



A University of Sussex EdD thesis

Available online via Sussex Research Online:

<http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by copyright which belongs to the author.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Please visit Sussex Research Online for more information and further details

**POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION IN A GHANAIAN PUBLIC
UNIVERSITY**

CHRISTOPHER YARTEY AKWAA-MENSAH

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

JUNE, 2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My supervisor, Prof. Valerie Hey provided invaluable support to me in the course of this research. She took pains to read through several drafts and offered insightful comments that helped to shape the development of my thinking and theorisation.

I am grateful to staff of the Department of Education, who were involved in the International Education Doctorate Programme. They offered me immeasurable support that was instrumental in the course of the thesis's research and the construction of the text.

I am indebted to the staff of UEW who participated in this research. I am grateful to the management team who understood why I have to take some time off my schedule to invest in further education, and ultimately in the production of this thesis.

DEDICATION

My family and staff of UEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vii
SUMMARY	viii
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Context of the Study	5
1.2.1 The University of Education, Winneba	6
1.3 Scope of the Study	8
1.4 Study Rationale	9
1.5 Previous Studies that have addressed the Problem.....	10
1.5.1 Historical Background.....	12
1.5.2 Student and Staff Population.....	14
1.5.3 Study Objectives and Research Questions.....	15
1.6 Structure of the thesis	16
CHAPTER TWO.....	17
LITERATURE REVIEW	17
2.1 Introduction.....	17
2.2 Nature and Scope of Policy	17
2.3 The Lifecycle of a Policy	22
2.4 Change Theory and Policy Development.....	24
2.5 Policy Development in educational institutions.....	31

2.6	Stakeholder Participation.....	35
2.7	Policy Implementation.....	37
2.7.1	Impact of Policy Reform on Organizational Management.....	41
2.8	Policy Reform in a Tertiary Education Context.....	43
2.9	Conceptual Framework.....	52
2.10	Tertiary Education in Ghana	55
2.10.1	Problems Facing the Ghanaian Tertiary Education Sector.....	57
2.10.2	Mitigation Strategies	65
2.10.3	Reform Programme: The Tertiary Education Policy	68
CHAPTER THREE.....		72
METHODOLOGY		72
3.1	Introduction.....	72
3.2	Methodological stance	72
3.3	Research Approach.....	74
3.4	Research Design	76
3.4.1	The case study institution.....	77
3.4.2	Research participants	78
3.5	Methods of data collection	81
3.5.1	Interviews.....	82
3.5.2	Documentary data	83
3.6	Data Analysis.....	84
3.7	Ethics and reflexivity	86
3.8	Study Limitations and Problems	90
CHAPTER FOUR.....		92
POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION IN UEW		92
4.	Introduction	92
4.1	Policy development in UEW	92

4.1.1 Stakeholders' perspectives on Policy development practices in UEW	96
4.1.2 Stakeholders perspectives on improving policy development practices in UEW	105
4.2 Policy implementation in UEW.....	108
4.2.1 Policy dissemination in UEW	108
4.2.2 Stakeholders' views on policy implementation in UEW	114
4.2.3 Stakeholder perspectives on improving policy implementation in UEW	117
4.3 Conclusion	120
CHAPTER FIVE	121
GAPS IN POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION IN UEW	121
5.1 Introduction	121
3.2 Opportunities and tensions in policy development at UEW	121
5.3 The relevance of various stakeholder groups in UEW policy development and implementation.....	126
5.4 Evaluation of policy development and implementation in UEW	131
5.5 Conclusion	135
CHAPTER SIX.....	136
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS	136
6.1 Introduction	136
6.2 Summary of Research Findings	136
6.3 Implications for Professional Practice	143
6.4 Contribution to knowledge	148
6.4 Recommendations for future research on Higher Education policy development and implementation.....	149
REFERENCES	152
REFERENCES	152
Sample Interview transcript.....	1
R4: Non academic staff	1

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADP	Accelerated Development Plan
EFA	Education for All
FCUBE	Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education
GES	Ghana Education Service
GER	Gross Enrolment Ratio
GPI	Gender Parity Index
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOESS	Ministry of Education, Science and Sports
MOEYS	Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports
NAB	National Accreditation Board
NER	Net Enrolment Ratio
NCTE	National Council for Tertiary Education
SSA	Sub Saharan Africa
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
TEP	Tertiary Education Programme
URC	Universities Rationalization Commission
UEW	University of education, Winneba
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Social and Cultural Organisation
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WHO	World Health Organisation

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION IN A GHANAIAN PUBLIC
UNIVERSITY
SUMMARY

This qualitative case study explores how policy is developed and implemented in public universities in Ghana, using the case of the University of Education, Winneba. It draws on a theoretical rationale in which inclusion and inclusiveness are seen as paramount (Lewin, 1951; Schein, 1995; Robins, 2003) to specifically question the influence of different stakeholder groups in the development and implementation of policies in the University.

The study utilized data from two sources: the analysis of policy documents, and semi-structured one-on-one interviews with fifteen senior non-teaching and teaching staff in three of the four University of Education campuses. The findings discussed in the two analysis chapters – Chapter Four and Chapter Five - indicate that not all stakeholders of the university community are involved in policy reforms. The discussion in Chapter Four suggests that some policy reforms are handled by the Governing Council and/or the Academic Board without much consultation with stakeholders. Junior level staff are the most excluded from the policymaking process with the effect that in some cases University management decisions become policies. Chapter Five discusses stakeholder participation and finds that efforts are made to disseminate policies although there are gaps in the dissemination methods and implementation. The main policy implementation gaps are the lack of proper evaluation and follow-up mechanisms for investigating the magnitude of collegiate participation and the impacts of such participation.

Given that all the stakeholders are required to support new policies irrespective of their gender and/or position, the study contends that collegial participation in the policy development and implementation processes is very important. Overall, it may be argued that stakeholder perspectives on policy development practices within UEW contradicts Muller's (2007) concerns that academic institutions are nurtured through the adoption of sound policies through wide faculty consultation. Due to the small number (fifteen) of participants and considering that this was a case study, it is recommended that future studies are scaled up to include a fuller range of views (junior and senior members) from both public and private universities.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1 Background

This work presents an outcome of a qualitative analysis that specifically questions higher education policy development and implementation. It is situated in a theoretical rationale in which inclusion and inclusiveness are seen as paramount (Lewin, 1951; Schein, 1995; Robins, 2003). The central proposition is that developing and implementing policy is a demanding task that requires broad participation by all stakeholders (Sabatier, 1991; Meek et al., 1996; Girdwood, 1999; Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002).

The literature on policy implementation argues that policy reform involves first subjecting existing legislation to an intensive evaluation with a view to determining what needs to be changed, how it should be changed, and the likely or anticipated impact of such changes on organizational goals (Smith, 2002). Such considerations are important as they facilitate smooth transition, and reduce the possibility of internal and/or external conflict or duplication of efforts (ibid). Thus any political ramifications of new policies and the extent of the resources necessary for development and implementation must also be taken into account. In this regard, I argue that the quality (in nature and scope) of the envisaged policy is critical as it determines the likelihood of achieving existing and new goals. Although Girdwood (1999) asserts that, to achieve set strategic goals, organizations should not only formulate new policies, but also ensure that they are compatible with the expectations of identified stakeholders, from my professional experience, this assumed consensus appears to be ideal and very rationalist – and rather belies the realities of contested power relations and hierarchical differences and antagonisms in organisations that must be well managed.

The point of interest in studying policy development and implementation is Brinkerhoff and Crosby (2001) proposition that the policy reform process is a “highly interactive [endeavour that requires] consensus building, participation of key stakeholders, conflict resolution, compromise ... [and] contingency planning

and adaptation” (p.6). In reference to policy development and implementation in higher education institutions in Ghana, Girdwood (1999) admits that it is an “essentially dynamic and political processes,” whose effects may surpass set organizational goals (p.2).

My concern that underlined this study is that a poorly coordinated policymaking team that adopts an “inwardly focused ... [and] ‘business as usual’ approach” (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002, p.6 [original emphasis]) will only open up room for internal dispute and external objections from stakeholders who were never consulted. Also, I share the view that “new policies often reconfigure rules, structures, and incentives, thus changing the array of costs and benefits to implementers, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders” (ibid). Thus I operated with arguments that, in order to create a healthy and sustainable programme, there is need for sound policies to be formulated and successfully implemented (Badu & Loughridge, 1997). Moreover, as Smith (2002) explains, creating sound policy alone is not enough, as institutions can still experience problems in the overall execution of their mandates. In this regard, there is the need to follow policies through and ensure that they are successfully implemented. Smith’s arguments also highlights that, policies can be ineffectual if they are not implemented well. As Brinkerhoff (1999) would say, the life of a policy is long: it begins at creation and continues into infinity until it is replaced or even fails in its entirety, the same way that a normal human being’s life is lived.

Therefore, this study was approached with a view that examining policy development and implementation requires questioning the processes in terms of proper planning, engagement and a sense of responsiveness on the part of both policymakers and stakeholders in order to ‘map-out’ implementation challenges that may otherwise scuttle successfully operationalising a policy. The study took a cue from Sabatier’s (1991) work, contending that all stakeholders must be well informed about the nature and scope of new policies, and prepared to effectively overcome any potential barriers to full implementation. As such, this study also proceeds from a view that, policy formulation and implementation processes require clear goals and objectives,

competent leadership, explicit guidelines, sufficient staff and, most importantly, an efficient method of evaluation (Government of Ghana Policy on Local Government, 1999).

In the context of higher education in developing nations, including the country of Ghana, Newman (2000) asserts that institutions invest heavily in policy reform in an attempt to catch up with rapidly evolving global technological innovation and demographic patterns. In specific reference to higher education policy development in Ghana, Girdwood (1999) argues that there are disparities often caused by political compromise over policy, while in other cases it is due to lack of policy implementation and enforcement. Given that context, this study specifically explored policy development and implementation in a Ghanaian higher education institution, primarily for the research potential adding substantial knowledge to what we know about policy making from the perspectives of stakeholders, who Marshall and Rossman (1999:115) described as “those most affected by educational policy and programmatic decisions” but whose experiences are absent from inquiry.

It was important for me to research stakeholder perspectives on policy development and implementation because I sought to study an area which has the potential to inform policy and practice in higher education in general and my own practice as a higher education administrator in particular. Therefore, my research focus has been informed by both personal and practical considerations.

Being Ghanaian and a higher education administrator, I became intrigued, as Manuh et al. (2006) argued, that much of the research that occurs in the public universities is contract research for organizations. It was important for me to research something which has both practical application and is personally interesting to me. In the context of Ghana’s higher education reforms that give prominence to policy making at the institutional level, I wanted to research an area which has the potential to inform practice at this institutional level. Also, I wanted to use a research approach that challenges my researcher values, interests, desires and needs, given that I am embedded in policy development

and implementation processes as a Registrar within the institution being studied. In so doing, I conducted a nuanced analysis drawing on qualitative analysis with the view of contributing to address the deficits that often emerge from much of the applied policy research that takes place in the Ghanaian higher education sector. This does not mean that this research is value free. The choices I made as a researcher determine the approaches, methods of data collection and the literature that places the project in relation to the scholarship and theorisation of others (see Schostak, 2002). Similarly, the choices I made throughout this research are informed partly by my biography: personal decisions, insider-outsider characteristics and transmutations along the course of the research. In terms of transmutations, I have moved from being embedded in a very positivistic approach to research to subjectivism – the idea of reality as inchoate and dependent on contextual experiences including my positioning as researcher. I have moved from quantifying data to gathering rich, messy and naturally occurring data using qualitative approaches. I have moved from minimalist's ontology to nominalism – an understanding of truth and reality as perspective bound.

The term 'policy' implies a number of definitions depending on the issue at hand and, may encompasses the stated policy (i.e. the actions organizations plan to take) and operationalized policy (i.e. the actions they actually take) usually determined by legislation or regulatory requirements and quality standards (Government of Ghana Policy on Local Government, 1999). However, for the purposes of the present study, 'policy' refers to the set of principles set out to guide institutional practice at the University of Education, Winneba (UEW). Thus this research specifically explores policy making and development in UEW to provide in-depth knowledge that adds significantly to what we know about higher education policy development and implementation; and as well, provides insights that can inform larger studies on policy reforms in the Ghanaian higher education sector from the perspectives of stakeholders.

1.2 Context of the Study

Ghanaian universities have been confronted with multiple challenges including a decline in government funding, lack of infrastructural development, an increase in student intake, competition from other education providers, quality assurance issues, and a move to full cost recovery (Leach et al., 2008). The education reforms that were embarked upon by the government in 1988, therefore, compelled universities to develop policies to address such challenges and stem student protests and staff disenchantment, as well as remain relevant in the face of global competition. To this end, governing councils and academic boards were called upon to enact policies for the effective management of their institutions. As Gibbons (1998) asserts, for the purposes of smooth management, institutions of higher learning develop and implement a wide range of policies (Gibbons, 1998).

For example, at UEW, policies have been developed to regulate academic practice, student welfare, finance, security, administration, sports, sanitation, staff welfare, and community services amongst many more areas, (UEW, 2011). Indeed, Leach et al. (2008) argue that just like other institutions of higher learning in most sub-Saharan African countries, Ghanaian universities were expected to operate as businesses and generate income to make up for shortfalls in government funding. However, between the 1990s and the year 2000, tensions grew between university administrators and academic staff around the issue of participation in decision making and university management. Academic staff felt that most policy-making lacked collegial participation and that academic decision making was being dominated by professional managers. On the other hand, professional managers also complained that policies are made by boards and committees dominated by academic staff; that is, administrators only implemented decisions taken by academics. Therefore, this study explored policy development and implementation in terms of questions about stakeholder participation in policy making.

1.2.1 The University of Education, Winneba

The University of Education was formally established in 1992 initially as the University College of Education from seven (7) Diploma awarding institutions, is committed to the development of education on the continent through the training of the Ghana's human resource. The component institutions that were brought together through the tertiary component of the 1987 educational reform by the PNDC Law 322 were Advanced Teacher Training College (Winneba), Advanced Technical Teachers' College (Kumasi), College of Special Education (Akwapim-Mampong), National Academy of Music (Winneba), St. Andrew's Agricultural Training College (Mampong Ashanti), School of Ghanaian Languages (Ajumako) and the Specialist Training College (Winneba).

Thus the University began as a conglomeration of many institutions, located in different parts of the country with diverse interests. Its mission was unique as a teacher education institution that was to train teachers in various categories. What may be argued is that the different components suggested that there will be diverse ways of working that were to be harnessed into a single stream that is to the University of Education, Winneba. There so many reasons for that argument.

My first consideration was that the Advanced Teacher Training College (Winneba), which now constitutes that South Campus in Winneba, for example, initially existed as the Kwame Nkrumah Ideological Institute (Essuman & Otami, 2011). The Institute hitherto trained nationalist fighters in Africa to support Ghana's commitment to the project of decolonisation. It was later transformed into the Specialist Teacher Training College (STTC). It transformed into the Advanced Teacher Training College (ATTC), which awarded diploma to Ghanaian teachers from various fields. Given that the South Campus hosted the main administration (central administration) of UEW until 2013, it might be argued that there is much of the historical baggage of the campus in the operations of the University. A cursory observer might argue that, from a nationalist orientation, the University's policy development and implementation processes might be more conformists than innovative. They are more likely to

be oriented to rigid implementation of national level policies than taking risks by adopting new and divergent ways of doing things.

However, given that the other component institutions of the University were established in Kwame Nkrumah era, but not necessarily oriented to nationalist ways of working, I took the view that there was likely to be several tensions between traditional nationalist offshoots and the other parts. That tension might have consequences for the policy development and implementation processes within the University. The National Academy of Music has a history as an institution established by a well known Ghanaian musician, Ephraim Amu. Given its status as originating from an individual initiative, it is more likely to embrace innovative policy development and implementation culture than the main Campus.

In my view, another aspect of UEW cultural baggage that might account for tensions in policy development and implementation is the status of the University as one that carried a baggage full of professionals who had to upgrade from the status of teachers at Diploma awarding institutions into professional lecturers and University administrators. In one way, that could lead to tensions between the traditional members that have upgraded themselves and the newcomers who became staff directly as qualified University lecturers or administrators. There was the likely that UEW policy development and implementation culture was significantly shaped by considerations for those who had to upgrade themselves. The one probable issue is that the 'old-timers' would have different perspectives of the policy development and implementation processes in the University as compared to those of the newcomers. Also, males dominated the very senior positions (registrar, Vice-Chancellor, Pro-Vice Chancellor, Finance Officer, Development Officer, and the positions of Deans and Directors within UEW leading to gender disparities in University staffing (Morley et al., 2010). That would indicate that more of the newcomers (and junior staff) were likely to be women than men leading to some gender perspectives in the analysis of the views expressed by the participants on the policy development and implementation processes in UEW. It was in this context that this research was conducted and the data analysed.

