2 show χ^2 (1df) = 17.412^a, Fisher’s Exact = .000, p -value = 0.000 and Cramer’s V of .652 (p=.000) led to rejection of null hypothesis 1.

Table 2: The Relationship between PE done for accountability and instrumental use of PE results.

Evaluation was done for accountability purposes		PE results were used			χ^2	Df	P-value	Fisher’s Exact	Cramer’s V
		False	True	Total					
Disagree	Observed	1(2.4)	27(65.9)	28(68.3)	17.412 ^a	1	.000	.000	.652 (p=.000)
	Expected	6	22	28					
Agree	Observed	8(19.5)	5(12.2)	13(31.7)					
	Expected	3	10	13					
Total		9(22)	32(78)	41(100)					

The findings indicate that there is a strong and positive statistically significant association between the purpose of doing PE in order to satisfy the expectations of funders and sponsors and the use of the results to modify a component of the program. These findings confirm Myhlhousen-Leak (2011) study that accountability as a reason for doing evaluation has an association with the use of evaluation results. A statistically significant and strong positive relationship suggests that programs that do PE to give accountability to sponsors and funders are more likely to use the results to modify a component or element of the program. It is of interest to note, however that, even though PE done for accountability to funders and sponsors is more likely to encourage the use of evaluation results as per Chi square and Cramer's V test results, based on self-reports of program leaders, it is not a very important reason for doing evaluation. This is surprising for these Christian affiliated institutions for whom it is assumed depend considerably on donations from their sponsors and funders. If their sponsors and funders provide finances and other forms of support, then it is expected that they keep them accountable. According to the findings, very few programs do that. It is possible that funders and sponsors are more interested in financial reports than PE findings and so the said institutions might render accountability through financial reports. It is also possible that overall institutional evaluation is used for accountability to sponsors and funders rather than specific PE. It is also possible that sponsors and funders rely on the regular evaluation reports that are done for accreditation and re-accreditation purposes. If this is the case, important information relevant to funders and sponsors to guide their input into the program and institution may be missed out. This is because constituency driven evaluation (such as for funders and sponsors) has value referents and criteria that are different from accrediting agency driven evaluation (Cole, 2001). Effective evaluation takes into consideration the evaluation audience, and aligns with the appropriate purpose, value referents, criteria, methods and use.

4.2.2 H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between PE done for program improvement and instrumental use of PE results in selected CCUs in Kenya.

Of the 78% who reported to have used the results, majority (84.4%) indicated that program improvement was the motivation for doing PE, while only 15.6% indicated the contrary. On the other hand, of the 22% who reported not to have used the results, majority (66.7%) indicated that program improvement was not the motivation for doing PE, while 33% said it was. This may

suggest that when program improvement is the motivation for PE, the results tend to be used. The statistical significance of the observed variances in use of evaluation results by program improvement purpose was tested statistically as postulated by hypothesis 2. The findings show a moderate, positive statistically significant association between the purpose of doing PE in order to improve the program and the use of the results to modify a component of the program. This is evidenced by χ^2 (1df) =9.322^a, Fisher’s Exact = .006, p -value =.002, and Cramer’s V of .447 (p=.002) as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: The Relationship between PE done for Program Improvement and instrumental use of PE results.

Evaluation was done for program improvement purposes		PE results were used			χ^2	Df	P-value	Fisher’s Exact	Cramer’s V					
		f (%)												
		False	True	Total										
Disagree	Observed	6(14.6)	5(12.2)	11(26.8)	9.322 ^a	1	.002	.006	.477 (p=.002)					
	Expected	2.4	8.6	11										
Agree	Observed	3(7.3)	27(65.9)	30 (73.2)										
	Expected	6.6	23.4	30										
Total		9(22)	32(78)	41(100)										

These results suggest that when program improvement was conceived to be the major reason for doing the evaluation the results were mostly put to use. These findings tally with Myhlhousen-Leak’s (2011) qualitative study findings that improvement as a purpose of evaluation relates to use of evaluation. In her study of 19 programs, comparing the low use programs and high use programs, she established that improvement as a purpose of evaluation was important in the higher use programs but not in the low use programs. This implies that when improvement is the purpose of evaluation, use of evaluation tends to be higher (Myhlhousen-Leak, 2011, p. 106).

The statistically significant and moderate positive relationship established by the current study signifies that when the motivation to do PE is to improve the program the results are moderately likely to be put to use.

