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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to determine the role of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers on secondary schools performance in national examinations in Nakuru district based on the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Examinations (KCSE) for the years 2003 to 2008. The researcher chose the district because the KCSE results have not been pleasant compared to the national aggregate whose maximum point aggregate is 12 on the scale. Specifically, in 2003 the district registered a standard mean score of 5.18.

In 2004 it registered a mean of 5.26. In 2005, there was a small gain of 0.11 leading to a mean score of 5.29 while in 2006; the district attained a mean of 5.2, indicating a decline of 0.9. The mean score went down further to 5.00 in 2007. However, in 2008 the mean standard score increased to 5.1. Arising from the aforementioned, the mean had either been static or insignificantly improved within the period 2003 to 2008. The researcher sampled 9 secondary schools out of 46 (21.2%) and 82 teachers out of 818 (10.1%) in Nakuru district. In addition, all the 5 Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (100%) in Nakuru District office being a small number were taken as respondents. It should be noted that the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers are mandated to undertake education quality assurance supervisory role in the entire Nakuru District. There were three research instruments used during the research, namely: Quality Assurance and Standards Officers’ interview schedule (QASOIS), Head Teacher Questionnaire (HTQ), and Secondary School Teachers’ Questionnaire (SSTQ).

The researcher used descriptive statistics that included; frequency, percentages illustrated in tables and charts to analyze information generated from the respondents. The information was also analyzed using proportions and means. The findings revealed that all the QASOs have the required academic and professional qualifications. Majority have long periods of experience in undertaking supervisory roles in curriculum implementation. However, they are faced with challenges in responding to their duties due to inadequate facilitation. Also, in some instances where they have performed their duties, their recommendations are not acted upon by either the head teacher or the Ministry of Education. The analysis indicates that QASOs roles are viewed positively by both the head teachers and teachers with expectations towards improving institutional performance. Given the wide range of supervisory roles, it is recommended that QASOs be provided with in-depth training on utilization of assessment techniques so as to provide informed advisory role to enhance teaching and learning outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immuno Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIE</td>
<td>Authority to Incur Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG</td>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDQAS</td>
<td>Deputy Director Quality Assurance and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQAS</td>
<td>Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education For All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immuno deficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTQ</td>
<td>Head Teacher Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE</td>
<td>Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KESSP</td>
<td>Kenya Education Sector Support Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNEC</td>
<td>Kenya National Examinations Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEST</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td>Mean Standard Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAS</td>
<td>Quality Assurance and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QASO</td>
<td>Quality Assurance and Standards Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QASOIS</td>
<td>Quality Assurance and Standards Officer Interview Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROK</td>
<td>Republic of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADQAS</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Director Quality Assurance and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDDQAS</td>
<td>Senior Deputy Director Quality Assurance and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMASSE</td>
<td>Strengthening of Mathematics and Science at Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQASO</td>
<td>Senior Quality Assurance and Standards Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTQ</td>
<td>Secondary School Teachers’ Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSC</td>
<td>Teachers Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific &amp; Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Laws of Kenya Chapter 211 known as Education Act gave the inspectorate a legal backing. Section 18 of the Education Act states that “school inspectors appointed by Ministry of Education be charged with authority to enter and inspect any school, or any place at which it is reasonably suspected that a school is being conducted, any time, with or without notice and to report”. The responsibility of the inspectorate is elaborated in MOEST Handbook (2000). The Handbook gives a guide to the inspectors and other stakeholders in education on their role.

Since the establishment of the inspectorate division in the Ministry of Education, over 30 years ago, the inspectors have been operating through circulars and guidelines. However, a direction has been given through KESSP report (2005), which realizes that, for effective curriculum delivery, a Quality Assurance and Standards Officer is expected to provide advisory services to school on how best to improve on pedagogical and andragogical skills. This eventually is supposed to enhance a schools performance. The same advice also goes to stakeholders at school, district and headquarters level. Specifically, the executive summary is given to the head teachers and other stakeholders for immediate action, including a full report distributed to principals/head teachers, chairman Board of Governors (BOG), District Education Officers (DEOs), Director Secondary, Director Quality Assurance and Standards and Teachers Service Commission. All these officers are responsible for making a follow up of the crucial areas either mentioned or implicated such as staffing, finances, curriculum issues and performance among others.
According to MOEST (2000), the QASO is charged with specific roles such as conducting standard assessment in schools, which encompasses all areas of management and specifically oversees examination (both internal and external) syllabus coverage, curriculum development and implementation, financial management and auditing as well as overall instructional leadership.

The Jomtien Conference on education (1990) focused on access to quality education for all. This position was reaffirmed in the Dakar Forum in 2000 when over 150 countries committed themselves to the achievement of six (6) goals now popularly known as Education For All (EFA) Goals. One of the six goals is specifically focused on quality of education (MOE Newsletter, 2005). This goal aimed at improving all aspects of the quality of education and ensuring excellence so that recognized and measurable learning outcomes are achieved by all, especially in literacy, numeracy and essential life skills. This necessitated various countries to come up with mechanisms to fulfill the aspect of quality. Finland through its Bergen Report (2005) had a similar idea but decentralized the practice. The Finnish system of evaluation and quality assurance has remained decentralized based on voluntary participation by the institutions and focused on quality enhancement rather than control-fitness for purpose.

Kenya has also made strides in quality improvement as stated in Sessional Paper No.1 of 2005, which reaffirms that the provision of education and training to all Kenyans is fundamental to the success of the government’s overall development strategy. This has been elaborated further in the Vision 2030 with three strong pillars namely; political, social and economic (Vision 2030, ROK).
Since independence, the government has addressed several challenges through commissions, working parties and task forces in order to enhance the quality of education in the country as per Sessional Paper No.1 of (2005). This led to the reforms, which resulted, into the re-structuring of the Ministry curving out a Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS) encompassing quality audit, quality assurance and quality development.

Before independence in 1963, most schools in Kenya were under the colonial government and missionaries. Emphasis was on provision of technical skills to indigenous Kenyans. As changes emerged with the demand for industrial education with mushrooming of schools, the government was forced to come up with supervisory systems for all schools. According to Maranga (1987) the colonial inspector was expected to impact the methods of teaching in all schools and criticize the suitability of the curriculum, to examine schools in conjunction with the staff and to adopt the examination to the curriculum. Just like inspectorate, the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards (DQAS) has a vision and mission statement to guide the QASOs in their operations. According to MOEST (2000) its vision is, “to provide quality assurance to all education stakeholders in all education institutions, while the mission is to establish, maintain and improve education standards”.

The Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards is headed by the Director assisted by a Senior Deputy Director. Cascaded below are: Deputy Directors, Senior Assistant Directors, Assistant Directors, Senior Quality Assurance and Standards Officers, and Quality Assurance and Standard Officers who are both stationed within the ministry headquarter and, replicated in the field, that is, Provincial and District. The QASOs at the Directorate headquarters are mainly in-charge of specific subjects or areas while the seniors are either in charge of a subsection,
program or project. It is also envisaged that the head teachers are also QASOs ‘number one’ assisted by Heads of Departments as for secondary and class teachers in primary schools. They are QASOs ‘number one’ because according to the norms, Quality Assurance Officers would visit schools at most once after three years unless it is a special measure or follow up being made.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

According to “Kenya Position Paper” UNESCO (2004), the mission and vision statement of this department shows clearly that the DQAS is a very central department in the provision of quality assurance in education. It further states that the legality of the department of quality assurance and standards is stimulated in the education Act chapter 211 section 18 of the laws of Kenya. The mission is, ‘establishing, maintaining and improving education standards’ and the vision is ‘to provide quality assurance to all education stakeholders’, create the operational climate or ethos of the QAS, it provides an overall code of conduct and overall criteria for the public to evaluate the performance of the DQASOs as an institution.