1.3 Scope of the Study

According to Meek et al. (1996), in almost all higher education systems, institutional diversity is considered an 'inherent good'. As such, the state always strives to provide considerable leeway to institutions, as well as developing policies and regulations designed to maintain or increase diversity (ibid). It is therefore important to note that policy ideally serves several purposes, including control, consistency, uniformity, and fairness. Policies ensure control when they are well developed and well publicized; they direct an organization's members in terms of what they should do, and, in certain specific circumstances, the manner in which they should do it. This ensures that people operate within defined limits and do not act in ways that would create problems for the organization. Moreover, policies ensure consistency and uniformity. For example, a policy aimed at bringing changes to employee interaction in the workplace is expected to include everyone in the organization.

It is suggested that if policies are to be effective and have the desired effect, they must be owned by everybody in the organization (Sabatier, 1991). All stakeholders are expected to be actively involved at each stage of the process of developing, implementing and evaluating new policies. For example, it is desirable to include employees' representatives, representatives of those who consume the goods or services produced by an organization, line ministry representatives, and any other actors whose influence may affect the achievability of organizational goals in policy reform. Moreover, in order to ensure efficiency and relevance to the organization, policies could be reviewed from time to time to reflect changes in management procedures and operational circumstances (Mine, 2007). Education institutions, for example, may carry out frequent policy evaluations in order to harmonize their policies with prevailing national, regional, and international development demands.

This study is focused on policy development and implementation at UEW where, in most cases, the majority of the university workforce appeared to be uninformed of these important policy changes. In fact, it appears most employees only come to learn of new policies when they are confronted with

them in practice, or not until they are faced with problems, changes in conditions of service, or other ways in which they are affected by management decisions (Leach et al., 2008). Drawing on my experience in the University, my general observation was that when policy statements were reviewed and approved by the Governing Council, Academic Board, and/or other committees, they were not disseminated to all identifiable groups within the University but remained in the hands of senior staff members and the filing cabinets of heads of department. Such a situation makes it difficult for staff to support policies or ensure that they are effective. Their detachment from the process impedes the governance and management process of the institution.

I am also aware that university statutes, rules, policies, and associated procedures and plans form part of the governance framework of the university; and, therefore, in accepting employment or enrolment at UEW, all employees and students agree to behave in ways that are consistent and in harmony with the University's governance framework. Accordingly, it is important that those who are affected by university policies are aware of and understand them. However, as indicated above, this was not found to be the case, as evidenced by feedback from staff and student representatives at Governing Council meetings.

The study draws on personal experience gained while working in a senior management position at UEW. In this capacity, I have been involved in several policy development issues through my involvement with the UEW Governing Council and Academic Board. In addition, I have also served on several other university boards and committees where policies are discussed and formulated. Therefore, I have been involved in policy formulation and implementation at all levels of university governance and management. I therefore drew on this experience to identify the most suitable and representative demographic as well as an appropriate research methodology.

1.4 Study Rationale

Just like any other institution of higher education, at UEW policies are critical to its effective management (Osborne, 2003a). In most cases, policies are the

outcome of decisions arrived at during Board or Committee meetings, and may refer to a statement of principles, or a position that is intended to guide or direct decision making and operations in a sphere of university activities, and may also specify requirements that need to be met (Leach et al., 2008). Although there are a number of existing studies that tackle policy development and implementation in the Ghanaian tertiary education sector, there is no existing documented research that addresses policy development and implementation in a specific or single institution.

Perhaps this is due to the fact that most policymaking matters were addressed at the national level until the Government of Ghana (GoG) implemented major legislative changes that gave individual universities the power to implement their own reform with very minimal interference from central government as indicated earlier on. On the other hand, it can also be reasoned that the lack of existing research on specific institutional policy reform is because administrators might have been reluctant to incorporate the findings into the management of their universities.

The present study was designed using a framework for examining the development, implementation and review of policies at UEW, with the aim of determining the guidelines and procedures of policy formulation, and how they affected staff performance and the management of the university. Understanding how policies served as a guide to practices at UEW would be very useful. As an element of its investigation concerned policy impact, the study also covered the extent to which policies supported the attainment of the desired outcomes and reduced institutional risk. Moreover, in undertaking this project, I sought to examine the compliance obligations in UEW policies and whether its employees were aware of these obligations. Finally, I wished to unearth who was responsible for monitoring policies and their procedures.

1.5 Previous Studies that have addressed the Problem

Policy reform in the Ghanaian higher education sector has been addressed by a significant number of studies (e.g. Dadu & Loughridge, 1997; Girdwood, 1999;

Kwapong, 2007; Leach et al., 2008). The majority of these inquiries focus on issues which range from the:

...breadth and complexity of the policy agenda [to the]...desired sectoral development objectives [to the] ... structural constraints impeding implementation [to the]...emerging political processes, [from the] prior state of things; ... [as well as] the evolving relationships between the government and the tertiary education sector (Girdwood, 1999, p.2).

Other commentators, such as Leach et al. (2008), dedicate extensive space to the process of policy development and implementation in the Ghanaian higher education sector. In addition, Kwapong (2007) offers an extensive account of the history of tertiary education reform in the country, with emphasis on diversification of the means of accessing tertiary education, and distance education among marginalized groups such as women and the poverty-stricken masses in remote parts of the country. These studies provide a rich database of information that may be utilized by researchers and policymakers alike to advance theory as well as draw insights for future policy development and implementation in the country's tertiary institutions.

Ghanaian institutions of higher learning such as polytechnics, colleges and universities have, over the years, undergone significant policy reform (Kwapong, 2007). Perhaps the impetus behind such innovation was initiated by the wave of education reform programmes that hit the country between 1988 and 2003 (Girdwood, 1999). It seems that these programmes were implemented in an attempt to meet the global expectation of harmonizing education policy with prevailing economic, political, social, technological and social imperatives (Association of African Universities, 2005; Osborne, 2003a). Global trends in higher education include increasing global student mobility estimated at about 3.3 million studying abroad; the emergence of higher education as a global market; and, the global mobility of labour necessitate harmonisation to meet global competition (Stockley, 2011). In addition to those are declining public funding and increasing private sector involvement, making higher education a commodity that is sold on the domestic and international market where students are becoming customers (ibid). Finally, global employability and universities forming strategic alliances to deliver quality

education that meets the demands of a global employment market and more so because of global ranking regimes that compares institutional quality based a unified standard have shaped the desire for harmonization. Ghana has initiated policy reforms to respond to these changes.

One such initiative was the Tertiary Education Programme (TEP), which was implemented by the GoG between 1986 and 1988. It succeeded in bringing about significant policy reform in the country's tertiary education sector, particularly in the realms of funding and access to higher education. It also offered the opportunity for meaningful evaluation of the overall performance of sector performance vis-a-vis socio-economic, political, and cultural goals (Girdwood, 1999).

Badu and Loughridge (1997) acknowledge that in spite of the many challenges that are common to the socio-political and economic infrastructure of developing countries, such as dwindling funding for tertiary education and limited access, the GoG has fared relatively well in terms of putting in place strong foundations for enhancing the quality of and access to tertiary education, particularly in strengthening the power of information creation, storage and dissemination through the updating of university libraries.

1.5.1 Historical Background

UEW is one of six public universities established as part of the GoG's strategic effort in addressing the strong demand for higher education among the rapidly increasing population. The University has four sites spread severally across Central and Ashanti regions, which are located in Winneba, Kumasi, Mampong-Ashanti and Ajumako townships respectively. UEW was inaugurated on 14 May 2004 through the University of Education, Winneba Act 2004 (Act 672).

This followed the initial inception of the institution under Rawlings' regime Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC) Law 322 (1992) as the University College of Education of Winneba (UCEW), when seven diploma-awarding institutions were amalgamated. The seven colleges were the National Academy of Music (Winneba); the Advanced Teacher Training College (Winneba); the

Specialist Training College (Winneba); St. Andrew's Training College (Mampong-Ashanti); the School of Ghana Languages (Ajumako); the Advanced Technical Teachers' College (Kumasi); and the College of Special Education (Mampong-Akuapem) (PNDCL 322). Pursuant to Statute 44 on the Affiliation and Recognition of Colleges and Institutions, UEW has a number of private colleges affiliated to it that award diplomas and certificates in various academic disciplines.

Being an education-orientated university, UEW is charged with the responsibility of developing and producing professional teachers capable of successfully spearheading the new national vision of education focusing on redirecting Ghana's effort towards the path of rapid economic and social development, as mentioned in the five-year strategic plan for 2009–13 (UEW, 2011). The university strives to meet this goal by promoting “research, disseminating knowledge and [initiating] education policy and development.” In this regard, the stakes are very high for UEW, with the expectation that it will play a pivotal role as both a national and regional institution; particularly in terms of ensuring that its graduates are equipped with the requisite knowledge and skills – as well as the ability to build such capacity in others – to enable them to live up to the expectations, “realities and exigencies of contemporary Ghana and the West African sub-region” (UEW, 2011).

The UEW curriculum is basically divided into four principal pedagogical areas: personal development, subject studies, core education studies, and professional studies (UEW, 2011). These components are further broken down to form the six academic divisions of the Centre for Educational Resources; the Centre for School and Community Science and Technology Studies; the Centre for Education Policy Studies; the Centre for Basic Education; the College of Agriculture; and the College of Technology.

Upon the attainment of autonomous status in 2002, UEW underwent several policy shifts that informed decisions and influenced the governance and management of the University. Policy reform empowered the UEW Academic Board to approve the appointment of vice chancellors and registrars without the

necessity of deferring to the University of Cape Coast (UCC)¹ or the Ministry of Education. The Board was also able to establish new departments and centres, inaugurate further undergraduate and post-graduate degree programmes, and introduce fee-paying courses to raise revenue (UEW Statutes, 2007). In other words, there was a degree of devolution of responsibilities for more local control and autonomy.

1.5.2 Student and Staff Population

At the end of the 2008/09 academic year, UEW student enrolment was 33,272, which comprised 16,631 full-time learners, 13,506 part-time students, and 3,135 individuals pursuing distance learning and sandwich courses. Of this total, 11,892 were female, representing 36 percent of the student body (UEW Basic Statistics Document, 2009). During the same period (2008/09), the university had a total workforce of 1,465 (23 percent female), comprising 322 research and teaching employees (18 percent female) and 1,143 administrative staff (25 percent female) (UEW Basic Statistics Document, 2009).

From a policy reform viewpoint, UEW's growth process has been directed towards three central and interrelated goals: the implementation of alternative financing strategies, the installation of new management structures, and the introduction a greater number of demand-driven courses. These objectives notwithstanding, the university faces substantial challenges posed by a number of determinants that include but are not limited to the following: faculty taking on increasingly complex tasks as the university expands; changes in administrative structures; and the diversification of professional responsibilities. Equally demanding are problems arising from an unfavourable research environment, unattractive remuneration packages, poor terms of service and inadequate staff welfare fare provision.

Nevertheless, university management is aware that it would not be overdramatic to argue, that the very survival of Ghanaian society might be called into question if UEW and similar institutions are unable to produce

¹ Before gaining autonomy, UEW was affiliated to and operated under the auspices of UCC.

graduates of a sufficiently high calibre to cope with the demands of a new information technology-driven era. For this reason, policies that seek to address such challenges must win the support of all stakeholders. It is therefore important that these policies are disseminated to harmoniously fit into a pattern of change that is sufficiently progressive to produce the kind of leadership needed for development.

1.5.3 Study Objectives and Research Questions

It was established at the beginning of this study that policy development and implementation are complex processes that demand high levels of commitment on the part of stakeholders (Badu & Loughridge, 1997; Girdwood, 1999; Anthony, 1999). What is of concern to this study is the crucial issue of whether stakeholder interest is authentic given that policy making regimes can be authoritarian. This study is interested in exploring stakeholder perspectives on their participation in policy development and implementation in UEW. In so doing, the study approaches the analysis of stakeholder perspectives as a crucial issue in terms of its importance in production of authentic and sustainable policies. In extension, the process of examining the manner in which institutional policies in the higher education sector are developed and implemented, as well as the effects of these actions, in the view of Sabatier (1991), requires an understanding of the behaviour of major stakeholders, in the present case, the Senate, the Academic Board, the Governing Council, administrative agencies, and the student body. Furthermore, these critical processes can only be achieved through keen observation of the behaviour of other interest groups such as labour unions.

In this regard, the study sought to address the following main question: What are the critical issues in developing and implementing selected policies at UEW? From this central inquiry, I composed the following research questions:

1. How is policy at UEW developed and implemented?
2. How influential are the different stakeholder groups in the development and implementation of policies at the university?
3. How can stakeholder participation be built?

4. How can the University policymaking be improved at UEW?

1.6 Structure of the thesis

This thesis is structured in six chapters. Chapter One introduces the thesis. It presents the background to the thesis; the context of the study and the scope of the study. Finally it discusses the rationale that informed the thesis.

Chapter Two discusses the literature and the theoretical understanding that informed the study. The chapter addressed issues relating to change theory in terms of policy development and implementation. It also presents stakeholder participation theory discourses and relates these to tertiary education in Ghana to put the research in context and highlights the gaps that informed this research.

Chapter Three explores presents the methodology – ontological and epistemological orientations that informed the research – and the practical research methods and ethical issues. The chapter described the methods of data collection and analysis, the characteristics of the research participants and the reflections on the research process.

Chapters Four and Five specifically discussed the data from this study. **Chapter Four** discussed policy development. It highlights the policy provisions in policy texts. It also highlights stakeholders' perspectives on policy development practices and ways of improving the processes. **Chapter Five** is focussed on policy dissemination and implementation. It also explores stakeholders' perspectives about the ways that policy implementation can be improved through enhanced stakeholder participation.

Chapter Six sums up the main findings and conclusions. It also discusses the implications of the research, the contributions of the thesis to knowledge and proposals for further studies.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews current theoretical and methodological knowledge on policy development and implementation in institutions of higher learning. The vocation here is to identify gaps in knowledge and enables one to define the research questions. Based on Creswell's (2003) postulations on the drawing of literature maps and abstraction of existing materials, this chapter is divided into following sections: the debates about the notion of policy and policy development; the lifecycle of a policy; change theory and policy development and implementation, and policy reform in a tertiary institution context. This is very clear

2.2 Nature and Scope of Policy

There are several understandings of policy. Torjman's (2005) review of conceptions of policies argued that there are several kinds of policy. The first group of policies Torjman identified was substantive and administrative policy. Policies concerned with legislation, programs and practices that govern the substantive dimension of such as income security, employment initiatives, child care services and social exclusion. Administrative policies focus largely upon routine administrative procedures.

Torjman argued that substantive and administrative policy can be further classified as vertical or horizontal policy. According to Smith (2003: 11), vertical policy is what we think of as the normal or traditional way in which policy decisions are made. Vertical policy is developed within a single organizational structure and generally starts with broad overarching policy, sometimes called "corporate" or "framework" policy. Such decisions are made specific enough to guide operational decision-making.

Thus vertical policy policies are developed within the institution that has responsibility for its implementation. Horizontal policy, on the other hand, is developed by two or more organizations and is also referred to as integrated policy. It may be "created between parts of an organization or among organizational components that are similar in hierarchical position" (Smith 2003: 11-12). Although this latter type of policy is mostly developed to align

government programmes across sectors of the economy in order to enhance service delivery, it is also popular with institutions that have semi-autonomous offices in multiple locations. These kind of policies are also useful for UEW because of its semi-autonomous multiple-campus that operate as part of an integrated whole.

The third group of policy Torjman identified is reactive and proactive policy. Reactive policy emerges in response to a concern or crisis that must be addressed. Proactive policies, by contrast, are introduced and pursued through deliberate choice.

The fourth group of policy is current and future policy. Current policies are those of present concern and are on the public agenda and future policy refers to insert missing phrase those that are not on the agenda (Smith, 2003).

Torjman (2005) explained that the four categories of policies are developed through 'evidence-based decision-making,' involving gathering evidence that supports the policy. Relevant evidence includes, for example, research findings, evaluation data and results from focus groups. What these classifications do not present is an organised understanding of policy which can be applied in organisations. As the explanations, show one policy may be identified across all categorisations depending on how it is viewed or interpreted. Also, the classification is not of much use to my own research as it is less interested in the *types* of policies, as it is in policy development processes. As have been explained in the rationale, this thesis is focuses specifically on stakeholder participation in policy development, in order to add substantially to the body of literature on higher education administration.