4.3 Regression Analysis: Effects of PE Purpose on the Odds of Using PE results

Table 4: Effects of PE done for Accountability to sponsors and funders and PE for Improvement on the Odds of Using PE Results in Selected CCUs in Kenya

Predictor Variable	p-value	ExpB (Odds ratios)	Conclusion
PE for accountability purposes	.004	.024	Significant
PE for program improvement purposes	.012	12.633	Significant

Table 4 shows regression analysis results which show the effects of PE purposes (accountability to sponsors and funders, and program improvement) on the odds of using PE findings in selected CCUs in Kenya. When PE is done for accountability to sponsors and funders, the use of PE results is likely to increase .024 times (p value of .004 and $\text{Exp}(B) = .024$). When PE is done for program improvement, use of findings is predicted to increase 12.633 times (p value of .012 and $\text{Exp}(B) = 12.633$). The findings suggests that motivation to improve the program is a more critical PE purpose in determining the use of PE results than external mandates such as sponsors and funders. These findings corroborate Welsh and Metcalf's study. Welsh and Metcalf's study established that when faculty and staff perceived the primary purpose of implementing institutional effectiveness activities as improvement of the institution's programs and services, they were more supportive and committed to implementing the recommendations than if the purpose was to fulfill external mandates (Welsh and Metcalf, 2003, p. 40). Similar to the current study, improvement was more important than external mandates. The programs that reported that the purpose of doing PE was improvement also reported more use of evaluation than those who reported that the reason for doing PE was external sponsors' and funders' mandates.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The findings agree with the study's theoretical framework. A conclusion is thus made that there is a direct relationship between PE purpose and use or non-use of the results. The purpose of doing evaluation tends to determine the use or non-use of the evaluation results. When the purpose of evaluation is accountability to funders and sponsors, and program improvement, the use of the findings tends to be high. However, program improvement is reported to be a more important motivation for doing PE than accountability to sponsors and funders. Moreover, program improvement is the more critical factor than external mandates such as sponsors and funders in regard to the use of evaluation results to modify or inform a program component or element. When the reason for doing evaluation is program improvement, the use of the results is likely to increase at least 12 times more than if the purpose was accountability to sponsors and funders.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The researcher advances the theory that the initiator of evaluation tends to specify the purpose of evaluation, which in turn is likely to determine the use or non-use of the results. To encourage use of evaluation results, the purpose of evaluation should be specified by the initiator. The value-purpose-use evaluation model (Figure 1) is recommended in attempt to align the purpose and use of evaluation and all the other aspects of the evaluation process.

Figure 1: Value-Purpose-Use Evaluation Model



(The initiator of evaluation tends to specify the purpose of evaluation, which in turn is likely to determine the use or non-use of the results. HACK, 2020)

The researcher also recommends pre-evaluation planning that deliberately creates an integrated and balanced system of evaluation, which closely aligns both external and internal initiators, purposes and uses of evaluation. Both the external and internal evaluators and users should engage in on-going deliberations concerning the purpose and use of PE at the planning and implementation levels. The purpose of evaluation should be considered and planned for beforehand to encourage the use of the results.

In addition, the researcher recommends that, to encourage more use of evaluation results and more effective evaluations that lead to quality programs, institutions should do PE for program improvement purposes more often.

All the programs are accredited as a government requirement and thus may tend to follow accrediting agency-driven values. Accountability to funders and sponsors and program improvement are the highlighted purposes, which should follow constituency-driven values (Cole, 2001, p. 328). It is recommended thus that institutions should be familiar with and adopt constituency-driven values when evaluating programs for accountability and improvement purposes so that the results can be used to meet constituency related needs. The relevant constituencies under which these institutions fall should outline and disseminate guidelines and standards reflecting their value referents.

References

- Abeya, G., G. (2014). Quality Assurance Policy and Practice in Higher Education Institutions in Ethiopia. Doctoral Dissertation, University of South Africa.
- Bennett, J. (2003). Evaluation Methods in Research. London: Continuum.
- Nyaigotti-Chacha, C. (2017). Press Statement on Quality Audit of Universities in Kenya Conducted In January And February 2017. <http://host.nationmedia.com/CUE-uni.pdf>.
- Christina, C. & Alkin, M. (2013). An Evaluation Theory Tree - 2012 (most updated version). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333392751_An_Evaluation_Theory_Tree_-_2012_most_updated_version.
- Cloete, F. (2016). Developing an Africa-rooted programme evaluation approach Department of Public Administration and Management, University of the Free State Bloemfontein South Africa.
- Babajide, C., V. (2001). Training of the Ministry: A Macro-curricular Approach. Bangalore: Theological Book Trust.
- Commission for Higher Education. (2008). Handbook on Processes for Quality Assurance in Higher Education in Kenya. <http://www.cue.or.ke> Accessed on August 15, 2018.
- Commission for University Education 2014-2018 Strategic Plan.
- Eisner, E., W. (1979). The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co. Inc.
- Frye, A., W. & Hemmer, Paul, A. (2013). Program Evaluation Models and Related Theories. Dundee, UK: AMEE.