The Ministry of Education has pointed out that an inspector must have excellent professional skills and knowledge and demonstrates impartial judgment among other characteristics (MOE, 2005) therefore, the image and role of the QASO must be totally different from the former inspector of schools and must measure to the current trends as per the restructuring of the Ministry of Education. The Kenya Certificate of Secondary Examination results of Nakuru district showed a declining trend in mean standard score from 5.29 in 2005 to 5.00 in 2007, rising minimally to 5.10 in 2008 as illustrated in Table 1.1 below. This has raised a lot of concern to the education stakeholders.
Table 1: Nakuru Mean Standard Score for the Last Four Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean Standard Score (M.S.S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DEO Nakuru District (2009)

Despite changing the titles, from school inspectors to quality assurance and standards officers, some QASOs still play the role of inspectors by harassing teachers and serious engagements in fault finding. This brings negative reputation, walloping their credibility, leading to poor performance in service delivery and draining the existing standards.

Teachers have expressed major concerns and other stakeholders on the poor image pasted against a very hardworking and diligent QASOs. Some Schools have complained of lack of quality assessment aimed at standard improvement. The bottom line is that, there are QASOs who are conservative and maintain status quo due to lack of understanding of what their job demands.

Nakuru District enjoys a good learning climate and abundance of other natural resources, which may contribute to good performance in national examinations. However, the existing scenario reflects declining academic performance for the last three years through the district mean standard scores available.

This therefore prompted the need to carry out research to determine the role of quality assurance and standards officers for effective supervision and performance of schools in Nakuru district.
1.3 Purpose of the study
Based on the problem under reference, the study was to determine the role of quality assurance and standards officers in school supervision and school performance in national examinations in Nakuru district.

1.4 Objectives of the study
The following were the objectives of the study:

1. To determine the level of training of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers on Standards assessment before employment.
2. To assess the factors affecting the Quality of school Standards assessment.
3. To find out teachers perceptions towards Quality Assurance and Standards officers (QASOs)
4. To find out the effectiveness of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers assessment reports and performance of schools in national examinations.

1.5 Research Questions
This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Are the newly appointed Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QASOs) inducted, given orientation and trained on Quality Assurance and Standards assessment before deployment?
2. What are the factors that affect the quality of standard assessment reports?
3. How do the teachers view quality assurance and standards assessment officers?
4. How do quality assurance and standards officers’ reports impact on school performance in national examinations?
1.6 Limitations of the study
This study may be limited due to the fact that:

i) All schools are visited and regularly supervised by the office of Quality Assurance and standards officer.

ii) Some of the respondents may not fill the questionnaire and send them in good time

iii) All schools have enough qualified teaching staff

1.7 Delimitations
The study was conducted in Nakuru district. The area of study had a total population of 46 secondary schools, 818 teachers, 5 Quality Assurance and Standards Officers and 16,983 students. This District covers approximately an area of 300sq kms located in the heart of Rift valley province. This District has long historical perspective, having developed as a colonial administrative point for the larger rift valley as well as a central white highland post for the white famers’ children schools. This means that most of the secondary schools in Nakuru District were developed during the colonial period in terms of physical and curriculum facilities. The study sought to find out the contribution of Quality assurance and standards officers in the improvement of KCSE results in Nakuru District.

1.8 Significance of the Study
The findings of the study are to assist the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards in the Ministry of Education to train and equip the QASOs with relevant skills and tools to conduct quality assessment before deploying them to conduct standards assessment in schools. The research identifies how the inducted officers are effective in curriculum supervision leading to improved school performance. This will change the approach the QASOs use in supervising schools, with an aim of improving supervisory roles in schools. In speculation, the current policy
of sampling schools in panel assessment relying on a report until after three years may be over-
turned. The capacity of quality assurance officers may at the end require enhancement.

1.9 Assumptions of the study
The following were assumptions that guided the study:

1. That the sample was representative of all the population of all secondary schools in Nakuru District.

2. That the responses of the respondents were objective and true

3. There was a high turn over of quality assurance and standards officers who opted to join other Directorates within the Ministry of Education.

4. High performances of schools in national examinations could be achieved through use of trained quality assurance and standards officers.

1.10 Theoretical Framework
The study is based on Role theory developed by Mullin (2004). According to Mullins, a role is the expected pattern of behavior associated with members occupying a particular portion within the structure of the organization. It also describes how a person perceives his own situation. The concept of role helps to clarify the structure and to define the pattern of complex relationship within the group. Coupled with the components like role conflict, role overload, role behavior, these will conspicuously portray the co-existences and relationship to drive the desired results. This theory takes into cognizance the fact that each person is expected by his superiors in an organization to have a certain behavior trend called “role demand”. Pareek (1993) defined role as a set of functions, which an individual performs in response to expectations of the significant members of a social system, and one’s own expectations from that position or office. Rue and Byars (1992), explains role as an organized set of behavior belonging to an identifiable job. Waweru and Ngugi (2007) defines role theory as a way individuals behave, how they feel, they
ought to behave and they believe other people should respond to their actions. Quality Assurance and standards officers are required to explicitly portray certain skills above their counterpart, the teachers whenever they are out in the field carrying out their duties

1.11 Conceptual framework
This theory takes into cognizance of the fact that each person in an organization is expected by superiors, peers, subordinates and others to have certain ways called role demands.

Wever (1979) reflects that role effectiveness of a person is determined by the accuracy of understanding of the roles demanded of him and how well the behavior meets the roles, while role satisfaction depends on how closely behavior fits the person’s role desire. This view is important because it helps one to see the relationship between supervision and schools performance in national examinations.

**Role set:** According to Ivancevich and Matteson (1990) notes that people have expectations for behavior of the individual in the particular role. Every officer in the Quality Assurance Directorate is expected to set targets to be achieved within a particular duration. If one of the officers does not click then the efforts of role set is thwarted resulting into poor performance.

**Role perception:** This relates role perception as the way people think, they are supposed to act in their own roles. In Quality assurance and standards department, the Director is the overall; the perception is that any failure in the organization is apportioned to the Director. Quality assurance and standards officers play a very important role in the implementation of curriculum in schools. The competences of the standards officers greatly determine the efficiency and efficacy of curriculum delivery. Trained quality assurance and standards officers will enhance supervision in schools through better curriculum delivery, good interpretation of syllabus and use of
pedagogical skills. Sharpening their teaching skills, which will translate to improved student performance, can assist naive and less skilled teachers. Trained quality assurance and standards officers understand best school culture, climate as well good School administration. This is expected to enable best decision made by Quality Assurance and Standards Officers on whom to head which school, which school is on an upward trend or downward trend academically, and be able to come out with a diagnostic treatment of either case. This therefore calls for need to training quality assurance officers on modern supervision techniques before they are hired.
Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework showing the effect of trained Quality Assurance and Standards Officer on school performance.

- **Role of Quality Assurance Officer**
  - Supervise implementation of curriculum
  - Train teachers on pedagogical skills
  - Take stock on Quality Audit
  - Build capacity on quality development

- **Independent Variable**

- **QASOS level of training**
  - High
  - Average
  - Low

- **Extraneous variable**
  - Credible performance
  - Average delivery
  - Poor output

- **Dependent variable**
  - Better curriculum delivery
  - Good interpretation of the syllabus
  - Use of pedagogical skills

  - On job training
  - No argument skills but acknowledgement

  - Kills teacher interests
  - Average grades
  - Filling space
  - Lack sense of direction
  - Vulnerable to challenge

**Source:** Adopted from: Waweru S.N and Ngugi N.N (2002)
1.12 Operational Definitions of Central Terms

**Assessment:** This is used to mean overseeing the total Curriculum, which includes all experiences. It also refers to inspection.