Ball (1990) holds that "policies project images of an ideal society" (p.3). Accordingly, the policy of an organization is closely linked to its mission and vision statements. For example, according to Kogan (1975), policy underscores the "statements of descriptive intent [that enhance the] "authoritative allocation of values" (p.55). However, values do not float free of their social context: In the

view of Ball (1990) policy is “both text and action, words and deeds, it is what is enacted as well as what is intended” (p.10).

In a slightly different vein, particularly from a public standpoint, policy is a “combination of basic decisions, commitments, and actions made by those who hold authority or affect [organizational] decisions” (Local Government, 1999, p.2). Within that context, it may be argued that, in most cases, policy is characterized by a central premise that forms the basis of an organization’s plans, strategies and goals. The continuation will be that, to achieve this, policymakers are required to consult widely, seek the views of different individuals, re-examine such views, and come up with a comprehensive framework to govern the entire reform procedure. In essence, the process of formulating new policy is complex and “requires political wisdom, diplomacy and prudence to bring diverse interests together around a shared purpose” (Local Government, 1999, p.2). Thus, it can be reasoned that policies have far-reaching consequences as they determine the nature and scope of the services or products to be provided to targeted individuals or groups. Yet, it should be pointed out that the policymaking process may at times be adversarial, particularly when sensitive issues are at hand, or when the policymaking team is made up of members with diverse views who may continue to hold to their own opinions even after lengthy lobbying. For example, team members may spend a lot of time trading objections to what should be included in reform and what should be excluded.

Mine (2007) holds that policy should be regarded as an organization’s official expression of the kind of behaviour it considers acceptable in its employees. Therefore, policy can be interpreted as a statement of conduct outlining a set of behavioural codes that govern the organization’s members. Moreover, policies can be said to offer clear-cut directions on what must be done and by whom, in order to achieve certain predetermined goals (ibid). Essentially, the following three attributes can be drawn from Mine’s (ibid) hypothesis; organizational policy ought to reflect:

- Broad ideas and goals in political manifestoes

- Official government legislation or guidelines that govern how laws should be implemented
- An organization's strategy on a particular issue; for example, an equal opportunities policy shows that it aims to treat its entire staff equitably

Smith (2002) classifies policies into a number of groups: distributive policies that extend goods and services to members of an organization; regulatory policies or mandates, which limit the behaviour of individuals and groups or otherwise oblige them to act in certain ways; constituent policies that create executive power structures or interpret state legislation; and miscellaneous policies, which are dynamic and form models that are often implemented.

These three policy classifications are all relevant in the context of higher education institutions as they cover a wide range of areas and a large number of stakeholders. Similarly, Ball (1990) argues that policies in the education sector are comparatively much more inclusive and should not be regarded as "reflecting the interest of one social class (commonly the industrial middle class), but as responding to a complex and heterogeneous configuration of elements, including ideologies that are residual or emergent as well as currently dominant" (p.3). As Ball would explain, dominant ideology in this context refers to established organisational culture with determinate lineaments that are important and often, in practice, effective.

In some institutions of higher learning, one can identify two distinctive types of policy: firstly, enabling policies, which can be described as high-level statements that enable decision making and set out the institution's position on the key aspects of its direction, and which must be approved by a governing council; and secondly, operational policies, which derive from enabling policies, are generally more specific, and are approved by an academic board (Deakin University Governance Unit, 2008).

Leu and Prince-Rom (2006) argue that the education policies of most nations are crafted to harmonize with two pertinent elements related to pedagogical quality: "student cognitive development and social/creative/emotional

development” (p.3). In this regard, Leu and Prince-Rom explained cognitive development as the central foundation on which other education policies can be built; and “the degree to which systems achieve this is used as a major indicator of ...[the] quality [of their policies]” (p.3). Other literature argued that both student cognitive development and social/creative/emotional development are broad and comprise various policy areas that institutions should strive to address (UNESCO, 2004). It may be argued that all education systems endeavour to put up structures designed to enhance the quality of education students receive. On the other hand, in order to reach a position in which they can hope to meet local, regional and international development challenges, policy in institutions of higher education should be seen to encourage the virtues of good citizenship, peace, equality, and respect for cultural diversity.

Meek et al. (1996) indicate that in almost all higher education systems, governments seek either to provide considerable leeway to academic institutions, and/or develop policies and even legislation to maintain or increase diversity. Diversity here refers to differences in the mission, institutional shape, purpose mandated by local level policies across higher education institutions due to policy reforms that give autonomy to institutions to make policies instead of the former practice where the state ‘gives’ legislation to institutions. This would imply that institutions may not necessarily have the same approach to policy development and implementation. This may reflect back on stakeholder participation in terms of, for example, gender and rank. However, in the view of Huisman et al. (2007), current understanding of factors that contribute to the increase or decrease of institutional diversity, in terms of the extent of stakeholder participation, is rather limited.

In the absence of policies, the deeds of those who oversee institutions would be unjustified and fragmented, and the organization would be unlikely to run efficiently (Spasoff, 1999). In other words, policies guide decisions and actions and provide reference points to justify decisions and actions.

Torjman (2005) argued that the challenge is to articulate in a comprehensible and cogent way the meaning of the term policy. Torjman explained that “policy

seeks to achieve a desired goal that is considered to be in the best interest of all members of society” (p.4). The central argument was that “any given policy represents the end result of a decision as to how best to achieve a specific objective” (p.4). This definition suggests that policies are designed to achieve public interest goals. As such, it is expected that policy development in an institution is conducted as a public process with inputs from members of the institution.

2.3 The Lifecycle of a Policy

Differentiating each new stage in the policy cycle may be problematic given that they tend to overlap. Policy development, which is the first stage in the cycle, may merge into the implementation phase, particularly if the policy has multiple sections that are each implemented in turn. Based on Pressman and Wildavsky (1984), the following questions can be asked: are there any differences between a policy and its implementation, or, rather, between its goals and the means of their achievement? And if there is a difference, how can it be identified? In response to these two questions, Pressman and Wildavsky (ibid) posit the following response:

We can work neither with a definition of policy that excludes implementation nor one that includes all implementation. There must be a starting point: if no action is begun, implementation cannot take place. There must also be an end point. Implementation cannot succeed or fail without a goal against which to judge it (p, xxii).

From this contention it can be deduced that the institution must decide on a policy direction, and, most importantly, it should consider the possible impact of the reform it plans to make. For example, a strategy that is aimed at building a knowledge base and linkage systems, requires a coordination of effort from all stakeholders, which, in the case of an institution of higher learning, in addition to its staff and student bodies, may include the government, academics, alumni, and the local and international community. The institution is therefore obliged to develop a mechanism to implement a database of evidence to support its policymaking activities.

This then suggests that policy implementation presupposes the preceding act of formulation and deciding what course of action needs to be taken, a consideration that is in line with Hill and Hupe (2002). Yet, it is not enough simply to identify the main stakeholders because if they are not integrated as a single actor, there is a need to decide who will perform various functions. It is thus also necessary to determine who the formulators are, who is the decision maker, and, most importantly, who is the implementer? (ibid).

This elaboration corresponds to the argument that policymaking is a continuous and interactive process that tends to revolve round certain elements such as stakeholders, policy areas, and so forth (Walt, 1994). If decision makers become aware of this fact, organized thinking is facilitated even if the actual process of policymaking is less orderly (ibid). Walt (ibid) therefore identifies four stages in the policy cycle: policy identification and issue recognition, policy formulation, policy implementation, and policy evaluation.

The guiding principle for the process of policymaking is that policies should be formulated on the basis of pertinent valid information and sound technical advice. For example, when organizing policy development, there is a need to define issues, and set goals, objectives and priorities. Indeed, Vidovich (2001) asserts that there is a growing resistance in education research to separation of the formulation and implementation phases of policymaking. On the contrary, orientation has shifted from the placement of all emphasis on the policy intentions of central authorities at the macro level to incorporating an analysis of the consequences of policy practices at the micro level (ibid).

Cibulka (1994) acknowledges that, "We now recognize that implementers have an explicit policy role, not merely a technical one" (p.111). Malen (1994) has also pointed to 'street-level' providers 'remaking' policy as it is implemented. Moreover, Fitz and Halpin (1994) argue for a balanced approach between the power of the centre to disseminate policy and the capacity of grassroots practitioners to interpret policy rather than merely execute it.

A balanced view of these contentions would be that they offer conflicting perceptions of the exact nature of the various stages of the policy cycle. However, for the purposes of the present study, it is taken as a given that development, implementation and evaluation are three distinct and critical stages albeit integrated cycle, and that they should each be carried out with the utmost care lest they antagonize the stakeholders of institutions planning to initiate reform.

Therefore, I reason that in order to clearly understand the processes of policy development, implementation, and impact on the management of UEW, some relevant theoretical frameworks and concepts should be adopted. To this end, the following five sections of this chapter respectively address the following salient elements of the policy lifecycle, as proposed by Walt (1994):

- Nature and scope of policy
- Stakeholders
- Policy development
- Policy implementation
- Impact of policy on organizational management

In this research, I will focus on three aspects of the policy lifecycle. I will look at the participation of stakeholders in policy development and implementation although this does not necessarily mean that I will exclude the nature of the scope of policies and the impact of policies in the study university. The point is that this work is not designed as an impact assessment of policy implementation nor is it designed to assess the nature and scope of policies being developed. It is more interested in the processes of policy development and implementation with an emphasis on the roles of stakeholders.

2.4 Change Theory and Policy Development

To elucidate how policy reform is initiated, accepted and successfully implemented within an organization, this thesis invokes the theory of change, as

advanced by Lewin (1951), Schein (1995) and Robbins (2003). Change theory rests on the postulation that innovation does not occur instantaneously but is gradual, and comprises a significant number of adaptations and adjustments. Based on elucidation by Robbins (2003), no form of institutional change just happens – it only takes place when the forces promoting it are stronger than those that oppose it. Essentially, whether from an individual or collective viewpoint, change is phenomenal. As Schein (1995) contends, change entails a profound psychological dynamic process that involves painful unlearning and difficult relearning as one cognitively attempt[s] to restructure ones thoughts, perceptions, feelings and attitudes.

Trucano's (2006) work has highlighted that in many situations, as it is in Ghana, it is only after central government consents to support innovation that the institution can embark on the process of drawing up a framework and timeline for initiation, development and implementation of reform. Several studies in Ghana have shown how state policy guides policy decisions in the Ghanaian higher education sector, for example, that an institution must first communicate to the government through the Ministry of Education in order to gain state support and avoid contradicting national education goals (Prah, 2002; Tsikata, 2007; Ohene, 2010; Morley, 2010; Adu-Yeboah and Dzama Forde, 2011). This would suggest that changing or introducing policy in institutions of higher education in Ghana is not a simple matter.

Writers such as Melton (2009) and Orr (2006) have observed that, the nature and scope of policy reform at any jurisdictional level of the education sector involves a multitude of processes and personnel. Accordingly, it may be argued that policy development and implementation in such a bureaucratic environment can be a daunting prospect. In the Ghanaian tertiary education sector, for example, some have argued that policymaking bodies of universities (Governing Councils) are required to carry out extensive consultation with all stakeholders, and construct a watertight framework within which to terminate existing teaching programmes and replace them with new ones (Girdwood, 1999; Trucano, 2006). Although there is little empirical evidence to support whether university councils do extensive consultations with stakeholders, my

argument will suggest that policy development and implementation would need to be all-inclusive. It also suggests that policy makers in institutions of higher learning must not only work hand in hand with all stakeholders, but should also be of exemplary character if they are to gain the confidence of interested parties. This corresponds with ideas in the work of Robbins (2003) who argued that policy makers need to fully engage driving forces in order to steer stakeholders towards the required destination and prevent them from reverting to old *modi operandi*.

Based on the opinions of Keams (2007), the initiation of change is more often than not a highly demanding endeavour given the obvious conflicting modes of reasoning among stakeholders. Nevertheless, Keams goes on to argue that innovation can be realized with a minimum of inconvenience provided it is not imposed on stakeholders and a sufficient amount of key information around the envisaged change is provided in good time. In this regard, Keams argued that change agents are encouraged to demonstrate high levels of professionalism, patience and humility in seeking to persuade stakeholders of the importance of the proposed innovation (*ibid*).

A classical change theory that is applied to institutional policy development and implementation has been the propositions of Kurt Lewin (1890-1947). Lewin argued that it is pertinent that the *driving* and *restraining* forces must be analyzed before implementing a planned change because of the dynamic balance of forces working in opposing directions (Schein, 1995; Robbins, 2003). The proposition suggests that policy changes in human systems may not be possible unless there is a negotiated balance and mitigation of the tensions between the forces promoting it and those that may be opposing it (Robbins, 2003).

Lewin envisaged that for change to take place, at least three basic steps – unfreezing, change, and refreezing - must be taken (Schein, 1995; Robbins, 2003). In his explications of change theory, Kritsonis (2005) explained Lewin's propositions as follows: **Unfreezing** is a process involving finding a method of making it possible for people to let go of an old pattern that was

counterproductive in some way. The argument is that if people do not see the need for a new policy they may not accept it. Therefore, Lewin's argument is that unfreezing is necessary to overcome the strains of individual resistance and group conformity. As proponents suggest, unfreezing increases the driving forces that direct behaviour away from the existing situation or status quo; and, subsequently decreases the restraining forces that may resist policy. **Changing** refers to the introduction of new policies. It supposes that a new policy is adopted with broad support across the institution or system because of change in thoughts, feeling, behaviour, or all three, which is in some way more liberating or more productive. Over time there is **Refreezing** – observance of the new policies becomes established as a new habit, so that it now becomes the 'standard operating procedure'. These arguments suggested Lewin's belief in stakeholder participation in policy development and implementation. For example, it suggests that if policy change is to be carried out successfully in an institution of higher learning, there must be visionary leaders who should seek to engage all members of a community or organization at all stages of policy reform. This, I would argue, is necessary to cultivating a climate in which all stakeholders are able to exchange critical information that can be aggregated to define an acceptable policy.

The explications of Kritsonis (2005) indicate that, in essence, Lewin's (1951) propositions highlight stakeholder participation as necessary to help break the cycle of existing norms and practices and prepare the ground for policy changes. Some have presented similar arguments in discussing that Lewin's unfreezing step include the need to : motivate participants by preparing them for change, build trust and recognition for the need to change, and actively participate in recognizing problems and brainstorming solutions within a group (Robbins, 2003; 564-65). Similarly, and of value to university policy development and implementation Kritsonis (2005:2) also explained the change step (or movement) as

... persuading employees to agree that the status quo is not beneficial to them and encouraging them to view the problem from a fresh perspective, work together on a quest for new, relevant information, and connect the views of the group to well-respected, powerful leaders.

The proposition suggests that policy development and implementation should involve stakeholders at a broad level – from the beginning, in thinking through various options, and in agreeing through the *dramatis personae* and the interstices of intersections what the policy should be and how it should be implemented. Lippit et al. (1958) added that information should be continuously exchanged throughout the process.

My argument is that it is such a cordial and trusting atmosphere that can play the role of incentivizing individuals to develop a positive attitude towards policy change. Lippit et al. further argued, in reference to the third level, that policies are more likely to be stable if they spread to neighbouring systems or to subparts of the system immediately affected. This speaks to policy dissemination and to engagement of stakeholders in policy implementation. However, Schein (1995) recognised the difficulty in applying Lewin's ideas. He argued that applying the three levels requires significant wit on the part of policymakers if it is to be conducted in a professional and diligent manner that allows for the creation of an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence. As there is little evidence in the research literature about how stakeholders participate in policy development and implementation at the institutional level, it was important for me to explore the subject in order to add some meaningful knowledge that can extend the frontiers of what we know about higher education policy making in Ghana.

Recent research in Ghana and Tanzania (Morley et al., 2010) using equity score cards raised questions that relate directly to current policy concerns for making African higher education more inclusive; and this work also evaluates the effectiveness of existing policy interventions to promote inclusion (HEPI, 2009; Leathwood and Read, 2009; Morley et al, 2010; McLean, et al., 2011). Trucano (2006) gave examples that within the context of the policymaking process in the Ghanaian tertiary education sector, management is expected to persuade all stakeholders of the need for policy reform in a particular aspect of administration, or even in faculty practice, before laying down structures that will make such reform palatable. The suggestion is that policy development and implementation should also include closely monitoring the overall reception of

the innovation in order to make timely decisions on whether to accelerate or scale down driving and restraining forces respectively (Robins, 2003). In this regard, Schein (1985) asserts that for real change to take place, an organization must build the strong capacity of its members to manage short and long-term innovation. Accordingly Schein, argues that change agents should sensitize the entire stakeholder body to the need to willingly 'learn how to learn' from emerging issues within their various areas of operation

In order to promote stakeholder participation, Lewin (1951) advanced three distinct sub-steps, characterized by creation of a clear distinction between existing behaviour and envisaged practices, which aimed at achieving a consensus among stakeholders. A rule of thumb here is that change agents should make an effort to enhance teamwork. In the classical works of Prochaska and DiClemente's (1983) this phase will refer to the stage of contemplation where change agents actively raise people's consciousness about proposing a policy (Kritsonis, 2005). In my view this should involve clarifying systems deficits or identifying areas needing policy reform to stakeholders. In the case of an institution of higher learning, the suggestion would be that the Governing Council should liaise closely with other local and international institutions to determine the kind of policy reform that can improve work practices and performance, and in what circumstances. Schein (1985) makes a similar assertion when he argues that organizations should formulate malleable structures that allow emerging issues as well as new ideas to be effectively entrenched.