Glasman, N., S. & Nevo, D. (1988). *Evaluation in Decision Making: The case of school administration.* (Evaluation in Education and Human Services Series.) Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hayward, F. (2006). *Quality assurance and accreditation of higher education in Africa.* Paper prepared for presentation at the Conference on Higher Education Reform in Francophone Africa: Understanding the Keys of Success. June 13-15, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

Inter University Council of East Africa Directory. *East African Universities and Higher Education in Partnership with Inter University Council of East Africa Directory 2015/2016.*

Leahy, M.J., Thielsen, V.A., Millington, M.J., Austin, B., & Fleming, A. (2009). *Quality assurance and program evaluation: Terms, models, and applications.* *Journal of Rehabilitation Administration*, 33(2), 69-82.

Malena, C., Reiner, F. & Janmejy, S. (2004). "Social Accountability: An Introduction to The Concept and Emerging Practice." *Social Development Paper 76.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Materu, P. (2007). *Higher Education Quality Assurance in Sub-Saharan Africa: Status, Challenges, Opportunities, and Promising Practices.* Washington, D.C: The World Bank.

McDavid J., C. Huse Irene & Ingleson L., R. L. (2013). *Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement: An Introduction to Practice.* 2nd Edition, Canada, SAGE Publications Inc.

Fatma, M.. (2006). *A Systems Approach to Program Evaluation Model for Quality in Higher Education.* In *Quality Assurance in Education.* Vol. 14 No. 1, Emerald Group Publishing Limited. 0968-4883 DOI 10.1108/09684880610643601.

Mukhwana, E., S. Oure, S. Kiptoo, A. Kande, R. Njue, J. Too and D.K. Some. (2016). State of University Education in Kenya. Commission for University Education. Discussion. Paper 04. Nairobi, Kenya.

Azat., M. (2001). "A Model of Academic Program Review for Program Improvement" Master's Capstone Projects. 109. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cie_capstones/109.

Myhlhousen-Leak, G., A., D. (2011). "An investigation of outcomes assessment utilization in the context of teacher education program accreditation." PhD thesis, University of Iowa. <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/1037>.

Okebukola, P. A. & Fonteyne, B. (2014). Developing a Pan-African Quality Assurance and Accreditation Framework.

Ott, B. (2017). Accreditation: Importance and Benefits for the Institution. In Leadership in Theological Education: Foundations for Academic Leadership. (184-215). Vol. 1. Editors Fritz Deininger & Orbelina Equizabal. UK: Langham.

Otunga, R. N., Odero, I. & Barasa, P., L. (2011). A Handbook for Curriculum and Instruction. Eldoret: Moi University Press.

Palomba, C., A. & Banta, T., W. (1999). Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, and Improving Assessment in Higher Education, 1st ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sawyer, B., J. (1992). Evaluating for Accountability: A Practical Guide for the Inexperienced Evaluator. Oregon State University Extension Service.

Saylor J. Galen, A., W., M. & Lewis A., J. (1981). Curriculum Planning for Better Teaching and Learning. 4th Edition. NY: Holt-Saunders International Editions.

Slimmer, V., M. (1981). "Evaluating a program in higher education: a conceptual process and its application." Retrospective Theses and Dissertations. 6854.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/6854>.

Stufflebeam, D., L. (2001). Evaluation Models. *New Directions for Evaluation*, no. 89, Spring 2001 © Jossey-Bass, A Publishing Unit of John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
https://wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/u58/2015/Evaluation_Models.pdf.

SUNY University Faculty Senate. (2012). Guide for the Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs. Undergraduate Committee. January 2012.

Teferra, D., & Altbach, P., G. (2003). "Trends and Perspectives in African Higher Education" In *African Higher Education: An International Reference Handbook*. Edited by Damtew Teferra and Philip G. Altbach. Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

UNESCO Education Sector. (2016). Designing effective monitoring and evaluation of education systems for 2030: A global synthesis of policies and practices.

Unruh, Glenys G. & Adolph Unruh. (1984). *Curriculum Development: Problems, Processes, and Progress*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.