**Curriculum:** All subjects taught and all the activities provided at any level of institution.

**External Standard Assessment:** Supervision of schools by Quality Assurance and standards officers.

**Role:** expected pattern of behavior of an individual organization in context of education

**School:** It is used to mean a place on which not less than ten pupils receive regular instructions.

**Supervision:** Overseeing with assistance.

**Quality Assurance:** means maintaining and disseminating acceptable standards.

**Value Added progress:** Means gauging the learning outcomes against the entry behavior of the child.

**Monitoring:** this study means regular checking of performance of a program.

**Standards:** It means, the level of performance or achievement judged against agreed basic requirements.

**Quality Audit:** judgment about quality of a school, done by Quality Assurance and standards officers after taking the stock.

**Effective supervision:** A means through which curriculum delivery is done as per the expectations.

**Head teachers:** Also referred to as principals
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction
This section reviews relevant literature on the role of Quality Assurance and Standards officers on effective supervision and school performance.

2.1 School Inspection
Immediately after independence in 1964, Professor Ominde chaired the first education commission called the Kenya Education Commission. This commission harmonized the education in the country as previously it was offered on segregation lines. This commission underscored the importance of supervision in schools. In 1970, the inspectorate division of the then ministry of education science and technology was given legal backing by the Education Act Chapter 211, where school Quality Assurance and standards officers were appointed by the minister and charged with authority to enter and inspect any school which is reasonably suspected that learning is going on there.

The colonial supervision of schools lacked qualified staff and sufficient number of QASOS to the available schools. For inspection and supervision to be effective, inspectors should make regular visits and adequate follow-up services in order to move out of the colonial inadequacies. Sifuna (1974) asserts that the work of inspectors concerns assessment and quality of standards of education being provided in schools. According to Maranga (1977), the role of inspectors in the past was perceived as those of policing teachers. Inspectors were seen as faultfinders who were mainly interested in reporting teachers to ministry of education without giving them any advice to enable them improve the teaching and learning techniques. Their visits to schools were impromptu and irregular. Such practice had adverse effects on teachers who felt mistrusted with their jobs and spied on. Current inspection trends calls for openness on the part of inspectors.
Internal and external supervision of teachers has its role in improving the quality of teaching. The unwarranted absenteeism, negligence in lesson preparation and marking of books could be a thing of the past. What remains according to Sifuna (1974) is to have a little more informed supervisors on modern methods of supervision.

According to Rono (1998), quality assurance and standards officers are prime movers in steering the establishment, improvement and maintenance of individual school standards. Therefore they are expected to be fully accountable and transparent in all activities. Wiles (1967) indicates that the basic function of quality assurance and standards officers is the supervision of the curriculum. The officers are required to visit schools and assess whether the school is functioning effectively or not. They are supposed to be examining school administration and school records, enrolment, staffing, facilities, school accounts and teachers. Rono further shows that quality assurance officers are to check on written work of students and their progress in continuous assessment test records. Mbithi (1974) identifies the overall role of quality assurance as that of controlling the quality of education at all levels throughout the country through supervision and advice to all schools.

2.2 Policy regarding Quality Assurance and Standards

Most of educational problems besetting schools today such as pupil wastage in terms of dropout and low standards of education all point to the need to improve supervision system and Quality of standard assessment. (Daily Nation, 2008) Since the establishment of the inspectorate division in the ministry of education, over thirty years ago, the inspectors have been operating through circulars and guidelines. (Handbook for inspection, 2000). Despite commendable work done in the area of in-servicing and training of inspectors, these induction courses have lacked co-
ordination to an extent that there is no comprehensive program or definitive training packages for the participants to undergo (Handbook for inspectors, 2000).

Tait (1983) defines quality Assurance as the process through which central authority, represented by inspectorate, monitors and evaluates the teaching and administration in the school. The first education commission was appointed and chaired by Professor S. H. Ominde. This commission underscored the importance of inspection in schools. In 1970, the inspectorate division of the Ministry of Education was given legal backing by the Education Act, where school Quality Assurance and Standards Officers were appointed by the Minister and charged with authority to enter and inspect any school or any place at which it is reasonably suspected that learning is being conducted. (Eshiwani, 1993).

The directorate of Quality Assurance and standards division in the Ministry of Education dealt largely with the maintenance and implementation of standards of education in Kenyan schools and colleges. It decided what should be taught and also because it is in touch with every aspect of educational development, it has sometimes been referred to as the ‘nerve centre’ of the MOE. Through the supervisory of the curriculum, the inspectorate in essence, determines the trend of education in the country at any given time. Maranga (1987) sees Quality Assurance and Standards officers of schools as playing a leading role both nationally and locally in curriculum innovation. Inspectors act as source of information and development and advice to the Ministry of education to the formulation of national education policies and objectives in the country. Kimball (1967) asserts that a basic function of Quality Assurance is in carrying on curriculum planning activities and being responsible for developing proposals for desired research demonstration and dissemination of activities. Mbithi (1976) says Quality Assurance Directorate
should be at the center to control the quality of education at all levels throughout the country through Inspection, Guidance and Advice in all schools in the country.

Quality Assurance and Standards Officers are charged with advising the government on trends obtained in learning institutions particularly in areas of access, quality gender, enrolment, wastage, curriculum evaluation and in-service training of teachers among others, (MOE, 2006). The reviewing of the teaching and learning material in collaboration with the Kenya national Examination council as well as advising on standards in education based on all round standard performance indicators in both curricular and co-curricular activities is a central involvement for quality assurance and standards officers. It requires that any quality assurance and standards officer should have competent skill background regarding inspection for him to stair teachers to teach effectively (Mbithi, 1976). The ministry of Education has placed great responsibility on Quality assurance officers, which includes carrying out panel inspection with a view to diagnose the academic performance of the institutions. Subjects based panel inspection are also organized to assist in the interpretation and implementation of the curriculum, Also Quality Assurance and Standards Officers are charged with a responsibility of” modifying” the introduction of any new subject in the school curriculum.

Sifuna (1980) contends that the work of inspectors concern assessment of standards and quality of education being provided in schools. He emphasizes that internal and external supervision of teachers has its role in improving the quality of teachings. Things like unwarranted absenteeism, negligence in lesson preparation and marking of books must be curbed. In addition, the supervision team should be a little more informed of modern methods and tone down their administrative roles to that of helper. A number abandoned their helping role. Some tend to
wear on color of a police officer that teachers often resent their presence. Maranga (1977) notes that these differences develop largely because, inspection had to adopt traditional inspectional legacies which Kenya inherited at independence. There is therefore a need to eradicate such attitudes through training where both sides appreciate each other as team players in curriculum implementation.

Maleche (1974) agrees that there are numerous teachers who in their long service have never attended these courses. One wonders how effective they are in their job. Occasionally, they are visited by that much-loathed official called the school inspector whose major role is to give guidance to practicing teachers. Unfortunately he visits schools when there is a crisis and his advice is least likely to be sympathetic to the plight of the teacher. Indeed on those occasions, he enjoys demonstrating his authority rather than acting as a counselor. He ends up being viewed as an unwelcome visitor whose professional services they would rather do without. And this merely serves to isolate the teachers from a potentially valuable source of professional help. In time, teachers who are so isolated become incompetent, apathetic and routine in their role.

Maranga (1987) observes that the inspector subjects the teachers to position of passive recipients expected to receive orders and instructions without questioning them. This behavior naturally stifles the creative spirit of those teachers dedicated to self-improvement in their teaching and learning process.