The theoretical reviews of Kritsonis (2005) pointed out that stakeholder participation is also highlighted in the *preparation* phase of the work of Prochaska and DiClemente (1983). Using the medical concept of working with patients to accept reform proposals, the work of Prochaska and DiClemente's pointed to the need to engage with people likely to be affected or whose interest may be impacted by a policy reform in defining the policy. Kritsonis explained that at this stage of change "the individual begins to engage in change activities" (p.4). Thus while it may be useful to work with representatives of stakeholder groups, the suggestion Kritsonis pushes forward is to use

mechanisms that promote individuals' ability to directly contribute to policy development and implementation. This in my view is an interesting proposition that encourages the development of innovative democratic systems of stakeholder participation.

In reference to Lewin's third step, organizational cultural change theory suggests that policy change involves the complete integration of new policies into existing systems (Schein, 1995; Robbins, 2003). In Robbins' (2003) view, this step should be aimed at cementing the new change and is therefore only applicable to situations in which the envisaged innovation has already been realized. In my view this thesis contributes to understanding the change process by providing some knowledge about the practical operations of this final stage in the change process, because this final stage is indeed critical, as it aims to prevent any potential slip-back into old habits within a short period of the innovation having been implemented. As I will argue in the analysis chapters, some stakeholders were concerned about monitoring and evaluation systems that ought to be available to check how policies have or have not sedimented and the implications for the university and further reform.

Robbins (2003) presents arguments that the final step of refreezing also serves to provide stakeholders with the necessary tools to smoothly embrace the long-term changes that should occur after an initial major innovation has been realized. Therefore, it involves the active entrenchment of new values, practices, and policies that are responsible for sustaining the new change(s) in the long term. To achieve this, change agents need to maintain a state of equilibrium between driving and restraining forces through the creation of new departments and positions, as well as the engagement of additional personnel to staff them. Schein (1985) corroborates these stipulations by opining that organizations should come up with policies, processes, events and tasks that allow the optimization of set goals and objectives, while still allowing participants to freely interact and form strong interpersonal bonds. This, in my view, is necessary to ensure that stakeholder participation is authentic and sustainable.

Thus within change theory propositions, policy development and implementation is a complex task. This is because policy whether reactive (emerging in response to a concern or crisis that must be addressed) or proactive (introduced and pursued through deliberate choice), entails introducing innovation which requires persuading individuals or groups to switch from practices generally perceived to be redundant to more productive ones (Torjman, 2005). It requires that stakeholders are effectively involved in the process, and they should be convinced that existing structures or practices are ineffective. Perhaps this is the reasoning behind Robbins' (2003) argument that the process of achieving change is gradual and directly dependent on the nature of the relationship between managers and their subordinates.

Therefore, Schein (1985) proposes that, change can be perceived as a by-product of a concerted effort to address looming issues that impede maximum realization of envisaged goals and objectives. The application of this notion is that policy development should be queried in terms of how a new policy will enhance the achievement of institutional goals.

In studying policy development and implementation at UEW, the assumption in this study was that stakeholders are involved. This assumption is based on the fact that being a public university, policy development will be pursued as a matter of public concern hence requiring engagement of all stakeholder groups to generate consensus towards the acceptance of the policy. Therefore, the understanding of policy development in this research is grounded in a change theory perspective that views policy development and implementation in the same way as introducing an innovation into a system. This conception of policy development in terms of stakeholder participation as espoused by Brinkerhoff & Crosby (2002), Brinkerhoff (2004) and Torjman (2005) and discussed in the following sections.

2.5 Policy Development in educational institutions

Policy development is explained as a decision-making process that helps address identified goals, problems or concerns (Torjman, 2005). According to Torjman,

The actual formulation of policy involves the identification and analysis of a range of actions that respond to these concerns. Each possible solution is assessed against a number of factors such as probable effectiveness, potential cost, resources required for implementation, political context and community support.

In short, any given policy represents the end result of a decision as to how best to achieve a specific objective. This implies that policy development in higher education should be to improve the quality of higher education and the aims of higher education; although there can never be consensus on what constitutes quality improvement – people advance different models of how to ensure and assure quality.

In an analysis of the policymaking process in special education in Cyprus, Liasidou (2009) asserts that “there is no such a thing as a ‘settlement’ in educational policymaking. Rather, policymaking is an ever changing discursive assemblage of contesting and unequal power relations subjected to incessant reconfiguration and reconstruction” (p.108 [original emphasis]). These sentiments are corroborated by Ball (1990) with regard to policymaking in education institutions in Britain: “policy making in [a] modern, complex, plural society...is unwieldy and complex” (p.3).

Barton and Tomlinson (1984) argue that policymaking in the education sector is characterised by disputes of all kinds that may derive from ideological, socio-political, and/or economic priorities. These writers argued that policymaking is not about indulging the most powerful stakeholders while disregarding those considered to be inconsequential. They suggested that policy development should ideally be inclusive and broad, allowing the taking on board of all the beliefs, values and tastes of those involved. However, due to unavoidable restraints, such as a limited time frame, lack of proper expertise, and monetary constraints, it is often difficult to incorporate the requirements of all stakeholders.

Ball (1990) contends that even uncertainties such as “discontinuities, compromises, omissions and exceptions are also important” for policy survival (p.3). It therefore seems that the most important thing that policymakers should

endeavour to facilitate is proper planning. As Trucano (2006) observes, the making of high quality and efficient policies is determined by the nature and scope of set institutional goals and objectives. For example, in the financial management policy area of institutions of higher learning, the main objective may be to minimize costs while at the same time increasing revenue generation sources. Johnstone, Arora, and Experton (1998) argue that the impact of financial policies is far more influential than that in other areas given that it determines the quality and quantity of academic access accorded to students.

As established in Chapter 1, institutions of higher learning in Ghana suffered untold problems between the 1950s and the early 1980s, when the country went through political and economic turmoil. Tellingly, this period was characterized by low funding for the education sector (Badu & Loughridge, 1997). Therefore, in order to avoid a relapse into such straitened circumstances, tertiary institutions are encouraged to work as close partners with government agencies to ensure that sufficient funds are provided.

According to Sabatier (1991), the success of any policy development process is chiefly determined by the ability of policymakers to engage stakeholders about the facts underlying reform proposals. Accordingly, the timely provision of support services, communication, and strong change motivation normally goes a long way in instilling a sense of awareness and responsiveness among stakeholders in an organization (ibid). Yet research reported that,

Male and female staff in Ghana thought that they could be used to inform decision-making and aid policymaking, and to expose the areas that need to improve. (Morley et al.'s 2010:102)

This bespeaks marginalisation of staff from policy development, dissemination and implementation. Similarly, Morley et al., explained that “there was little discussion by staff in either country of the student experience or student voice” (p.36). I would argue that the lack of effort by leadership to effectively bring stakeholders on board is problematic because participation is critical to the achievement of effective policy development. As Brinkerhoff and Crosby (2002) assert, such leadership in the reform process does not benefit from a domineering stance, but, rather, is better advised to be all-inclusive.

During the overall deliberation process, such a non-domineering and decentralized leadership could be devised to serve to instil an air of authority on the one hand and a sense of collectivity on the other (ibid). The central premise behind this postulation is that the success of any policy development process depends on the ease with which team members are able to obtain high quality, relevant information and knowledge (Sabatier, 1991). Indeed, since new policies are more often than not prone to many forms of uncertainty, the timely mitigation of such challenges definitely strengthens the viability of the overall initiation and development plan (ibid). Indeed, according to Mine (2007), open and dual communication channels combined with inspirational leadership are sure recipes for instilling motivation as well as the 'in-servicing' of reform by team members. The implication is that it is important that policy development provides social spaces for stakeholder participation in order to cultivate a sense of trust and acceptance among stakeholders.

In short, policy change is one of the most challenging endeavours an organization can undertake (Johnstone et al., 1998). This is because sometimes, certain stakeholders may hijack the reform process by imputing wrong motives to it so that it loses its appeal to the targeted demographic (Aryee, 2000). For example, in the case of a public policy such as the introduction of a new metropolitan commuter bus system in Ghana, some politically active civil servants and other activists might have circulated half-truths about the envisaged project and thus swayed public opinion. Therefore, my reading of the message in Aryee's proposition is that policy development processes need to include clear communication strategy – policy makers being in contact with stakeholders, clarifying the compelling rationale for the policy from the beginning of the processes to the implementation phase.

Similarly, in the case of a higher education institution, initiating change whether from within or outside may prove to be problematic, particularly when, for instance, the high expectations of students are taken into account. For example, introducing additional fees into a tertiary education system in which the

government has hitherto met most of the cost might provoke concern and cause chaos amongst the student body.

2.6 Stakeholder Participation

The discussions in section 2.5 so far indicate that stakeholder engagement is an essential part of policy development. One view is that, successful stakeholder engagement policy development process entails an intensive analysis of the stakeholders (Brinkerhoff, 2004). According to Brinkerhoff,, stakeholder analysis is a procedure that begins by acknowledging the roles of different personalities and/or entities involved in the facilitation of innovation. Brinkerhoff, however, argued that not all stakeholders are involved in the critical processes of decision making, and some will be sidelined if it is felt that their contributions weaken the positions of other stakeholders or even the overall goals of the organization. Epstein (1993:12) described this as “the concentration of power in hierarchies” because of “the role that institutional structures have in maintaining power relations”. As such this research was particularly interested in understanding the influence of stakeholders in policy development as discussed the analyses chapters.

Brinkerhoff's (2004) proposition is that stakeholder analysis should account for the needs and interests that are stake when a policy development process is initiated. In terms of organisational theory, however, the bigger concern is that organisations are not homogeneous (Paker, 2000). Organisations' are institutions comprising conflicted positions because they are “populated and influenced by people who occupy different power positions” (Parker, 2000, p.226). Theorists suggest that institutions are a “a site of struggle, where the negotiations taking place can either strengthen or weaken possibilities for change” (Epstein, 1993:157). This would suggest that policy development would be a social as well as a political process.

Therefore, my reading of stakeholder analysis in policy development as discussed in the works of Brinkerhoff (2004) and change theory as discussed in section 2.4 of this chapter is that staff and students need to be incorporated into

the process of formulating policy. Also, entities (such as the Ministry of Education and NCTE) with considerable leverage on the overall process of implementing change need to be fully incorporated in the policy reform process, particularly if it is established that they have a great influence on the overall success of the reform (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002). For example, policy reform in curriculum development should seek the views of students as they are directly affected by the implementation of such changes.

Stakeholder analysis is for the purposes of identifying stakeholders who will participate in policy development (Brinkerhoff, 2004). According to Brinkerhoff and Crosby (2002), the variance in stakeholder background may prove to be a huge impediment when it comes to taking part in group activities. Tellingly, if other restrictions such as financial constraints interact with idiosyncratic stakeholder backgrounds, participation may be greatly hindered (*ibid*). The suggestion is that equipping education institutions with the necessary incentives (modern libraries, qualified teaching staff, decent accommodation, etc.) is not sufficient, unless they are accompanied by strategies for enhancing participation of the target beneficiaries (Osborne, 2003a).

As Sawyer (2004) notes, most obstacles facing institutions of higher learning – particularly those arising from institutional incapacity – are dealt with at state level. However, impediments arising from idiosyncratic stakeholder backgrounds cannot be addressed if policymakers are not willing to consult all interested parties. In this regard, policymakers are expected to first identify the salient needs of each group of stakeholders and devise ways of meeting them while continuing to work within the desired reform framework. Accordingly, Rumball et al. (2001) identify certain principles for promoting collegial participation and responsibility in academic policy formulation. These revolve around power and authority on the part of policy reform team leaders, which, when adopted can eventually help to guide and shape any reform process (*ibid*). Rumball et al. (*ibid*) go on to argue that initiatives endorsed by an academic board receive a relatively higher profile and greater engagement across the institution.

2.7 Policy Implementation

The distinctive characteristics of policy implementation make it clear that team leaders need to establish a way of thinking about how to manage the process. Nevertheless, if we consider Kogan's (1975) assertion that policymaking entails the "authoritative allocation of values" (p.55), we may wonder on what criteria such values are based; are there some values that are not allocated, perhaps those that lack authority? These are genuine questions that can be associated with Ball's (1990) assertion that "policies are statements that project images of an ideal society" (p.3). It is common knowledge that a typical society consists of a number of classes of power, and those at the top of the societal ladder wield more power than those at the bottom. This generalization is corroborated by Prunty (cited in Ball, 1990) when he argues that "the authoritative allocation of values draws our attention to the centrality of power and control in the concept of policy" (p.3).

Sikwibele (2003) develops a framework to help policy disseminators and implementers understand and navigate the complexities associated with policy implementation. This model divides the process into six roughly sequential tasks: this is precisely counter to the model of power discussed immediately above – the idea of linearity implies a structural account and is different from Ball's more fluid model -

- Legitimizing: engagement of the organization's members to drive the policy forward. An important product of this task is the emergence of a well-regarded 'policy champion' (an individual or group committed to the policy) to lead the subsequent implementation task.
- Constituency building: a process whereby active support is sought from groups that see the proposed reform as desirable or beneficial.
- Resource accumulation: ensuring that present and future human resources are sufficient to support policy implementation requirements.
- Organizational design and structure: the shaping of the objectives, procedures, systems and structures of the department responsible for developing and implementing policy.

- Mobilizing action: builds on the favourable constituencies assembled for the policy (Task 2) and marshals their commitment to engage in concrete effort to bring about change.
- Monitoring impact: as the final stage of policy implementation,

Policy implementation is the most important stage of the policy lifecycle, which, tellingly, requires a high level of commitment and dedication on the part of stakeholders who are by default the actual implementers of reform. Yet, as Sabatier (1991) notes, stakeholders cannot commit themselves to a policy that they know very little about. For example, Ball (1990) cautions that a lack of proper policy definition and preparation may lead to problems in future stages, particularly if there are 'conservatives' or 'doubters' on the team (p.30). Quoting the example of the early stages of education policymaking in the UK, Ball (op. cit) contends that hitches in the implementation process can make room for some stakeholders – particularly those who disregard the niceties of the policy development process – to digress from the mainstream agenda. This calls for proper awareness and the orientation of all stakeholders to prepare them for their roles.

According to O'Toole (2002), although policy implementation no longer frames the central concern of public management or policy, some commentators have debated appropriate steps for its revitalization. Indeed, policy implementation continues to be a concern to many scholars, while they may not address implementation per se and understandably approach from very different positions to public administration professionals (Hill & Hupe, 2002). In the view of these authors, "There must be something out there that acts as a curtain raiser prior to the actual implementation process; otherwise there would be nothing to move forward in the process of implementation." Such a contention leads to the suggestion that policies should always be accompanied by both goals and the means of achieving them (Osborne, 2003a). Furthermore, goals not only facilitate the actual implementation process, but play a central role when policies are evaluated to determine their impact (Local Government, 1999).

However, it is worth noting that the process of implementing new policies, particularly when they are technological in nature, can be overwhelming (Trucano, 2006). Many people yearn for change but when it comes to its actualization, they tend to shy away or even grow weary in the course of the pursuit of such change (Agyepong & Djei, 2008). In reaction to this observation, O'Toole (2002) argues that in order to increase the chances of successfully implementing technological innovation and ensure that the implementation process does not veer from its course, implementers should conduct evaluation exercises at closely punctuated intervals of, say, six months. In my view this helps to identify any implementation challenges for redress.

In assessing political and economic reform in developing nations, Grindle and Thomas (1991) advocate a pluralistic approach to understanding, interacting with, developing, and implementing policies. The authors argue that although technically, policy reform requires the conventional procedures of development, implementation and evaluation, there is a need among proponents of change to acknowledge that such innovation tends to be as political as it is technical (*ibid*). In this regard, Grindle and Thomas (*ibid*) note that eminent personalities – perhaps those with influence in society – can make a huge impact on policy reform, particularly when it comes to shaping social opinions, agendas, and voting patterns. Therefore, their services should be fully utilized when policy reform is initiated. Indeed, in most developing nations, such eminent personalities are the very people who in most cases are charged with the responsibility for initiating and developing policy reform (*ibid*).