2.3 Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards

The directorate of quality assurance and standards is mandated to work in curriculum development, implementation and evaluation, Quality assurance and standards Assessment functions through the following areas (Oyaya, 2007).
• Advising the government on the current trends obtained in learning institutions in areas of access, quality, leadership, staffing, governance, health care, career guidance, curriculum evaluation, pre-service training of teachers, teacher proficiency and institutional plans and performance.

• Reviewing the teaching and learning materials in collaboration with Kenya institute of education and publishers (both formative and summative)

• Liaising with Kenya institute of education in quality development service with the design of in–service training programs whenever the curriculum is revised

• Advising stakeholders on education matters pertaining to curriculum delivery, assessment and provision of resources.

With the changes in the education system, there are concerns about the Standards of curriculum and assessment made to award qualification in the system. What has been gained and lost in the country has come to think about knowledge, its transmission by educators and acquisition by learners? How valid and workable are the instruments used to enable individuals to assemble their own qualifications and their own building block of knowledge. Quality of knowledge is about enhancement of cognitive skills through the schooling experience. In other words, good schooling should be about the development of highest levels of cognitive skills. In 2005 EFA Global monitoring report demonstrated a strong link between the developments of cognitive skills as measured by cognitive tests scores and educational quality (UNESCO, 2004). In the UNESCO report, little doubt is cast over the use of cognitive skills as a key measure for measuring quality in education, rather than the functionality of schooling.

According to Oyaya (2007) Monitoring and advising on standards in education and training is based on all round standard performance indicators in both curricular and co-curricular activities.
The core values of directorate of quality assurance and standards are derived from the ministry of education charter, which underscores the following as important segments for quality assurance officers.

- Impartial judgment where by an officer is required to demonstrate secure judgment which are reliable, valid, comprehensive, prognostic and corporate.
- Respect for value added progress by examining entry behavior and assessing the value added and progress made on individual learner and institutions
- Integrity through upholding transparency and accountability through objective assurance and standard assessment and reporting
- Professionalism through subject mastery and skill upgrading of teachers through in-servicing and conducting teacher proficiency courses
- Quality assurance by establishing, developing and monitoring educational and training standards through quality audit and control and giving feedback to stakeholders.
- Good rapport by using collegial approach and respect of individual differences, available resources and regional disparities

2.4 Quality Assurance and Standards Officer

The mission of the department of Quality Assurance and standards is to establish, maintain and improve educational standards in the country (Wasanga, 2004). This department is mandated to co-ordinate, follow-up and advise on curriculum delivery in schools.

Wasanga (2004) maintains that Quality assurance officers should have good academic qualification, specialized skills and well established staff development programs. He contends that the department of Quality Assurance is hampered due to inadequacies in skills. This is
mainly caused by lack of a specific policy on recruitment and deployment of Quality assurance and standards officers. Such a policy should take into account an officer academic background and experience and in the education sector.

Bannaars, (1994) view the purpose of a Quality and standard officer’s as one of being able to have an overview of the quality of education based on agreed and all round performance indicators. This trained officer is able to report back in full to the educational institution, so that it can effectively improve the standards that are being offered to their pupils. As an assessor, feedback to observed teachers is important. The objective of the feedback is to improve teacher effectiveness. The observed teacher is able to have the perceptions of quality of the lessons and response of the students (Oyaya 2007).

The criterion used for the selection of inspectors’ previously was based on the identification of successful head teachers who excelled in their administration as well as in their subject area. Currently, the recruitment of QASOS is a prerogative of the public service commission. Those who go through the interviews are appointed and deployed as QASOS of various calibres. This is devoid of their passed records. Maranga (1987) sees quality Assurance and standards officers as playing a leading role both nationally and locally in curriculum innovation. He goes on to say that QASO act as a source of information and development and advice to the ministry of education on formulation of national education policies and objectives.

To enhance quality inspection and supervision, both the quality assurance and standards officer and the head teacher are expected to have a very good grasp of all curricular subjects, how best these should be delivered to the students and the optimum use of resources that can achieve
effective teaching and learning. Kimball (1967) concurs that the central role of Quality assurance and standards is to control the quality of education at all levels. Rono (1998) hinted that it is regrettable that many quality assurance and standards officers respond as fire brigade. He noted that the method of appointing quality assurance officers in education was weak. Training of quality assurance and standards officers in relevant knowledge, skills, ideas and attitudes is necessary for the adequate performance of their duties.

Macharia (2008) contends that quality assurance and standards officers should possess a repository of pedagogical skills, which could enable him, organize upgrading workshops for trainees and have capability and exposure to new approaches in Education. The whole aim is to improve performance and organization standards. According to UNESCO Global monitoring report (2004) attempts should be made in order to improve on the quality of education by traditionally embodying accountability measures where an outside body intervenes in the school or classroom area. Examples of these external interventions include school inspection.

2.5 Effectiveness of School supervision and Performance of Schools in Nakuru District

Despite the government's effort in strengthening quality assurance directorate by providing vehicles and motorbikes, there is an increasing concern on efficiency and effectiveness of quality assurance officers by various stakeholders. Parents because of the numerous school strikes have expressed major concerns, mismanagement of schools and poor performance in national examinations. (Koech, 2009)

Most parents cite quality of schools as their main reason for transferring their children from one school to another. They indicate that this behavior is caused by the differentiated demand of perception of low quality in state system associated with increased class sizes.
Wiles (1999) explains that a basic function of quality assurance and standards officer is in carrying on curriculum planning and also being responsible for developing proposals for desired research demonstration and dissemination. Rono (1998) emphasizes that quality assurance and standards officer are seen as fire brigade, who have very little to advise on curriculum matter. According to Maranga (1977) this difference develops largely because inspection had to adopt traditional legacies, which Kenya inherited at independence. There is therefore a need to eradicate such attitude through training where both sides appreciate each other as team players in curriculum implementation (Maleche, 1974).

Nakuru district over the last three years has performed poorly in its Kenya certificate of examination having obtained a mean of 5.17 in 2008 results out of a maximum of 12 points to be scored (DEO Nakuru, 2009). This performance is certainly not the best for the district bearing in mind that the District is geographically placed in agriculturally potential area with ample supply of other basic learning facilities (Nakuru District development plan, 2007). The table below gives a summary of the District performance in KCSE examinations for the last six years and reflects that the performance has not improved over the same period.
Table 2.1: Nakuru Mean Standard Score for the Last Six Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean standard score (M.S.S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: DEO Nakuru District (2009)*

It is evident that the District Mean Standard scores for the last six years have not improved significantly. In the last three years the recorded performance depicts a decline with an insignificant improvement in 2008. The district has an advantage of having enough teachers in most subjects offered in the schools. Therefore this study will seek to find out if supervisory services are not adequate to give a boost for better performance.

2.6 Summary

From the summary reviewed, the existing studies have shown that increasing access to quality secondary education has become a challenge to both the Ministry of Education and the school administration. Majority of students receive low cognitive levels of education through insufficiently-supervised teachers. Good school supervision is regarded as a jumping point for all schools as they pursue individual national goals. The classroom should be the target of intervention and building opportunities for teachers to learn to better their teaching methodologies. The reviewed literature has also established that no study has so far been carried out to determine the effectiveness of Quality Assurance and Standards officers on performance of schools. This study will therefore try to examine the effects of good school supervision on examination performance in Nakuru District and the results of the study will enable the Ministry
to intensify programs aimed at sharpening the skills of Quality Assurance and standards officers so that they could provide effective school supervision.

3.1 Research Design

The study involved a descriptive survey research design to collect data on the effectiveness of standards officers in effective school supervision. The data was collected through a detailed description of existing practices, with the aid of questionnaires and interviews in the school situation.

3.2 Target Population

The population of the study comprised head teachers, committee members, and standards officers from 46 secondary schools in the district. The researcher used a systematic random sampling procedure to select the schools. According to Nishimura and Pals (1995), a systematic sampling strategy due to various limitations that may not allow for a whole population to be surveyed. A total population of 46 secondary schools was selected. 9 head teachers were selected using proportional stratified sampling technique, to form a representative population for this study. This sample is 20% of the accessible population from which the
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction
This chapter deals with the research methodologies that were used to carry out the study. This includes research designs, population sample, sample size and sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis procedures.

3.1 Research Design
The researcher adopted a descriptive survey research design to investigate the role of Quality Assurance and standards officers in effective school supervision and performance. This design enabled the researcher to collect information, opinions and attitudes of different groups targeted. This design was also considered appropriate for non-experimental studies because it provides a detailed description of existing phenomena, with the intent of employing data to justify the current situation.

3.2 Target Population
The population of the study comprised head teachers, teachers and quality assurance and standards officers from Nakuru District. The District had a population of 46 head teachers, 818, teachers, 5 Quality assurance and standards officers and 16,983 students (Nakuru statistics Report, 2007).

3.3 Sample Size and Sampling Procedures
The study comprised sampled schools from the 46 secondary schools in the district. Simple random sampling procedure was used to select the schools for the study. According to Kathuri and Pals (1993), a researcher selects samples due to various limitations that may not allow for a whole population to be studied. From population of 46 secondary schools head teachers, 9 head teachers were be selected using proportional stratified sampling technique to get a representative population for this study. This sample is 20 % of the accessible population from which it’s
possible to make a generalization of the entire population. A representative sample of 10% of the teachers was selected to determine the sample size. Thus, 82 teachers were sampled from a population of 818 teachers. 5 Quality Assurance and Standards Officers representing 100 percent sampled were picked using purposive sampling as this was the only number of officers available for the study.

3.4 Instrumentation

Three instruments were used to collect data to meet the objectives of this study. The first instrument was that for the Quality Assurance and Standard officers interview schedule (QASOIS (see appendix A). This was used to elicit the required information on the role of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers on supervision and schools performance. The second instrument was Head Teacher Questionnaire (HTQ) (See Appendix II) that was used to establish the role of head teachers in supplementing quality assurance and standards officers. The final instrument was Secondary School Teacher Questionnaire (SSTQ) (see appendix III). This was used to establish the effectiveness of quality assurance and standards officers' advisory or supervisory role in improving teacher quality in curriculum delivery. The instruments were developed with the assistance from the supervisors and experts from the department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies at Kenyatta University.

3.5 Piloting

Two schools were used for piloting in Nakuru municipality. The purpose of the piloting was to determine the validity and reliability of the instruments.

3.5.1 Validity of research instruments

Two experts from the department of curriculum and instructions department of Egerton University, one from the department of mathematics department university of Kenyatta assisted
in validating the instruments. The piloting involved one secondary school in Nakuru district with 20 teachers randomly selected.

3.5.2 Reliability of the Research instruments
The formula for Cronbach’s co-efficient alpha was used to estimate the reliability co-efficient of the QASOI’s, HTQ, and TQ. Cronbach co-efficient Alpha Formula was appropriate because the items in the instrument consisted of range scores (Thorndike, 1994). The formula was given as

\[ K = (\chi + a)^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} \chi^k a^{n-k} \]

Where;  
- \( k \) -- sample size  
- \( a \) -- Coefficient of variation  
- \( \chi \) -- error of margin  
- \( a \) -- population size

3.6 Data collection procedures
The researcher was granted by the Ministry of Education permission before conducting the research. All schools in the sample were visited in advance to make arrangement on when to administer the questionnaire. The data collection took six weeks. Before starting to collect data, the researcher sought a letter of introduction from the university. The head teachers of the schools under study were visited and notified in advance. The respondents were very cooperative and thus making the data collection exercise very successful. The data was collected in readiness for analysis.
3.7 Data analysis

Data was collected utilizing both qualitative and quantitative approaches in data collection. The quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations using the SPSS software package. The qualitative data was analyzed thematically by arranging them according to research questions and objectives. Thereafter inferences and conclusions were drawn to highlight the findings.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND PRESENTATION

4.0 Introduction
The purpose of this study was to determine the role of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers in school supervision towards improved performance in national examinations in Nakuru district. This chapter presents results of the study according to the responses obtained from Quality Assurance and Standards officers, Head teachers/principals of secondary schools and the teachers of the respective secondary schools.

The data analyzed was focusing on the following areas:

a) Characteristics of the respondents

b) Influence of School Administration on Supervision Work

c) Impact of School Supervision on School performance

d) Factors affecting the quality of schools standards assessment.

4.1 Characteristics of Respondents
This section discusses specific characteristics of the respondents comprising gender, academic and professional attainment, years of experience and the induction courses attended.

4.1.1 Gender Characteristics
The study utilized three categories of respondents, that is, head teachers and teachers from nine schools and Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QASOs) from Nakuru District Education Office. Table 4.1 presents the number and gender distribution of the respondents. Majority of the teacher respondents were females at 63.4 percent as compared to the males at 36.6 percent. The large number of female teachers is attributed to the Teachers Service Commission Policy guidelines of encouraging couples staying together due to the rampant spread of HIV and AIDS (TSC, 2007). Hence, Nakuru being an urban district has many of the female teachers joining
their spouses working mostly in the public service. However, males constituted the majority among head teachers/principals and QASOs at 77.8 percent and 80.0 percent respectively.

**Table 4.1**: Number and Gender distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Number (N)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Teachers/principals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance and Standards Officers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 *Academic and Professional Achievements*

The respondents’ academic and professional attainment is presented in Table 4.2. The study shows that majority of the head teachers, teachers and QASOs have attained university level of education as they constitute 88.9 percent, 88.9 percent and 90.0 percent respectively. In terms of professional qualifications the data presented indicates 11.1 percent of head teachers and 2.6 percent of the teachers had attained a Masters in Education. Majority of the respondents had Bachelors in Education, that is, 77.8 percent of the Head teachers, 65.8 percent of the Teachers and 70.0 percent of the QASOs. The category of others comprises respondents who have other qualifications outside education such as Bachelor of Arts Degree and Masters of Arts among others. These are not considered professional degrees unless supported by a post graduate diploma in education.

This information reflects that the QASOs, head teachers and teachers meet the minimum qualification as stated in the education policy. It is worth noting that for the officers who do not meet the minimum requirements of diploma they are allowed to undertake a Teachers...
proficiency course and promoted from as low as P1 level to approved graduate teachers IV, III, II and I.

Table 4.2: Proportion of Respondents by Academic and Professional Achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Level</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O' Level/KCSE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters in Education</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors of Education</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGDE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.3 Years of Experience

The analysis presented in Table 4.3 indicates the number of years of experience for the head teachers and teachers. The data depicts that majority of the teachers have over 9 years of class teaching experience at 58.3 percent while 66.3 percent of the head teachers have between 4 to 9 years of experience in headship. The long period of experience of teachers reflects the outcome of Government employment freezing of teachers, only carried out in cases of replacement due to natural attrition.
Table 4.3: Number of years of experience of the Head teachers and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 3 years</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 years</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9 years</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 9 years</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.4 Attendance of Induction Courses

Capacity building is one of the components in the Kenya Education Sector Wide Support Programme (KESSP) that is being coordinated by the Kenya Education Staff Institute (KESI). Emphasis has been laid to train head teachers and teachers on school management and teaching.