The views of Grindle and Thomas (*ibid*) touch on three key aspects of the policy lifecycle: the “environmental context of reform, the agenda setting circumstances, and the policy characteristics” (Agyepong & Adjei, 2008, p.151). Indeed, these three elements may be considered to constitute the conventional policy framework that should be utilized regardless of the nature of the reform being implemented (Agyepong & Adjei, *op. cit.*).

In their study of policy reform in the Ghanaian health sector, Agyepong and Adjei (*op. cit.*) found that most innovators tend to put too much effort into the

technical aspects of the process, neglecting the political dimension, which comprises:

analyzing, understanding and factoring into attempts to reshape or change policy, the complex historical, social, cultural, economic, political, organizational and institutional context; actor interests, experiences, positions and agendas; and policy development processes that influence policy and programme choices (p.150).

Similar interplay between technical and political factors in shaping policy reform is identified by Glassman et al. (1999) in their analysis of health policy reform in the Caribbean nation of the Dominican Republic. For their part, Walt and Gibson (1994) argue that too much emphasis on the traditional aspects of policy reform may jeopardize the successful achievement of envisaged goals. In using the phrase 'traditional aspects', Walt and Gibson refer to technical elements, such as the evidential research informing policy decisions and the programmes subsequently implemented. In this regard, it is argued that policymakers and implementers alike should maximize stakeholder participation through the dissemination of critical information (both technical and political) about the envisaged policy reform (ibid). As Agyepong and Adjei (2008) assert, by means of such a strategy, reform-minded individuals may be equipped with the necessary tools for manoeuvring "within the challenges of the environmental context, agenda setting circumstances, and policy characteristics of reform" (p.151).

A number of factors have been cited as determinants of successful policy implementation in tertiary education institutions and/or systems (Girdwood, 1999). Such indicators may vary from one country to another depending on cultural factors, and the prevailing national, regional and international socio-political and economic situation (Osborne, 2003a). For example, in a study that evaluated the success of the Ghanaian higher education system in general and the government's Tertiary Education Policy in particular, Girdwood (1999) found that among the many determinants of successful implementation of education policy, the following were the most pertinent:

1. The breadth and complexity of the policy agenda, particularly where Ghanaian policy concerns extended beyond the priorities established by the Tertiary Education Project
2. Desired sectoral development objectives, and the Government's ability to finance or prioritise these
3. The structural constraints impeding implementation, including administrative capacity and resource allocation mechanisms
4. Emerging political processes, and the transition from a military to a civilian government (and the consequent need for Government to respond more visibly to the competing demands of civil society)
5. Closely related to this, the evolving relationships between the Government and the tertiary education sector, which led to the continuing testing and redefinition of institutional and sectoral autonomy (p.2)

Nevertheless, there are other conventional policy implementation determinants that obtain in all forms of policy reform, and which can be applied to the tertiary education sector to enhance the probability of successfully implementing education reform. According to UNESCO's (2004) recommendations, if any education system is to achieve its envisaged goals it must be seen to fulfil the interests of all the people it is mandated to serve. This is because no education system can claim to meet the conventional quality standards posited by Harvey (cited in Leu & Prince-Rom, 2006) if it does not make its services available to its various stakeholders in a completely impartial fashion.

2.7.1 Impact of Policy Reform on Organizational Management

Although policies can be rated based on degree of acceptability to stakeholders, it is important to acknowledge that there are no good or bad policies (Local Government, 1999); those that attract a wide following are normally perceived to be good while those that are unpopular are considered to be bad. Perhaps this is because policies are not to be made in a vacuum; rather, they are to be formulated in close consultation with stakeholders (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002). Policymakers normally draw up work schedules and strategies based on the views of both junior and senior stakeholders. In the case of institutions of higher

learning, the relevant bodies (the senate and governing council) seek the views of subordinate academic and administrative staff in order to produce good policies (Osborne, 2003b; Trucano, 2006).

Policies that command a wide following and are thus perceived as 'good' have a huge positive impact compared to those with a lower following, particularly when it comes to the implementation stage of the cycle (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002). Clearly, if there is a sense of ownership on the part of stakeholders, policy reform is most likely to succeed as forces will be channelled in a single direction; as opposed to a situation in which there is discontent, and forces are factionalized and driven in opposing directions.

Good policies should also enhance the equitable distribution of valuable resources to all interested parties without discrimination (Local Government, 1999). In short, policies that enhance equity of purpose and do not impose or force some stakeholders to put up with unfavourable situations are considered to be good (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002). In this regard, policymakers should ensure that they not only listen to the voices of the majority of stakeholders but also learn to give the minority a chance. Perhaps this feat can only be achieved if organizations are mindful of the bill of rights and due process provisions enshrined in almost all national constitutions. This is crucial point, in my view, since those policy regimes which define things for everyone when not all people are the same and thus have different needs – are designing in the further embedding of that difference as inequitable

In a slightly different vein, policymakers should endeavour to solve existing problems through policy reform because the integrity or untrustworthiness of a new policy is normally judged on its ability to address the shortcomings it was designed to overcome (Local government, 1999). To achieve this feat (the solution of existing problems), new policies should be accompanied by clear-cut goals and objectives as well as the methods of implementation and evaluation (Sabatier, 1991).

It is only wise to reason that policymakers should craft more than one method of implementing a new policy as a means of mitigating unforeseen problems as well as a way of increasing the probability of solving the problem(s) for which it was designed. These different implementation measures should also be accompanied by various evaluation mechanisms and, most importantly, means should be put in place to evaluate the impact of decisions that affect the overall implementation process (Aryee, 2000). This is because, good policies are characterized by the extent to which they can withstand unforeseeable challenges and still accomplish set goals (Local Government, 1999).

2.8 Policy Reform in a Tertiary Education Context

The previous sections of this chapter have tackled policy reform largely from a broad perspective. However, given the nature of the study, it is imperative to narrow the scope to review the existing literature on policy reform from a higher education viewpoint. Although policy reform in a higher education context has undeniably been referred to above, such cases were clearly limited to expounding on points raised while reviewing the phenomenon in general. Thus, this section is limited to the relevant literature that tackles policy reform specifically in the higher education sector.

In relation to Ghana and Africa in general, Morley et al. (2010) asserted that, while scholarship on African higher education is increasing (Kwesiga, 2002; Manuh *et al.* 2007; Mkude *et al.*, 2003; Morley *et al.*, 2005; Teferra and Altbach, 2004), there is still an absence of policy-oriented and cultural sociology in African higher education. Although Newman (2000) asserts that, in Ghana, institutions of higher learning invested heavily in policy reform, yet Morley et al.'s research in Ghana and Tanzania found several policy gaps. They assert that "there seemed to be a gap between policy intention and policy implementation in relation to quality assurance" (Morley *et al.*, 2010:36). According to Morley et al. staff in universities expressed concern about lack of monitoring and accountability, arguing that "Government led Quality Assurance procedures were cited as monitoring mechanisms". In terms of accountability, Morley *et al.*, found that it has been "mainly conceptualised in relation to the state, rather than to consumer groups" (ibid).

Similarly, Morley (2003) argued that policy reforms often fail to be intersected with quality assurance procedures. In terms of equity they argued that equity initiatives frequently remain at the level of aspiration in many national locations. In terms of monitoring and evaluation, Morley et al. and other researchers argued that policies are not accompanied by strategic action plans and effective evaluation procedures (Deem et al., 2005). The effect Morley et al. identified is that

The lack of systematic attention to monitoring and accountability, including the analysis of performance data, the poorly developed management information systems and the reliance on impressionistic evaluation raise questions about the nature of structured interventions to support students to achieve and complete their programmes ... it is uncertain who is at risk, and what kind of support is required. (Morley et al., 2010:40)

In his paper that highlights policy reforms that tertiary institutions in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) should undertake to enhance the efficiency and quality of their programmes, Bollag (2004), contends that policies should be formulated in a manner that fulfils the following critical functions: “a) improve quality, b) increase efficiency; c) change output mix; d) increase participation in the financing by beneficiaries and their families” (p.i). Given that the stakes are high in arguments for public or private or mixed provision Bollag’s recommendation opens up wider political questions about higher education. In terms of policy development, however, this view implies that policy development and implementation should not occur in a vacuum. It suggests that policy development in tertiary institutions should be linked to the achievement of the goals of the institution. It calls for a careful analysis of the impact of higher education policy on graduate output, opportunities for equitable access and institutional quality in terms of value for money.

Bollag’s (2004) analysis of the future of tertiary education among African states, argued that contemporary tertiary institutions have made tremendous progress in freeing themselves from traditional policies as they struggle to remain relevant and competitive in the face of the inherently dynamic social challenges of the 21st century. Also, other writers argued that there is clear evidence that

tertiary education sector policy reform in SSA has been manifested as diversification, modernization and innovation whereby redundant policies have been scrapped and more responsive ones installed in their place (Leach et al. 2008; Osborne, 2003a; 2003b; Trucano, 2006). This would suggest that a lot of policy changes are happening within the higher education sector. Yet, as noted above, the most recent arguments of Morley et al. (2010) indicate that policy gaps persist. This does not seem to be only a developing country problem as literature on higher education in the developed world is replete with (claims of the feminisation, including the feminisation of teaching and learning; complexities of gendered formations, learner identities and pedagogical experiences (Burke and Jackson, 2007; HEPI, 2009; Leathwood and Read, 2009; McLean, et al., 2011).

In terms of the manner in which different countries and institutions have fared in respect of these core policy areas, there has generally been remarkable improvement across the developed and developing economies divide (Johnstone et al., 1998). Indeed, the authors go on to note that the last three decades – beginning in the 1990s – have been characterized by increased access to tertiary education among traditionally marginalized groups such as women and those from economically disadvantaged regions (Johnstone et al., *ibid*). Johnstone et al. (*ibid*) further argue policy changes have facilitated a shift in the economic pattern of institutions of higher learning from publicly funded tertiary education, to cost-sharing programmes, to purely private funding. This has both improved equity and yet has other elements that depress aspects of equity. What is important, to note is that Morley et al (2010) advised that access is a very limited way to consider equity. In their view, access should include the nature of experiences and outcomes – degree successes, access and success in labour markets and of course completion and progression within higher education.

Trucano (2006) asserts that most higher education institutions have improved their library facilities to accommodate increasing numbers of students, diversified academic programmes, and sought to accommodate advances in IT. In the same vein, Shapiro (cited in Ball, 1990) opines that in reaction to such

progress, there has been increased activity among institutions of higher learning in putting in place the necessary structures to facilitate the purposeful inclusion of IT in the academic/faculty domain, as well as in the general delivery of instruction and the evaluation of products.

Morley et al. (2010) argued that widening participation policies had increased the participation rates of students but crucially noted that not all have benefitted equally. Badu and Loughridge (1991) agree that 21st century institutions of higher learning have indeed improved their financial management structures in line with changing economic patterns. They argued as Johnstone et al. (1998) did that, financial management has recently been a central concern in policy reform debate, perhaps due to the exponential growth that many higher education institutions have experienced in recent years on account of public pressure to increase their student admission capacity.

In terms of the proper management of available human resources, Bollag (2004) assert that successful institutions of higher learning are those where an essential component of the policy reform process is the active engagement of all stakeholders. Bollag argued that institutions which express their willingness to incorporate the views of a wide range of stakeholders “have often found a willingness on the part of donors and multilateral organizations to provide additional funding to support specific elements of these strategic plans” (p.2).

In terms of institutional capacity to manage policy reforms, Johnstone et al. (1998) argued that there is immense growth in the scope and capacity of institutions of higher learning in almost all core policy reform areas, but most importantly in the area of finance and administration. Interestingly, such growth is not discriminatory in respect to the socio-political and economic capabilities of a country and/or region. Johnstone et al. (1998:2) contend that higher education has traditionally been and continues to be perceived as “a repository and defender of culture, an agent of change in this culture, an engine for national economic growth, and an instrument for the realization of collective aspirations”. Thus all nation states are keen in policy questions in their higher learning

systems, perhaps due to the perceived socio-political and economic benefits that education sector growth can bring.

Gibbons (1998) argues that the policy reforms witnessed in many tertiary education sectors across the globe have been occasioned by a need to respond to the reality that higher education institutions are no longer the sole providers of knowledge, as there are many other resources just as capable of generating and disseminating knowledge in a contemporary and increasingly technologically competent world. In other words, policy reform (whether academic or otherwise) is invariably a matter of 'do or die' for tertiary education institutions, particularly in a knowledge economy era in which demand for higher education has grown exponentially (Muller, 2001). Reforms have become more important in context of intense competition for students, global mobility of labour and the international ranking of higher education institutions (Stockley, 2011).

On the other hand, according to the findings of a report by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2004), many institutions of higher learning have implemented a number of policy reforms over the years in reaction to a crisis that can best be described in terms of three determinants of financial constraint, diversified provision of education programmes, and increased student enrolment. For example, rising student numbers have been experienced in combination with reduced revenue due to dwindling government funding. Institutions have had to come up with income-generating initiatives such as the parallel degree programme, the inauguration of distance learning courses, and the expansion of degree options (UNICEF, 2000).

Analysis of globalisation and international student mobility suggests that this underplays the way that the economic orders of advanced capitalism – neo-liberalism – has sought to maximise its case for accumulation of profits by deregulating markets in Europe and in diversifying into Higher Education as a new source of profits (Shields and Edwards, 2010; Shields, 2013). One analysis suggested that strong colonial affinities are creating hubs where UK and other countries have become centres of higher education for students from former

colonies (Shields and Edwards, 2010). I would argue in that regard that, higher education in the global south, as in other aspects of global relations, is increasingly being shaped by and in its turn is shaping the global north as two 'blocs', so to say, which permeate each other via networks of institutions, people, policies and practices.

Also, it has been argued that policy reforms should usually aim at refocusing an institution's mission and vision statements, with a view to adjusting them to the contemporary and envisaged developmental needs of the country and/or region (Bloom et al, 2001).

The university must become a primary tool for Africa's development in the new century. Universities can help develop African expertise; they can enhance the analysis of African problems; strengthen domestic institutions; serve as a model environment for the practice of good governance, conflict resolution and respect for human rights, and enable African academics to play an active part in the global community of scholars (Bloom et al, 2001).

The argument above requires policies that help to streamline overall institutional management, as well as the relationship between academic institutions and their immediate communities (Osborne, 2003b). From another viewpoint, governance policy reforms can help an institution tie up any loose ends where efficiency in the realms of professional and/or vocational training is concerned, particularly in respect of prevailing labour force needs (Leach et al., 2008). Reform in the area of governance is aimed at enhancing institutional autonomy, and aligning an institution to other ancillary bodies, such as international tertiary institutions; collaborative and/or supportive services; and student transfer and research and development programmes (Osborne, 2003a).

Another critical policy area for institutions of higher learning is human resources management. As Johnstone et al. (1998) assert, such institutions should endeavour to enhance autonomy in the core human resource management area of payroll administration in terms of all their employees but, most importantly, with regard to academic staff. Again, institutions should be free to create employment positions dependent on need rather than a situation in which they are determined by national remuneration boards and/or public

service commissions. Such autonomy should be accompanied by the power to design promotion and/or employee development programmes, perhaps based on best sector-wide practice or even institution-led strategies as long as they do not violate prevailing labour laws (Salmi, 1992). In collaboration with national and international employee disciplinary conventions, institutions of higher learning should also put in place a mechanism that clearly outlines the expected minimum employee code of conduct in order to enhance the proper utilization of human resources, while at the same time maximizing the smooth running of academic programmes (Bollag, 2003).

Academic and faculty policy reforms are expected to conform to dynamic national, regional, and international labour requirements; to this end, institutions of higher learning are expected to ensure that they have proper mechanisms in place that allow for selective student enrolment drives (Salmi, 1992). To achieve this, Salmi advised institutions to liaise with national, regional and international labour organizations to get a clear idea of what professional and vocational courses are in demand. In this regard, Newman (2000) asserts that tertiary institutions will be in the best position to concentrate their efforts on courses according to marketability and relevance in meeting local and global labour demand by liaising with range of labour organizations. The point here is that higher education policies are essentially worthless if they do not ultimately contribute to the production of students who will be useful to society as a whole in more concrete terms.

In reference to distance education policy for example, Salmi (1992) argued that another way of meeting the demand for marketable courses is by enhancing flexibility, particularly with regard to students who are in full-time employment, as well as among women, who have traditionally been neglected in terms of the development of courses that suit their private commitments as mothers and homemakers. Salmi's argument is that higher education institutions could adopt policies that ensure that open distance learning centres are cited near residential areas to make it ease physical accessibility for women. I would argue, based on my personal knowledge of things in UEW, this is the driver of

UEW's distance education programme although there is not a strict/written policy position on this.