The Head teachers and teachers were asked if they had ever attended induction courses as presented in Table 4.4. The data shows that 88.9 percent of Head teachers and 68.1 percent of teachers did attend induction courses in the last 3 years. The proportion of 31.9 percent of teachers not having attended induction course is significant.

Table 4.4: Ever attended induction Course in the last three years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If attended Induction Course</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that most of the induction courses were organized by the Ministry of Education (35.2 percent) followed by publishers (14.1 percent) and SMASSE (12.7 percent) as illustrated in Figure 4.1. The induction courses offered, range from pedagogical skills, content upgrading and financial management among others.
4.2 Influence of School Administration on Supervision Work

This section describes the actions taken by the head teacher as a requirement of his or her role in assessment of learning and teaching outcomes at school level. The policy of inspection as stipulated in the inspectorate manual requires that the Head teacher undertakes supervision of curriculum implementation at school. The head teacher can also delegate the responsibilities to the deputy head teacher. Effective supervision is possible with a leader that has good qualities with adequate exposure and experience.

4.2.1 School level Inspection

Information on number of times the head teacher had been inspected is presented in Table 4.5. The analysis show that 33.3 percent of the head teachers had been inspected twice while 22.2 percent been inspected nine times.
Table 4.5: Number of Times the Head teacher had been inspected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Inspection</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrice (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four (4) times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine (9) times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analysis reveals that 55.6 percent of the inspections were routine, 22.2 percent district/advisory inspections while 11.1 percent were national as shown in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Type of Inspection Visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Inspection</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District/advisory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel/Audit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine inspection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Teaching Work load

Majority of the head teachers (55.6 percent) had a lower teaching workload than the teachers as compared to 44.4 percent reporting to have equal workload as shown in Table 4.7 and figure 4.2. This is in tandem with the workload policy where the head teachers have a lower workload in order to give the more time to handle administrative work. This is normally reflected in the curriculum based establishment where a complete guide of teaching is categorized. That is workload as per categories of institutions, national, provincial or district. In the schools where the work load for the head teacher and the teacher is the same depicts the acute shortage of teachers with experiences. Head teacher’s teaching load compared with other staff is further reflected in figure 4.2 below.
Table 4.7: Head teachers teaching load compared with other staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: Head teachers teaching load compared with other staff

4.2.3 Internal Supervision

The Ministry of Education recommends weekly supervision of the professional documents for teaching and learning to enhance delivery of the curriculum. It is therefore important that all the head teachers conducted internal supervision in their schools. The study sought further to find out the frequency of internal supervisions as illustrated in Table 4.8. A total of 55.6 percent of the head teachers reported to be undertaking weekly supervision followed by fortnightly supervision, 33.3 percent. Only 11.1 percent stated to have had internal supervision on annual basis.
### Table 3.8: Frequency of checking teachers’ professional documents by Head teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of checking documents</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.4 External Supervision Requests

According to the Education Act Cap 211, inspectors can visit any school at any time with or without notice. Table 4.9 presents the data on the requested external supervision in the last three years. The results reveal that 44.4 percent of the head teachers had requested for external supervision. However, due to limited number of QASOs there is a possibility that not all the requests for external supervision where fulfilled.

#### Table 4.9: Head teachers who requested for external supervision in the last three years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.5 Head Teachers Perception of External Supervisors

Information was sought from the head teachers on how they viewed the external supervisors. The results shown in Table 4.10 indicate that 88.9 percent of the teachers positively viewed the external supervisors as compared to the 11.1 percent. Over the years, the perception of QASOs has changed with the Head teachers recognizing their role in supervision.
Table 4.10: Head teachers view of supervisors and QASOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positively</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked further to provide reasons for their perception of the external supervisors. The data from Table 4.11 reveals that 22.2 percent reported that they gave professional advice, 11.1 percent, advice teachers on new trends of teaching and another 11.1 percent reported that they contributed to teachers’ professional development.

Table 4.11: Reasons given by the Head Teachers who viewed positively the external supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice teachers on the new trends in teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give professional advice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help them do their work diligently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is advisory and eye opener</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the school meet its education objectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to teachers professional development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.6 Status of External Supervisors Report Submissions

External supervision reports are normally prepared and shared with the head teachers to enable them address the gaps identified and implement effective supervision mechanism at school level.

In this regard, Table 4.12 shows that 88.9 percent of the head teachers did receive reports from the external supervisors.
Table 4.12: Ever received processed supervision reports after external supervision visits by QASOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The head teachers were also asked if there were any follow up supervision conducted as illustrated in Table 4.13. The data reveals that only 33.3 percent of the head teachers had external supervision follow up visits. In the absence of feedback reports and follow up visits there is a likelihood of the teachers repeating the same mistakes and hence not taking supervision seriously, since it is not adding any value.

Table 4.13: QASOs making follow up supervision visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Impact of School Supervision on School performance

This section describes the supervision activities with the teachers.

4.3.1 Frequency of teachers supervision

The teachers were asked on the frequency of supervision during their teaching lessons as presented in Figure 4.3. The analysis indicates that 33.8% of the teachers reported to have been assessed between 3 to 5 times while 24.6% of the teachers reported 1-2 times and 6-9 times.
Figure 4.3: Frequency of supervision of Teachers in general

The teachers were further asked if the supervision was by the head teacher/head of department as illustrated in Table 4.14. The results show that 71.2% of the teachers reported to have been supervised by the head teacher and/or head of department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Stated</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=82

In terms of frequency of supervision, 55.6 percent of the teachers reported to have been supervised 3 times and 11.1 percent once as shown in Table 4.15.
Table 4.15: Frequency of supervision by Head teacher/Head of Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of supervision</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice(2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrice(3)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=82

4.3.2 Requests for external supervision

Information on head teachers request for external supervision was sought from the teacher. Analysis of table 4.16 indicates that 55.2 percent of the teachers reported that head teachers did request for external supervision. However, a large proportion (25.9 percent) reported that they didn’t know.

Table 4.16: Head Teacher requesting for external supervision as stated by Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3 Teachers perception of external supervisors

The results in Table 4.17 show that nearly all teachers (92.9 percent) regard external supervisors positively in their work. However, the 7.1 percent who view external supervisors negatively is a significant proportion that requires attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positively</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatively</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.4 Teachers supervision report discussion with head teachers

The teachers were further asked if they ever discussed supervision reports with the head teachers. Analysis in Table 4.18 indicates that 86.4 percent of the teachers reported that that they did discuss. Only 13.6 percent of the teachers reported that they had never discussed the reports with the head teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stated</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=82

4.4 Factors Affecting the Quality of School Standard Assessment

4.4.1 Number and Distances to Schools

The education policy requires that the QASOs undertake regular visits to schools within a year to ensure that there is quality provision of education. However, this at times depends on the work plan and the resources available. The study sought to know the schools and distances covered by
the QASOs in their areas of jurisdiction. Analysis of Table 4.19 reveals that in Nakuru district on average, the QASOs are responsible for 145 schools with the furthest being 100 kilometers away. Though the study relied on the 46 secondary school in Nakuru district, the QASOs are also responsible to visit any other institutions of learning such as pre-primary, primary and teacher colleges among others.