According to Sawyer, (2004) institutions of higher learning need to intensify their external relations efforts. In an era of globalization spearheaded by IT, it is suggested that universities and other tertiary institutions should endeavour to become proactive agents of international relations (Bollag, 2004). To achieve this end, there is the need to develop programmes that offer incentives to foreign students willing to enrol in local institutions. Needless to say, such courses should be taught in a variety of major global languages, such as English, French and German; and a further strategy would be to liaise with overseas academic institutions to facilitate the smooth movement of students, particularly those taking masters and postgraduate courses (ibid).

With regard to policy reform that addresses the application of IT, tertiary institutions could collaborate with experts and donors in order to ensure that courses undertaken by students in various academic fields correspond with local and international market needs. Most importantly, institutions of higher learning must endeavour to install modern infrastructure such as libraries equipped with internet-connected computer systems. They should also strive to employ adequately qualified individuals, ensure that existing unqualified staff members receive appropriate training, and that lecturers are motivated. Annan, (2000) contends that universities need to acknowledge that:

Information technology could be used to tap knowledge from the greatest universities in the world, and bring their learning to all. In fact, information technology can facilitate progress across a wide range of issues. In order to make the most effective use of these new opportunities, African universities must be strengthened, financially and technologically.

Although some (Garcia, 2014) criticise the Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) as a delusion and absurd vision to educate the world, it may be argued that the platform offers an important site for such collaborative ventures internationally and within Ghana. I would argue that the issue of IT infrastructure is a vital one for the immediate and longer term massification of higher education.

The World Bank (1994) report *Lessons of Experience* indicates that tertiary education reform should principally revolve around upgrading the academic and professional qualifications of teaching staff, developing the various degree curricula, enhancing student evaluation mechanisms, and improving critical facilities and infrastructure. In corroborating the aforementioned recommendations, Johnstone et al. (1998) postulate that if education productivity is to be increased, the following four requirements must be met:

1. Effective teaching, including good instructional techniques, but also utilizing appropriate resources such as libraries, laboratories, scientific equipment, computers, and internet accessibility
2. An appropriate curriculum, including content that is intellectually challenging, up-to-date, and appropriate to the mission of the institution
3. Effective learning, including appropriate student time-on-task and facilitation of the ability to focus and concentrate
4. An efficient managerial and administrative structure (pp.6–7)

According to Leu & Prince-Rom (2006), policy reform at the tertiary education level should not only achieve set administrative goals but also lead to the generation of well qualified graduates. They conceptualize educational quality using five robust indicators, which, he argues, have been in use for a very long time by a wide range of education systems. These indicators are “exceptionality, consistency, fitness-for-purpose, value for money, and transformative potential” (p.2). Further they argued that, the graduates of an education system may be considered to be qualified if they are able to successfully integrate into the community and use the skills and knowledge they have acquired productively. In this regard, policy reform should aim at enhancing consistency, be transformative in nature, and, above all, serve its intended purpose.

Similarly, in order to fully achieve the goal of providing tertiary education in an equitable manner, institutions should be seen to serve students from both well-off and poorer backgrounds. Moreover, if policy reform in this sector is to be

successfully implemented, institutions should be seen to promote the creation of more learning centres in close proximity to target populations (Kwapong, 2007).

Another critical element in successful policy implementation is the encouragement of stakeholder participation. As Cummings (1997) asserts, one way of enhancing the chances of successful implementation of education reform and, by extension, improvement of the overall quality of education, is by engaging as many stakeholders as possible. Such an endeavour is regarded by the implementers of United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Education Quality Improvement Programme, second stage (EQUIP2) (2006) as best achieved by seeking to enhance the quality of education from within the school, in engaging educators, students, parents, and the immediate community in all stages of policymaking. Additionally, Cummings (1997) argues that involving teaching staff as well other members of a school in community matters can be an effective method of handling policy reform. Such an inclusive approach goes beyond mere reliance on inputs and outputs from various quarters, as is the case in many policy implementation scenarios; rather, daily experiences witnessed at institution level should be harnessed to enhance the efficacy of education policies (Prouty & Tegegn, 2000).

2.9 Conceptual Framework

In seeking to critically assess how the Ghanaian tertiary education system has fared over the years, this thesis adopts a number of theoretical frameworks that have been utilized by previous studies. For example, Leu an advance “three conceptual focal points” for evaluating the quality of education delivered by institutions of higher learning (p.5). The basic elements, include 1) the examination of existing policies and strategic plans, and the progress made in the actual implementation of them; 2) the impact of such policies and plans; and 3) the interaction between different inputs to an education system (Muskin, 1999).

According to Leu and Price-Rom (op. cit.), one way of measuring the quality of education programmes and the research endeavours that ground them entails determining the nature of “the relationship between different ‘inputs’ and a

measure of student performance, or ‘output’” (p.5 [original emphasis]). In this regard, the output constitutes students’ overall academic attainment at the end of their courses, while inputs represent the quality of infrastructure and other resources critical to the smooth running of the institution.

For example, resources such as computers and other IT tools, textbooks, libraries, staff remuneration packages, sports facilities, and other pedagogical resources are all important in determining the quality of the education programmes offered by an institution of higher learning. However, the relationship between these two factors is just as important as each is individually. Indeed, proponents contend that education output is directly related to the quality of the inputs available: in short, institutions with efficient inputs unsurprisingly produce high quality outputs (Muskin, 1999; Osborne, 2003a).

However, I would argue that sometimes, there is also something about the culture and the imperatives of contextual circumstances that seem to override the input–output dynamic and speed up the learning process. For example, the commitment to education witnessed in Cuba cannot be said to be based on cutting-edge technology; it is rather the product of a society geared – albeit in an authoritarian fashion – to the promotion of equality, mass literacy, and the general education of its citizens (Ravsberg, 2013). It is about a collective redistributive project which has its serious downsides but equally the Cuban example suggests that relatively poor countries can develop and implement higher education policies in a manner that it will have popular support.

Another conceptual focal point regarding the quality of education programmes concerns the overall evaluation of the education system to determine its level of efficiency (Muskin, 1999.). In essence, the most appropriate way of evaluating the quality of education is by employing indicators such as the number of students graduating from a one level to another, say, from secondary to tertiary, or even from one level of higher education to another.

Other indicators may include the ratio of women to men enrolling in and successfully completing tertiary education, as well the ability of graduates to

obtain active employment in both local and international job markets. Indeed, as Leu and Price-Rom (2006) contend, evaluation concerns the outcomes of an education system as reflected in the productivity of successful graduates. This can be gauged by applying economic measures to estimate the return on education for graduates in relation to their academic and professional qualifications. Based on Cobbe's (1990) assertions regarding calculations appertaining to the economic cost of education, such a calculation is made by factoring in the income earned over a given period of time against the monetary cost of total years of schooling.

Thirdly, the quality of an education system can also be measured by focusing on the "content, context, and relevance of education" (Leu & Price-Rom, op. cit.). The proponents of this conceptual framework argue that the quality of an education system should be determined by the nature of the relationship between an academic institution and its immediate community; the quality of the relationship between various inputs at institutional level is also given great emphasis (ibid).

Moreover, it is argued that the quality of students' academic experience is determined by the extent to which the academic institution is willing to dedicate itself to instilling in the former recognized societal values, knowledge, and attitudes (Muskin, 1999). In this regard, it is held that tertiary education institutions which cultivate and maintain sound knowledge and character relationships with their immediate communities have a better chance of graduating students who can easily fit into and work towards the improvement of society. Such students are able to identify the community's needs, and to prioritize them with a view to utilizing knowledge acquired and exploiting available opportunities to devise problem-solving strategies (UNICEF, 2000).

In what seems to be an extension of the aforementioned focal frameworks, in a study carried out among institutions of higher learning in Scotland, three different policy appraisal models can be identified that are based on ease of acquisition as well as retention of what is learned. These appertain to "*academic* (raising entry qualifications); *cultural* (raising awareness); and

internal (changing institutional structures)” factors (Osborne, 2003a, p.13 [original emphasis]). These three frameworks not only improve access to tertiary education among secondary school leavers but also enhance the quality of their higher learning experience. For example, with regard to the first framework (the academic factor), students from communities with recurring poor performance may be enrolled in summer school to help boost their chances of gaining a place at university (Osborne, op. cit.). Again, universities liaise with secondary schools and help to prepare students for university entrance well before they complete their secondary education (ibid). Analytically, these strategies help raise awareness among secondary school pupils and their families, and the community at large in reinforcing the notion that tertiary education should not be the preserve of a few bright students but something that all secondary school leavers can aspire to (ibid).

2.10 Tertiary Education in Ghana

As in many other developing nations, the tertiary education sector in Ghana has gone through many ups and downs. Since independence, successive governments have endeavoured to mould the higher education system to fit changing developmental needs by employing a number of strategies, and Ghana has fared relatively well in terms of diversifying its tertiary education sector. In preparing for and gaining independence, the country established three universities, namely, the University of Ghana (UG), which was inaugurated in 1948 and located in Legon, Accra Metropolis District; Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), which was opened in 1952 and situated in Kumasi; and the eponymous University of Cape Coast (UCC), which was inaugurated in 1962.

These universities provided a wide range of courses to the young but rapidly growing nation. KNUST offered science and technology-related courses, while UG offered liberal arts as well as professional courses such as Engineering, Law, Agriculture, and Business Studies. On the other hand, UCC provided secondary school teacher training course in both science and arts-related disciplines (Kwapong, 2007). Drawing on the findings of a USAID-funded study on Basic Education Strategy Objective (BESO) Community School Activities

Programme (BCSAP) in Ethiopia, which declares that, “A better performing school is determined by improvements in the physical plant or increased enrolments,” Prouty and Tegegn (2000, p.6) conclude that in the early years after independence, the Ghanaian higher education system was indeed faring relatively well.

It can be argued that the programmes offered at these three universities were just enough for the young nation during the early years. However, they were soon rendered insufficient with the increase in demand for higher education from students following the realization that economic independence was directly influenced by the level of academic achievement as well as an increase in the country’s secondary school leavers (Girdwood, 1999).

In response to these developments, the country embarked on a number of strategies that included the creation of new public universities. Two such institutions were inaugurated in 1992: the University of Education, Winneba (UEW), and the University for Development Studies (UDS), Tamale. An additional institution opened nearly a decade later in 2001, that is, the University of Mines and Technology, Tarkwa, whose mandate was to help address the problem of increased demand for tertiary education and supplement the range of academic programmes offered by existing universities. The government also established several polytechnics and community-based colleges to offer professional courses to those not eligible to enrol public universities. A number of private universities and colleges have since been licensed to offer degree and diploma courses alongside public institutions as a way of mitigating the high demand for tertiary education in the country (Kwapong, 2007; Leach et al., 2008).

In terms of policy reform in the tertiary education sector, Ghana holds a position of respect among developing countries (Leach et al., 2008). Beginning in 1986, when the country initiated a major review of its higher learning sector, significant effort has been made to harmonize policy frameworks with regional and international standards. Consequently, according to the three conceptual models described above, it is fair to assert that the Ghanaian government-

initiated policy reform of the country's tertiary education system has been implemented in a visionary and coherent manner that goes a long way to meeting prevailing local, regional and international developmental needs. Reforms have centred mainly on improvement of the quality of education (academic and vocational), and enhancement of access to higher learning among the country's burgeoning number of secondary school leavers, with particular emphasis on those from underdeveloped regions and marginalized groups. It is noteworthy that considerable effort has been made in the field of IT as well as equality of access to tertiary education among such underrepresented groups as women and persons with disabilities (Girdwood, 1999). No doubt these policies are advocated in line with the prevailing notion that in the context of a strong and all-inclusive education system, effort should be made to ensure that flexible and efficient learning programmes are implemented (USAID/EQUIP2, 2006).

Nevertheless, it is only fair to acknowledge that these outstanding developments notwithstanding, the initiation and implementation of policy reform in the Ghanaian tertiary education sector has also suffered significant setbacks, some of which have been immense. Although there can never be a single cause of such obstacles, it is only fair to assert that on occasion, policymakers and sector stakeholders alike have failed in their core responsibility to skilfully juggle the political and technical aspects of policy reform (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002). Some of these setbacks are reviewed in greater detail in the next subsection. A good balanced commentary – comprehensive in scope.

2.10.1 Problems Facing the Ghanaian Tertiary Education Sector

With such an increase in the number of tertiary institutions in Ghana, one would be justified in assuming that the country has succeeded in accommodating the demand for higher education from its rapidly growing numbers of secondary school leavers. However, the truth of the matter is that the country is very far from achieving this feat. As the existing literature indicates, the history of policy reform in the country's tertiary education sector is littered with all manner of setbacks (e.g. Girdwood, 1999; Kwapong, 2007; Leach et al., 2008).

In reality, the expansion of the tertiary sector is far from meeting the increase in demand for higher learning, given that the current enrolment rate stands at only 2.5 percent of the 18 to 21-year-old age group, which is extremely low compared with the 30 to 40 percent average enrolment rate of the same age group in developed nations (Kwapong, 2007). Only about 32 percent of all students eligible to enrol on a tertiary education course were actually admitted to Ghana's five public universities between 1996 and 2001. Again, only about 54 percent of this group was admitted to the country's polytechnics and community colleges in the same period. From 2005/06 academic year figures, as little as 55 percent of eligible students were admitted to public universities, and 78 percent were admitted to community colleges and polytechnics during the same year (Kwapong, 2007).

Although significant strides have been made towards harmonizing Ghanaian tertiary education with national, regional, and international development needs, much still remains to be done. This is because, as with many other social sectors, the tertiary education system still bears the scars of the political chaos that was experienced in the country shortly after independence, and which continued until the late 1980s. According to Badu and Loughridge (1997), the Ghanaian tertiary education sector has yet to emerge from the chaos it experienced for some forty years, a period in which the country went through socio-economic and political turmoil. During this time, Ghana experienced a nationwide political crisis at the hands of successive military regimes that did not place much emphasis on education. Such governments not only neglected the tertiary education sector, but were also responsible for a barrage of other societal injustices that contributed to the general decline (ibid).

Overall, Ghana experienced three whole decades characterized by poor economic performance. Needless to say, this led to low budgetary allocations to critical social sectors, including tertiary education. It should be borne in mind that the country inherited one of the most promising economies in Africa and notably managed to maintain growth in the years following independence, with a gross domestic product (GDP) per capita income of USD 70 in 1960, a figure

that was even higher than that of the most prosperous developing nations such as Egypt, Nigeria and India. However, this trend declined sharply during the period of political instability, when the country's economy sunk to a very low level compared to what it had inherited from its colonial masters in 1957. According to Bollag (2004), the 1960s to the 1990s was a period in which many SSA countries fell on hard economic times whereby "regional output per capita dropped from about USD 525 in 1970 to USD 336 in 1997. Most primary commodities experienced drastic price drops while on the other hand the cost of imported (manufactured) goods went up" (Bollag 2004).

On the other hand, acting on pressure from donors, many SSA countries adopted new policy frameworks that demanded less funding for higher education and more for basic schooling, these governments were beginning to channel funds away from tertiary institutions to the basic education sector as a way of mitigating increasing illiteracy and poverty levels (Bollag, op. cit.). Some donors also reduced the amount of funding to higher education as well as the subsidies originally accorded to expatriates working as faculty members in African universities, prompting most of them to consider going back to their home countries (Bollag, 2004)

Consequently, a combination of these political and economic factors greatly impaired the quality and quantity of higher education in Ghana. As a result of reduced funding from the government, universities and polytechnics continued to operate outdated programmes in spite of rapidly changing local and global education demands. Institutions were also obliged to operate under reduced budgets, meaning that they could not procure vital materials and equipment, or even undertake necessary research on new policy areas. For example, the procurement and construction of critical educational materials and infrastructure, such as books, computers, IT facilities, furniture, lecture halls, and accommodation facilities was all lacking (Girdwood, 1999; Kwapong, 2007; Leach et al., 2008).

Moreover, Bollag (2004) asserts that following the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in the late 1980s, the quality of higher education in many SSA

countries fell greatly. Indeed, this socio-political development, which ultimately saw the disintegration of the Soviet Union, marked an end to the “generous scholarships” offered by the Soviets to many bright African academicians (ibid, p.3). In this regard, it should be noted that African students who were awarded these scholarships benefitted from the opportunity to study in the countries of the Soviet Bloc and aligned states such as Cuba (Bollag, op. cit.).