Table 4.19: Number of education institutions covered by QASOs and distance to furthest schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QASO</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>Distance of furthest school from office (Km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td><strong>145.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are various types of quality assurance assessment levels undertaken in the Kenyan education system. The QASOs were asked to state the types of supervision during quality assurance activities. Table 4.20 shows that all the QASOs (100 percent) mentioned panel supervision followed subject teacher based observation at 80 percent and school registration, 60 percent. The least mentioned type of supervision as reported by 20 percent of the QASOs was curriculum, advisory, institutional and follow up.
Table 4.20: Types of Supervision stated by QASO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision Type</th>
<th>Supervision stated (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel supervision</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject teacher based observation</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block assessment</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration supervision</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass supervision</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum supervision</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional supervision</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory supervision</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up supervision</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=5

4.4.2 Supervision of Coordination

The QASOs were asked to respond to the issue of who coordinates supervision within the districts. Table 4.21 shows that 80.0 percent reported that at times it were the DEO with delegation to the DQASO and 20.0 percent, said the DQASO. This implied that in the overall the DEO is also responsible in ensuring that the school supervision takes place.

Table 4.21: Responsible person on coordination of supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQASO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3 In-service training on supervision

Information on whether the QASOs underwent in-service was sought as represented in Table 4.22. The responses reflect a conflict, meaning that not all QASOs were trained on the job.

Table 4.22: Received in-service training on supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4 Participation in Panel inspection

There are several types of supervision mechanism in the assessment of education institutions that quality assurance and standards officers can use. Information of types of supervision was sought and is illustrated in Table 4.23. Panel supervision was mentioned by all the respondents followed by subject teacher based observation at 80 percent and registration, 60 percent.

Table 4.23 Type of supervision participated by the QASO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision Type</th>
<th>Supervision participated (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel supervision</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject teacher based observation</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block assessment</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration supervision</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass supervision</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum supervision</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional supervision</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory supervision</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up supervision</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=5
4.4.5 Problems encountered during supervision

In order to ensure delivery of the education curriculum, it is critical that supervisory activities are supported by the Ministry of Education. The Sessional paper No 1 of 2005 on education training framework identifies that, besides increasing access, emphasis was to be laid in ensuring quality. It is in this perspective that the revamping of the quality assurance department was enforced and resources enhanced.

The data presented in Table 4.24 represents the problems encountered by the QASOs during the supervision exercise. It can be seen that 80 percent of the respondents reported lack of transport facilitation as one of the problems followed by delayed in action on recommendation by the head teacher/Ministry at 60 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stated Problems</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transport facilitation</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete information from Head teachers</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay in action on recommendations by Head teacher/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distortion of information by head teachers</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate funds</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Supportive District Education Officer</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=5

4.4.6 Head Teachers Requests for inspection

It is the responsibility of the head teachers to make sure that there is effective teaching and learning is taking place in the school. Hence, the Ministry of Education encourages the teachers
to seek for inspection so that they can ascertain that all is going on well. However, results illustrated in figure 4.4 indicate that only 20 percent of the QASOs reported to know of cases of head teachers requesting for supervision to be carried out in their schools.

Figure 4.4: Frequency of head teachers requesting for inspection as stated by QASOs

4.4.7 Role of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers
The responsibilities of quality assurance and officers are to ensure that the students are imparted with skills that will enhance learning outcomes and hence delivery of quality education. The respondents mentioned the roles of QASOs as illustrated in Table 4.25. Majority (80 percent) reported that the QASOs role is advisory followed by 40 percent reporting that they ensure provision of quality education. Other roles of QASOs mentioned were assessment, monitoring and evaluation and data collection, analysis and interpretation.
Table 4.25: QASOs Response on their Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stated Role QASOs play</th>
<th>Stated Roles(Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring provision of quality education</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection, analysis and interpretation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=5

4.4.8 Relationship between Teachers and QASOs

A good working relationship among the teachers and QASOs provides an enabling environment for effectively managing school programmes. The QASOs will succeed where the teachers have the positive thinking of the kind of support they can get. Analysis of Figure 4.5 shows that 80.0 percent of the QASOs reported to have excellent relationship with teachers and 20.0 percent reported a pleasant relationship.

Figure 4.5: Relationship between QASOs and colleague teachers
4.4.9 Relationship between district KCSE Performance and Supervisory Role of Quality Assurance and Standards

The data presented in Table 4.26 shows the performance of KCSE examination in Nakuru district for the years 1999 to 2008. Before 2004, when the schools were being supervised by inspectors, the data indicates that national KCSE examination mean score in Nakuru district was as low as 4.47 in 1999 rising to 5.18 in 2003. This performance was low though showing steady upward trend, was witnessed during the period when supervision was being carried out by the inspectors. In 2004, the Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards was established, giving the officers a new dimension from inspectors into quality assurance and standards officers. This completely changed their attitude from harassing of teachers to colleague relationship, thus enhancing professionalism. The outcome of the association saw improvement in performance from a mean score of 5.26 in 2004 to 5.29 in 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean standard score (M.S.S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DEO Nakuru District (2009)
Though there has been improvement in performance with the district attaining a mean score of above 5.0, Figure 4.6 illustrates mixed performance between 2006 and 2008.

**Figure 4.6:** Trends in KCSE Performance in Nakuru Districts secondary schools, 1999-2008

The data in Figure 4.7 reflects further that, where the Head Teacher workload is lower the KCSE mean score is higher as compared to where the Head Teacher workload is equal to that of the teachers. This implies that where the Head teacher has equal load has no time for supervision while teaching a lower load creates more time for making spot supervision.

**Figure 4.7:** Head Teachers Teaching load and school performance in KCSE, 2003-2009
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction
This chapter presents the summary of the research findings. It also provides the conclusions and recommendations for further research.

5.1 Summary of the findings
The following are the main findings of the research study:

- Majority of the QASOs (90.0 percent) had attained university academic and professional qualification as compared to 88.9 percent of the Head teachers and Teachers.

- About four fifths (80 percent) of the QASOs had attended in-service training on supervision.

- In relation to factors affecting quality assurance and standards, the results reveal that the QASOs are faced with several challenges, such as:
  - Lack of transport facilitation (80 percent)
  - Delay by Head teachers and Ministry in taking action on recommendations provided (60 percent).
  - Incomplete submission of required information from Head teachers during supervision (40 percent).
  - On average, they are assigned 145 schools to be attended to in a year hence making the tasks difficult to undertake follow ups.
  - Long distances to travel to the schools during supervision (average 100 kilometers)
• The relationship between the QASOs, teachers and head teachers was noted to be quite good as stated by QASOs (pleasant, 80 percent), Teachers (positively, 92.5 percent) and Head teachers (positively, 88.9 percent).

• The study did indicate that 88.9 percent of the external supervision reports were received by the head teachers. It is also noted that about a third of the head teachers stated that the QASOs made a follow up.

• Most teachers reported frequency of visits of between 1-2 times (24.6 percent), 3-5 times (33.8 percent) and 6-9 times (24.6 percent). However, it is worth noting that 9.2 percent reported not to have been visited at all.

• About 71.2 percent of the teachers reported that they were supervised by the head teacher or head of department. The proportion not supervised by the head teacher/head of department was significant (28.8 percent).

• Nakuru district KCSE mean standard score improved from 4.47 in 1999 to 5.18 in 2003, though performing poor, the results indicate steady progress. The conversion of inspectorate to quality assurance and standards officers reflected improvement in performance and improved attitude towards teachers.

• Schools with Head Teachers Teaching lower load perform better as compared to schools where Head teachers have equal teaching load.
5.2 Conclusion
This section summarizes the study findings in relation to effectiveness of the quality assurance and standards officers in school supervision and performance.

5.2.1 Training and Experience
The training level and experience of the QASOs have a direct impact on their ability to effectively undertake quality and assurance assessment. This is in tandem with the level of training of the teachers and the headteachers towards meeting their teaching responsibilities. The results show that the QASOs have the necessary training and experience that matches with the role and supervisory expectations for the teachers and head teachers though the duration may not be sufficient.