However, the abrupt end of such programmes created a shortage of highly educated Africans who could fill faculty positions left by the returning expatriates. No doubt this inhibited the teaching careers of many aspiring young university lecturers, as well as administration policy reforms already in place in many of the newly inaugurated institutions of higher learning on the continent. This in turn led to deterioration in the quality of tertiary education in many African countries, some of which were very new states having recently gained independence, and thus struggled to implement higher learning programmes without funding and expertise from Western donors.

With deteriorating higher education standards and falling economic capacity in most African nations, the majority of those who had benefitted of from international scholarships found themselves without meaningful employment when they returned home. As a result, many of them opted to move to developed countries in search of better jobs with more lucrative reward packages. Consequently, numerous African institutions of higher learning were stripped of critical local intellectual resources (Sawyerr, 2004).

To make matters worse, the salaries and wages of African tertiary institution employees were not reviewed regularly, which resulted in a deterioration in working conditions, low morale, high worker turnover, and constant strikes. Poor remuneration packages led to poor academic standards, as university employees (support as well as teaching staff) spent fewer working hours engaged in their official duties due to commitment to additional part-time jobs they were obliged to take in order to make ends meet. Absenteeism and widespread incidences of purely ‘technical appearance’ were very high during this period as there was little motivation for supervision, given that senior

university management staff were subject to similar low morale. To cap it all, the filling of vacancies arising through natural attrition or resignation never took place on a sufficient scale, which led to poor service delivery (Girdwood, 1999).

As a result of this continent-wide tertiary education crisis, student bodies in many universities and colleges in sub-Saharan Africa were involved in countless demonstrations against the apparent apathy of the authorities responsible for higher learning issues. In the case of Ghana, these demonstrations did not help to improve the way tertiary institutions were governed; in fact, they exacerbated the problem as the authorities resorted to crude tactics such as divide and rule strategies to quash them. For example, the majority of demonstrations resulted in the suspension, incarceration, or, at worse, death of key student leaders; the destruction of valuable property; and the closure of institutions for long periods of time (Girdwood, 1999).

Moreover, the prolonged closure of institutions led to significant disruption of academic programmes as well as an increase in the cost of education. Analytically, these riots only increased the government's fear of implementing policies that had been provisionally introduced, particularly those related to cost-sharing arrangements between universities. Furthermore, the protests put significant strain on existing consensus-building initiatives between universities and the political elite. This led to duplication of effort on the part of both the government and university leadership due to the environment of mutual blame that obtained, each side being suspicious of the other and neither wanting to negotiate before embarking on reform (Girdwood, 1999).

From a population perspective, Girdwood discussed, that the escalating population exerted a lot of pressure on the country's higher education system, and the growing number of secondary schools leavers increased competition for the few tertiary education places available. For example, a government directive to universities to absorb A-level students from two successive years saw the student population increase by 30 percent. Tellingly, this rise in student numbers was not supported by additional funding or even expansion of the existing infrastructure. Yet, on average, institutions that were designed to

accommodate 2,000 students increased their enrolment to 7,000. Consequently, there was massive disruption as university administrators were forced to implement ad hoc programmes to accommodate these huge student numbers (Leach et al., 2008; Girdwood, 1999).

The suggestion is that, as with many other developing countries across the globe, Ghana has experienced exceptionally high inflation rates. Consequently, the prices of essential education commodities have increased markedly, the cost of such widely varying items as books, IT facilities, building materials and foodstuff all skyrocketing over the years. This situation has posed significant challenges to institutions of higher learning that continue to operate with tiny budgets (Girdwood, 1999).

Given that a core element of contemporary education comprises the modern IT tools that are employed to generate, record, disseminate, and put information to active use (Bollag, 2004), it is clear that institutions of higher learning in Ghana are immediately at a disadvantage. Due to the fact that overall funding for universities and polytechnics is still very low compared to increasing student enrolments, only a small percentage of academic programmes are conducted via online learning technology (Leach et al., 2008).

From another perspective, over the years, Ghanaian universities and polytechnics have experienced problems of access to information. Indeed, based on Badu and Loughridge (1997), the greatest impediment to tertiary education in Ghana is the poor condition of library services in institutions of higher learning. Emerging from a period of poor tertiary education sector management, and the many policy interventions that have since been implemented notwithstanding, many institutions of higher learning have yet to put in place modern library facilities (*ibid*). A host of factors are responsible for this problem, including small budgetary allocations, student riots resulting in the destruction of libraries and their contents, and poor planning and management (*ibid*).

Moreover, as is also the case with many other developing nations that experience poor governance (Johnstone et al., 1998), there has been serious miscommunication between Ghanaian tertiary education managers and policymakers, particularly in matters related to the development of facilities and infrastructure (Girdwood, 1999). For example, there are cases in which facilities have been developed without previously conducting a thorough evaluation of existing physical infrastructure such as electricity supply, internet access, telephone line, sanitation services, and so forth (Leach et al., 2008). For example, Kwapong (2007) argues that a modern library which is built in a location that lacks internet access will not effectively serve its main purpose of storing and disseminating knowledge. In the end, projects subject to such mismanagement only end up exacerbating the problems they sought to address, as they consume valuable resources but are unable to meet the albeit worthy objectives they were designed to achieve (Bollag, 2004).

The curriculum followed by Ghanaian tertiary institutions is also rigid. According to the Education Reform Committee (cited in Kwapong, op. cit.), the country's higher learning curriculum still fails to accommodate everyone, the current system only offering limited opportunities to those who opt to combine study with their employment. This often creates tensions between work and education because people are forced to choose between resigning from their jobs and dropping out before completing a course of study; in most cases, they defer their education and concentrate on their careers (Girdwood, 1999).

Again, as with many developing nations, the Ghanaian higher education system does not create sufficient opportunities for secondary school leavers who are unable or do not wish to go on to tertiary education straight away but would like to return to their studies at a later stage of their lives (Bollag, 2004; Sawyerr, 2004). Moreover, there are very few academic or professional development opportunities open to those who do not qualify for university or polytechnic courses but would benefit from attending vocational centres. Equally neglected are those who wish to pursue life-long learning programmes, and even those who have suspended their tertiary education at some point but wish to pick up from where they left off at a later stage (Kwapong, 2007). Needless to say, all

these shortcomings combine to reduce the overall accessibility of tertiary education.

With regard to those with special educational needs, the Education Reform Committee (Leach et al., 2008) notes that the Ghanaian tertiary education system lacks sufficient facilities to accommodate students and staff with disabilities. This is a chronic problem, particularly in terms of older institutions that were designed without provision for the access of people with special needs. Although efforts have been made to upgrade older buildings, there is still much that needs to be done if equal treatment and positive discrimination policies are to be realized (Leach et al., 2008.).

Indeed, the government has generally done very little to accommodate the access of persons with disabilities to tertiary education, particularly in terms enhancing the smooth transition from secondary school; and the percentage of disabled students who graduate from secondary school and successfully enrol in a tertiary institution is still very low (Anthony, 2009). This situation ironically obtains against the backdrop of a policy framework that has been put in place to accommodate as many persons with disabilities as possible (ibid). Perhaps such a paradox arises from the undervaluing of the importance of educating persons with disabilities just as much as the allocation of too few resources to special needs in higher learning per se.

In developing countries, females are disadvantaged in almost all areas of life, including access to tertiary education as well as their gender impeding their ability for uninterrupted study (Plummer, 2000). Although it is laudable that the total number of students admitted to Ghanaian tertiary institutions has greatly increased, the male to female ratio remains strongly biased in favour of the former (ibid). Statistics for the 2005/06 academic year show that the male to female ratio stood at 65:35 in terms of university enrolment, and 70:30 with regard to polytechnic enrolment (Kwapong, 2007:66).

Again, it is ironic that this huge disparity occurs at a time when the government has put in place interventions to enhance gender balance, as provided for by a

policy of positive discrimination. Yet, it appears that most Ghanaian tertiary institutions fail to embrace equal opportunities policies, partly because there are far more qualified secondary school leavers than they have the capacity to admit. Moreover, the transition rate of girls from secondary to tertiary education is still very low in Ghana, due in the main to socio-cultural practices such as pressure on females to marry early or go out to work in order to support their siblings.

2.10.2 Mitigation Strategies

The GoG has responded in a number of ways in an attempt to mitigate the challenges facing policy reform in the tertiary education sector (Leach et al., 2008). With a view to better describing the driving force behind the reform that has engulfed the Ghanaian tertiary education sector, perhaps the commentary of Leu and Price-Rom (2006) may prove useful. With reference to education trends recently witnessed in many developing nations, the authors assert that, “Educational quality in developing countries has become a topic of intense interest, primarily because of countries’ efforts to maintain quality...in the context of quantitative expansion of educational provision” (pp.1–2).

Based on the policy recommendations of the University Rationalization Committee (URC), which was chaired by the then Deputy Secretary of the Ghanaian Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC), formed to examine the extent to which the country’s tertiary education sector had fared in the light of policies implemented to streamline institutions, and harmonize them with changing local and international development needs, a number of major strategy areas can be identified:

- Unification of existing institutions into a coordinated tertiary education sector, and the establishment of new bodies and mechanisms to provide systemic management and control
- Measures to ensure the system’s overall financial sustainability, including cost-recovery; cost-sharing with both students and the private sector; a norm-based approach to institutional management; and a new block grant funding mechanism

- Measures to improve the quality and relevance of Ghanaian tertiary education
- Significant expansion of the tertiary education sector as a whole to meet the demands of school leavers and the needs of employers, and to provide greater opportunity of access to those previously denied it (whether through poverty or gender); expansion to be achieved firstly, by upgrading existing post-secondary institutions to polytechnic or university college status, and secondly, by considerably increased institutional enrolment (Girdwood, 1999, p.viii).

These four reform policies have been pursued through a number of strategies that span the engagement of development partners; the introduction of cost-sharing programmes; the launch of distance learning courses; the launch of pro-development academic programmes; and the creation of further tertiary institutions across the major regions of the country (Kwapong, 2007; Leach et al., 2008). These strategies have to some extent borne fruit – as discussed below – particularly in terms of increased access to tertiary education, and reduction of the disparity between male and female students who both enrol on and successfully graduate from tertiary education courses.

The success of some of these strategies can be interpreted as the positive impact of policy reform in the Ghanaian tertiary education sector. This generalization derives its impetus from Osborne's (2003b cited in Osborne, 2003a) conviction that reform addressing the quality of education should ensure that systems enhance the attainment of "the economic imperatives created by global competition, technological change and the challenge of the knowledge economy, individual responsibility and self-improvement, employability, flexibility of institutions and individuals, and social inclusion and citizenship" (p.6).

Perhaps the most rewarding strategy the GoG has adopted to transform its higher education sector is partnership with international development agencies and academic bodies. As early as the years immediately following independence, Ghana sought the assistance of development organizations such as the United Nations subsidiary body responsible for education, UNESCO, the Commonwealth Education Trust, and a wide range of foreign

tertiary education institutions. For example, Canada's Simon Fraser University has been at the forefront of the implementation of distance education programmes since the 1990s. Other development partners such as UNESCO and Cooperation Development Partnerships have done sterling work in drawing up policies designed to assist in enhancing the smooth transition from secondary school to tertiary education, as well as expanding institutional diversity.

Driven by a need to address the issue of gender disparity in its tertiary education sector as well as the increased overall demand for higher learning, the GoG launched a distance education programme implemented through its six public universities for students in isolated and rural areas. This policy has already borne fruit, especially in terms of increasing the number of women in tertiary education and expanding higher learning access for its rapidly increasing population. Based on Kwapong's (ibid) contention that the policies of tertiary education institutions have the potential either to promote or hinder opportunities for women to access critical academic and professional training, while still attending to the responsibilities of the home and motherhood, it is clear that the distance learning programme has succeeded in at least partly redressing the gender disparity in the country's tertiary education sector.

Indeed, Plummer (2000) found that although disadvantaged by numerous duties at home, female students are more receptive to distance education because they demonstrate a greater propensity to cultivate opportunities to work closely with others (fellow students and academic staff). Bearing this in mind, various Ghanaian administrations have continued to work in partnership with the relevant stakeholders to implement distance education programmes, with female students – who for a long time have been underrepresented in universities and colleges – being the main target demographic.

In the present context, an all-inclusive study conducted among 400 distance education students of both sexes enrolled at UCC, UEW and UG found that 63 percent (252 students) enrolled on all courses were female while the remaining 37 percent (148 students) were male. Drawing on the findings of Plummer's

(ibid) study on the impact of distance education on both male and female students in Australia, it can be concluded that such a strategy serves Ghanaian female students better than their male counterparts.

It is interesting to note that in spite of the argument that young people who have the qualifications to access tertiary education are unable to do so due to lack of capacity on the part of institutions to admit them, the majority of the 400 students in this study were found to be young. This is an indication that young people are beginning to embrace a programme that they initially regarded as only targeting mature students.

Of the students in this study, 70 percent were married while the remaining 30 percent were single (never married, separated or widowed). Moreover, it was found that the majority of those enrolled were teachers working in remote schools throughout Ghana. The findings also indicate that 87 percent of the sampled group comprised teachers while the remainder were social and health workers, and self employed persons.

These data reveal that the majority of those enrolled on the distance learning courses in this study were employed with family and other social commitments. It may thus be inferred that such people are unable to meet the requirements of conventional academic courses, as these are presently constituted. Accordingly, there seems to be a great demand for flexible programmes that offer the opportunity to study at a higher level while at the same time attending to daily duties (Kwapong, 2007).

2.10.3 Reform Programme: The Tertiary Education Policy

One GoG initiative aimed at mitigating challenges facing the tertiary education sector involved the launching of a sector-wide programme – the Tertiary Education Policy (TEP). This was a nationwide reform agenda implemented by the GoG in collaboration with the International Development Association (IDA) in the late 1980s (Girdwood, 1999). The programme was initiated to address the following pertinent objectives:

To reverse system deterioration, falling standards, and declining quality of education; to expand access to tertiary education; to establish a stable and sustainable basis for the financing of tertiary education; and to create institutional capacities for quality monitoring and policy evaluation in the tertiary education sector (p.2).

The TEP was therefore a policy reform aimed at demonstrating GoG commitment to defining and successfully incorporating the tertiary education sector into a socio-economic and political arena. To this end, the framers as well as the stakeholders (the GoG and IDA) of the reform programme shared Harvey's (1995) vision of high quality education, which holds that for an education system to meet high standards it must be exceptional, consistent, needs-driven, transformative, and reflective of the amount of resources invested in it. The policymakers behind the TEP proceeded to represent these key quality indicators through rigorous planning as well as heavy investment of time and other resources.

These efforts culminated in a centralized tertiary education sector in which all the country's institutions of higher learning (universities, middle-level colleges and polytechnics) were brought together. Other notable changes were increased access to tertiary education for the escalating number of secondary school leavers. In this context, tertiary education was also scrutinized, and to some extent integrated, with both the "preliminary and intermediate cycles of education" (Girdwood, 1999, p.2).

However, a general observation of achievements vis-à-vis the objectives of the TEP shows that only minimal changes have so far been realized, and, as Girdwood (1999) notes, there have been glaring discrepancies between what was projected and the reality. Girdwood (ibid) goes on to argue that "slippage has occurred in a number of key policy areas [as a result of] disjunction," particularly when the whole programme is analyzed from a political and economic standpoint (p.3).

Girdwood (ibid) identifies the “longstanding policy agreement, and the acceptance of political responsibility for announcing new and unpopular measures; and the implied costs underlying policy decisions, and fiscal reality” as the main reasons for this shortcoming (p.2). This is no doubt a worrying trend given that no significant amendments to the TEP were implemented before 1999. This is a sign of policy ‘implementation flop’, whereby incumbent stakeholders continue to pursue completely different agendas at the expense of the espoused goals.

To mitigate such criticism, it is important to note that the number of students enrolling in Ghanaian tertiary education institutions has grown considerably over the years, a trend that has been facilitated through cost-sharing schemes and other strategies advocated by the TEP. However, projected government expenditure figures for sustaining such a large student population have not grown proportionally. Additionally, tertiary education institutions themselves have also fared badly in terms of honouring their commitment to the cost-sharing deal, as Girdwood (ibid) asserts:

[They] have complied only intermittently with agreed quantitative norms (there are no incentives for them to do so under current funding mechanisms, nor financial penalties for failing to do so), and the bodies which were intended to ensure policy co-ordination and quality control across the system (the National Council for Tertiary Education, the National Accreditation Board, and the National Board for Professional and Technician Examinations are greatly under-resourced, and function only partially, if at all (p.3).