5.2.2 Quality of school standards assessment
The quality of school standards assessment is impacted by various factors that include; workload, coordination, facilitation, accountability, type and level of assessment among others. The QASOs are under the direct supervision of the DEOs who are required to provide the necessary support, hence the DEO becomes a critical facilitator for an effective quality school assessment, being the Authority to incur Expenditure (AIE) holder. Also, at school level, the head teacher has a dual responsibility of teaching and ensuring quality of education provision. It is therefore important that after the supervisory visits follow up mechanism must be integrated in the process from either internally or externally.

5.2.3 Relationship, roles and policies in Quality assurance and standards supervision
The effective implementation of a quality assurance and standards assessment requires that all the actors understand their roles and the outcome of their supervision. Over the years, the role of QASOs was seen as inspectors whose work was to look for mistakes and recommend disciplinary action. This led to change of the designation name from inspectors to quality
assurance and standards officers. The study shows that the image has indeed changed and the relationship between QASOs and teachers is positive.

5.2.4 Effectiveness of QASOs in Assessment reports and school performance
It is a requirement that all supervisory visits should have reports presented and shared with the aim of improving teaching and learning and eventually the school examination performance. The positive perception of QASOs was as a result of the benefits that included; professional advice, imparting of skills in new teaching trends, making a school achieve its learning objectives and contribution to teacher development among others. It was also noted that the QASOs role ranges from advisory, assessment, data collection, analysis and interpretation and monitoring and evaluation among others. These aspects when well engaged, contribute enormously to the improvement of the learning outcomes at school level.

5.2.5 Relationship between secondary schools performance and QASOs supervision
The role of quality assurance and standards is to ensure effective curriculum implementation with the outcome being improved performance in both formative and summative evaluation. The interaction and attitude between the teachers and the QASOs has immensely improved. The outcome is reflected in the steady rise in KCSE mean scores for Nakuru district. It also evident that the Head Teachers play a significant role in supervising teachers especially when they have less teaching work load, hence increased supervisory responsibilities, leading to improved performance in KCSE. Though the QASOs started very well with an upward trend in KCSE mean score in 2004 and 2005, however, the impact is unpredictable with fluctuations of the mean score between 2006 and 2008. This can be attributed to increased workload, bottlenecks such as transportation and their inability to provide immediate feedback. These factors are detrimental to
the schools performance in the national examinations, since there is no value from the supervision visits.

5.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations emerging from the research findings need to be put in place to the QASOs effective in their role in quality assurance and standards schools assessment:

- The Government should increase the number of QASOs to effectively participate in the schools standards assessment so as to reduce the number of schools and distance covered. This will make the QASOs concentrate and avoid generalized fallacies with unspecified complaints.

- The Government should provide adequate resources to the districts that will allow more frequent supervision visits, increased in-service training and allow for sharing of experiences in quality assurance assessment. Instead of the usual 2 weeks induction courses, they should be trained for at least one month coupled with constant evaluation by the Director Quality Assurance and Standards.

- The head teacher and departmental heads should play a key role in implementing internal quality assurance through development of appropriate guidelines that should be followed.

- The Directorate of Quality Assurance and Standards should develop appropriate guidelines and instruments to facilitate a common platform for supervisory reports to hasten actions on recommendations at all levels.

5.4 Areas for Further Research

The study was carried out in Nakuru District only. More research can be carried to evaluate the effectiveness of quality assurance and standards officers from the national level to the district level so as to enhance the findings for policy direction. Research should be carried in other parts
of the country to determine the influence of schools QASOs in not only national performance but also school level assessment. The data gathered should be adequate and generalizable to determine national impact.
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APPENDIX I
QUALITY ASSURANCE AND STANDARDS OFFICER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (QASOIS)

This information you give will only be used for the purpose of this study, the information will be treated as confidential. Thank you in advance.

SECTION A GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of officer ..............................................................

2. Designation ..................................................................

3. Sex .............................................................................

4. District ...........................................................................

5. Division ........................................................................

SECTION B; QUALITY ASSURANCE COMPETENCES

What is your highest academic achievement? .........................................................

What is your professional qualification? .................................................................

3. How long have you served as Quality Assurance and standards officer
...............................................................................................................
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SECTION C: FACTORS AFFECTING THE QUALITY OF SCHOOL STANDARD ASSESSMENT

1. Please enlighten me on the various types of school supervision.

2. How many schools do you have in your District?

3. How far is the furthest school from your office?

4. Who co-ordinates supervision?

5. How often do you supervise schools as a panel?

6. What problems do you encounter in the process of conducting supervision?

7. Do the teachers request for supervision?

8. What role do QASOS play?
9 How do you relate with your colleague teachers?

10 Did you receive pre-serves training as a supervisor?

11 How often do you undergo in service training?

12 How do teachers views QASOS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K.G.S.B.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.P.E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other specify:

Education qualification:

BED |  |

Diploma |  |

PL |  |

Others specify:

How long have you served as a teacher:

Have you attended an induction course within the last three years:
APPENDIX II
HEADTEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (HTQ)

This information you give will be treated as confidential and will only be used in this study. Kindly respond to the items by placing a tick to what is applicable to you and fill in the blank spaces. The questionnaire is divided in section A, B & C. Thank you in advance.

SECTION A GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of the school

Your sex
Male [ ]
Female [ ]

What is your highest academic achievement
University
‘A’ level
‘O’ level
K.C.S.E.
C.P.E.

Other, specify

What is your professional qualification
B.ED [ ]
Diploma [ ]
P1 [ ]

Others specify

How long have you served as a Head teacher

Have you attended an induction course in the last three years
SECTIOIN B; INFLUENCE OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION ON SUPERVISION WORK

How often have you inspected? – please indicate number of times

What type of supervision was it?

How is your teaching load in comparison to the members of your staff?
Equal [ ]
Higher [ ]
Heavier [ ]

Do you ever conduct internal supervision?
Yes [ ]
No [ ]

How often do you check the teachers’ professional documents?
Daily [ ]
Weekly [ ]
Fortnightly [ ]
Yearly [ ]
Have you ever requested for external supervision for the last three year

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

How do you view supervisors and QASOS

Positively [ ]

Negatively [ ]

Why

Do you ever receive processed supervision reports after supervision visit

Do QASOS make follow-up supervision yes/No If Yes specify

(b) O level

c) CSE

d) IGCSE

e) Others

Specify
APPENDIX III
SECONDARY SCHOOLS TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (SSTQ)

This information you give will be treated as confidential and will only be used for this study.

Kindly respond to the items by placing a tick to what is applicable to you and fill the blank spaces. The Questionnaire is divided into section A, B, & C. Thank you in advance.

SECTION A GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of the school

2. Your sex
   Male [ ]
   Female [ ]

3. What is your academic achievement?
   (a) University [ ]
   (b) O’ level [ ]
   (c) K.C.S.E [ ]
   (d) C.P.E [ ]
   (e) Others [ ]

Specify:______________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
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4 What is your professional qualification?

(b) Bachelors of Education

(b) Diploma

(c) PI

(d) Others specify

5. How long have you served as a class teacher?

6. Other than teaching, do you have any other responsibilities in school

7. Have you attended an induction course in the last three years?

Yes

No
SECTION B IMPACT OF SCHOOL SUPERVISION ON SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

1. How often have you been supervised – please indicate number of times?

2. What type of supervision was it?

3. Have you been supervised by your Head teacher or head of department?

4. If yes, how often?

5. Do your Head teacher request for external supervision?

6. How do you view supervision and QASOS?
   (a) Positively
   (b) Negatively
Why?


7. Do you discuss supervision report with your Head teacher? If yes, give more details