This situation has evolved against the backdrop of an alarmingly diminishing overall share in the national budgetary allocation to the tertiary education sector, with figures (as of 1999) showing an estimated fall of between 3 to 4 percent from the 15 percent allocation it enjoyed at the inception of the TEP. By any standards, these are very low figures that could hardly be expected to finance a full-time equivalent (FTE) student through tertiary education at prevailing rates of inflation. Indeed, precise figures show that overall annual expenditure per FTE university student between 1990 and 1997 decreased from USD 2,500 to USD 900, while that of polytechnic students dropped from USD

180 to USD 74 over the same period. This is a clear indicator that the programme was not in any way sustainable (Girdwood, 1999, p.3).

What the TEP has initiated is a policy shift in higher education administration. The reform that it set in motion has worked in such a way that higher education institutions, particularly universities, have become largely autonomous in their governance: policy development and implementation (Manuh et al., 2006). However, there is hardly any evidence of research that explored policy development and implementation in higher education institutions. It is in this context that this thesis adds substantially to what we know about higher education in Ghana. The next chapter explains the methodology and methods I used in thesis' research process.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes methodology and the methods employed for data collection and analysis. The chapter is organised as follows. Section 3.2 explains my methodological stance – the ontological and epistemological understandings of *reality* and *truth* as adopted and applied in this study. Section 3.3 specifically discusses the research approach. Section 3.4 explains, presents information on the research design, the characteristics of research participants and the UEW component institutions involved in the study. Section 3.5 focuses on the research methods – interviews, observation and documents analysis – used in data collection. Section 3.6 explicates how I analysed the data. Section 3.7 addresses questions regarding ethics and reflexivity while section 3.8 presents the limitations of the study.

3.2 Methodological stance

Methodology is taken to mean the entirety of the research design including theoretical stances (ontology and epistemology) as well as practical concerns, whilst method is used to represent the specific techniques used to accomplish the methodology (Dunne et al. 2005; Pryor, 2010). From that understanding I conceptualised with Dunne et al. (2005:167) that the “research is a social process ...[with] affective dimensions alongside the practical, technical and methodological issues”.

The methodological position in this research is not to produce a monolithic universalising theory because it adopts a subjectivist epistemological approach that questions the notion of absolute *truth* (Usher, 1996; Creswell, 2003; Yin, 2009). *Truth* is understood as a product of discursive formations including my interactions, writing descriptions and explications (Schostak, 2002). So, in this research, I worked with the belief that *truth* (in this case understood as the knowledge I produced from the analysis of stakeholder perspectives and policy texts) is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of discursive formations (including my interactions) in the social research process and the negotiations taking place in the particular research context (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). I

conceptualised the context of reality and the interactions as being in a flux, being constantly (re)created through talk, representations and performances even as I interact with the participants.

Similarly, the research is located in nominalist ontology of social reality, as a product of individual consciousness or outcomes of the multiple interactions rather than phenomenon out there and separate from those involved in its construction (Bryman, 2004; Yin, 2009; Cohen et al., 2011). I conceived of *reality* (in this case referring to stakeholder perspectives on policy development and implementation) to be perspective bound - idiographic, contextual and subjective (Usher, 1996; Yin, 2009). I took Mander's (2010:252) view that "impersonal 'objective' social science research is inadequate to investigate complex social phenomena" because of my understanding of *reality* as "contingent, dialogic and context specific" (Dunne et al., 2005:172).

Therefore, I approached this research as *discovery* of "local actualities" (Smith, 2005) because I was interested in exploring policy development and implementation from the perspectives of insiders - people located within the institution (Smith, 2005; Denscombe, 2007). I applied the case study design because the research was more qualitative. The case study institution (UEW) was conceptualised as a 'field' where the regimes of social conduct (Bourdieu, 1990; Smith, 2005) implies being drawn into dialogic studies of different dimensions – structural, social and cultural - of local actualities that influence policy development and implementation (Smith, 2005). Thus the research approach interrogated policy development and implementation by exploring the contextual experiences of stakeholders in UEW. So, I considered the research participants as social beings located in a particular locale from whom I generated a mosaic of data that is largely influenced by their contextual situation, the conditions of my methodological knowing, and my insider and half-outsider researcher identities, which I will explain in the following section.

3.3 Research Approach

The approach to this research is mainly qualitative. Qualitative research approach is non-positivistic (Cohen et al., 2011). It engages with “diversity of subject positions” (Smith, 2005:9) where depth focused on gaining “insights into the sedimented, enduring verities” of the context, rather than coverage, is the recommended choice (Stark & Torrance, 2005:35). It pays attention to local actualities, imposing alertness and in-depth analysis that forces rethinking in the research process (Smith, 2005).

Application of qualitative approaches in social research dictates that people are studied in their own territory using multiple methods, which are usually through interviewing, observing and critical examination of policy texts (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Flick, 2006; Atkinson, 2007; Cohen et al., 2011). The approach privileges the significance of meaning to a person’s lived experiences; and, to the social processes through which these are constructed (Bryman, 2004; Cohen et al., 2011). The approach explores complex inter-relations within the spheres of official and informal processes or activities (Smith, 2005). Data analysis occurs through processes of thematic coding, analytical induction and deductive reasoning and explications of complex and multi-layered narratives (Silverman, 2010).

As such, a qualitative approach can comprise a focus on case studies, allowing the exploration of the visible, hidden and marginal aspects of social phenomenon or institutional life or the research issue to surface (Smith, 2005; Flick, 2006; Atkinson et al., 2007; Cohen, et al., 2011). The key reason for adopting a qualitative approach is that my research questions indicate I was interested in participants’ understandings of micro-processes of policymaking.

Also, the decision to opt for an exploratory qualitative methodology was based on the fact that, it seems more appropriate to explore stakeholder perspectives on policy development and implementation in UEW, compared to the use of a quantitative approach. Indeed, a qualitative methodology ensured that all key issues affecting a particular phenomenon, such as the critical stages involved in the ‘lifecycle’ of policies (Babbie, 2004). Moreover, based on Creswell’s (2003)

observations on the interview and case study, it was probable that a qualitative approach would offer the best data-gathering opportunities for the present study; given that the underlying research problem centred on policy development, implementation, and its impact on the management of Ghanaian tertiary institutions with specific emphasis on UEW.

Creswell (2009) asserts that an explorative qualitative methodology accords the researcher the right mindset in making crucial assumptions from the set of findings emerging from a study. In this regard, a qualitative research methodology is particularly apposite in highly interactive inquiries to facilitate the expeditious and accurate drawing of inferences, particularly if the researcher intended to bring participants' beliefs, values, actions and experiences to the fore (Cohen et al., 2011). In short, a qualitative methodology was best suited, given that I was keen to unearth some hitherto unknown effects of policymaking processes in UEW.

In adopting the qualitative approach, I sought in-depth understanding of policymaking in the study institution. This data will be presented in Chapter Four and Five. I used qualitative processes of sustained interaction: becoming immersed in studying policy texts that are organizers of policy making processes and reflecting on policy making within the institution; in interviewing and seeking participants' perspectives and meanings (Atkinson et al., 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). In adopting the qualitative approach, I explored conditions and experiences from the participants' perspective.

The qualitative approach requires complex analysis including inductive reasoning about the researcher being a reflexive practitioner (Dunne et al, 2005). This is more serious in my position in relation to study participants where researcher identity can either enhance or detract from the viability of the data gathered and hence the results of the study (Cotterill & Letherby, 1994). As a senior administrator who is also inextricably embedded in processes of policy development, dissemination and implementation within the institution being studied, researcher identity is extremely important because of ethical and legal issues that combine to create what Howard-Rose and Winne (1993) and Bong

(1996) call a 'social desirability response'. Social desirability response, in the case of this thesis, refers to a situation where the participants may not tell me what is problematic about policy making in UEW because of their awareness that I am involved in all policy making processes. So, self-disclosure (Schostak, 2002) in terms of how I empowered the participants to be able to talk back to me is central to this research, as I explained in section 3.7 of this chapter.

Also, I followed practices in qualitative research analysis, which rely on complex reasoning that moves dialectically between deduction and induction, tie the loose strands of the data to arrive at themes and meanings embedded in participants comments (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Silverman, 2010). I engaged with complexity, exploring beneath the surface of participants comments to understand things that they may be conceptualised as 'unsayable' because of my position within the institution (Schostak, 2002). I explained, more fully, how I wrestled with my insider perspectives in Section 3.7. The analyses as described in section 3.6 involved thematic coding, drawing on membership categorisation and critical discourse analysis. I privileged participants 'voices', sometimes quoting their comments verbatim, because I seek to bring their perspectives to the fore.

3.4 Research Design

This research seeks in-depth exploration of the "perspectives of people located distinctively in the institutional processes" (Smith, 2005:34) relating to policy development and implementation. This implies that I was interested in participants' personal understandings that are contextually specific to the specific circumstances of the ways policies are translated into the lives and understandings of the social actors at UEW.

As such I adopted the case study design to provide opportunities for in-depth analysis through a long dialogic process. Although Lisa (2008) explains that, there is a continuing stereotype of the case study as a weak research method - characterized by insufficient precision, objectivity or rigour - Fielding and Moss (2011:16) extol the value of "critical case studies" as contributory to the expansion of public discourse of education.

Case study involves empirical investigation of a contemporary phenomenon in its complexity to generate knowledge that can inform wider studies (Yin, 2009; Cohen et al., 2011). Case studies are typically, particular, descriptive, inductive and ultimately heuristic - involving interviews that offer insight into participants memories and explanations of why things have come to be what they are (Schostak, 2002; Stark & Torrance, 2005; Yin 2009). So, I adopted case studies for its utilitarian values - a science of the singular (Schostak, 2002) that can generate knowledge. In my view, case studies always require careful calibration of claims beyond the specific and they can suggest conceptual possibilities not claim to be certain of them.

In adopting the case study I examined the institutional policy contexts in all its complexity. I examined documents for immediate content and the values that such content manifests throughout the system of policy development and implementation. I queried the national level policy document from central policy maker, to local authority interpretation of policy and policymaking processes. I asked questions of each level of the system where the policy has come from as well as what it is intended to achieve (see Section 4.2 in Chapter Four).

This style of policy analysis, as Stark and Torrance (2005) suggests, makes it possible to derive data from well beyond the physical location of the institution of the case, and the case becomes not just one example of a policy *in situ*, in action, but the policy itself. In my research, this in-depth but broad level analysis suggested by Stark and Torrance helped to achieve the objective of generating knowledge that can inform wider studies of policymaking in the Ghanaian higher education system, and elsewhere.

3.4.1 The case study institution

The case study institution, the University of Education Winneba (UEW), was selected for several reasons. First, I have professional interest in conducting a scholarly analysis of policy making processes in UEW to understand concerns about the policymaking systems that I have part of for many years. This quest

was spurred on by the dearth of studies and academic literature on higher education policymaking in Ghanaian Universities. Secondly, in applying the case study, coupled with the limitations of time and my professional commitments as an administrator, I sought to study an institution where I have basic understandings of some the issues that can be questioned. I have also been aware of some of the existing gaps in policy making. Therefore, the analysis in this study is represent my version of 'truth' and cannot be the basis for the production of a monolithic universalising theory about policymaking in Ghanaian public universities and the higher education system as a whole. Whereas I have been very critical of my own administrative performance and systems process to which my daily work is intricately linked, I would not claim that I have addressed all the ways in which my biases may have constituted a barrier to researcher objectivity.

Secondly, UEW was selected for its multi-campus characteristics that make it possible to draw views from a wider network of people located on different campuses in order to bring together how their diverse experiences of policymaking speak to gaps and best practices. Although I did not analyse the views of stakeholders based on their location, in my view the selection of a university that allows the researcher to draw views from people in semi-autonomous institutions has utilitarian values. In my view, it enhances the diversity of viewpoints. For my professional practice, it allowed me to learn much from the ways that people in different sites experience policies emanating from a central location. As such I selected 5 participants each from the three component institution comprising UEW as discussed in sub-section 3.4.2.

3.4.2 Research participants

A total of 15 participants were selected for the study based on objective criteria. Those participants comprised senior UEW teaching staff (academic staff) and non-teaching (administrative staff) due to the technical nature of the study. Specifically, the participants were selected from among staff in management positions as follows.

Characteristics of participants	Frequency	%
Academic Staff	9	60
Administrative staff	6	40
Total	15	100

The participants included nine (9) academic staff constituting 60% and six (6) administrators representing 40% of the total participants in the study. They comprised five (5) Deans of faculties and four (4) Associate Professors who previously held senior management positions as Pro-Vice Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Director of an Institute or Dean of Faculty. The administrators comprised four (4) Deputy Registrars and three (3) Assistant Registrars who have a many years of experience in policy development and implementation at UEW. The disparity in the numbers of academic and non-academic staff can be attributed to the fact that there were usually more senior academic staff than there were administrative staff in the University. Also, documents that I was privy to (because of my position as registrar of the University) and examined prior to the selection of participants indicated that more academic staff were usually involved in policy development and implementation at UEW.

No of years experience in policy making	Frequency	%
3	2	13
4	1	7
5	4	27
6	3	20
7	5	33
Total	15	100

The data indicates that 80% of the participants have a minimum of five (5) years experience with policy development and implementation in UEW. All participants had more than two years experience with policy development and

implementation in UEW. Thus the participants were staff with substantial experience in senior positions at UEW, either in academic or administrative departments, who were capable of giving an intensive account of university policy practices. They comprised people in management positions and some individuals that have distinct experiences with policy development at the University.

Gender characteristics of participants	Frequency	%
Male	8	53
Females	7	47
Total	15	100

In terms of gender, there were seven (7) females and eight (8) male participants. As such, there were more males representing 53% than females representing 47%. The gender disparity between the males and females was not on purpose; but it may reflect the general disparity between male and female senior members in the University.

In terms of the principles governing selection of participants, I was influenced by the view of Leach et al. (2008) that, education management and policy formulation among higher education institutions in Ghana are mostly the preserve of senior staff members (academic and administrative), with junior employees only playing a peripheral role. Therefore, I also reasoned that junior staff might not provide the necessary information, given that most of them did not participate in actual processes of formulating and implementing policy changes which I questioned in this research. In that regard, it was reasoned that because most junior staff were known to remain with UEW for comparatively short periods before moving on to new and better remunerated jobs – perhaps after advancement of their academic and professional skills – they were unlikely to constitute an ideal respondent base in the present study's aim of examining policy making, implementation and impact. A combination of these considerations led to the decision to focus attention on senior non-teaching and teaching staff only.

Participants were selected based on length of service at the university, with one year being the minimum requirement but it was realised that all participants had more than two years' experience with policy development and implementation in UEW. However, participants were selected on the basis of their willingness to take part in the research project and, most importantly, their availability for the entire study period. Thus, expediency was generally employed in sampling, although it is important to note that no form of coercion was used. To identify suitable participants, records at the University's main campus, Winneba, were consulted, appropriate individuals identified, and their contact details taken.

It is prudent to note that I experienced some challenges in selecting study participants. Owing to the scarcity of resources, it was also determined and reasoned that a small sample was necessary. This decision was drawn from Ader, Mellenbergh and Hand's (2008) opinions regarding the size of an ideal study sample. The authors assert that a study sample should neither be too big nor too small; rather, it should be easy to manage and representative of the targeted demographic. This is so because a large sample may pose challenges to me, particularly during data collection, compilation and analysis processes, and could end up consuming a lot of resources.

3.5 Methods of data collection

Case studies usually adopt fieldwork involving the use of multiple methods of data collection (Flick, 2006). Data is collected through fieldwork (Yin, 2009). As such this section outlines the methods - how in-depth interviews and document analysis have been employed as methods data collection.

The method of empirical data collection for this study was the structured interview. Such an approach is in line with Babbie's (2004) contention regarding the gathering of data in qualitative research. , Fieldwork was initially carried out between May and June 2010, and crosschecked again in January 2014. Additionally, I undertook to review existing relevant policy materials. The latter were important as they facilitated the context framework for the analysis, triangulation and interpretation of primary data gathered through these

interviews. To allow for maximum retrieval of information, interviews were structured according to guidelines set by Creswell (2003) and Kvale and Britmann (2008), whereby both open-ended and closed questions should be utilized.

3.5.1 Interviews

The type of interview used to collect data was structured one-on-one interviews. The interview questions were open-ended so as to not suggest certain kinds of answer to respondents and to allow unusual responses to be derived so that both exmanent and immanent themes were explored (Bauer, 1996; Bryman, 2004). Immanent themes (such as perspectives on policy dissemination) emerged from the data whereas exmanent themes (such as stakeholder perspectives policy development and implementation) were overtly established prior to the beginning of data collection. Interviews were arranged with all 20 individuals in the sample, and were conducted face to face.

One-on-one interview sessions, explored participants' perspectives on policy development and implementation. The individual interviews were very rewarding. They allowed for two way engagements. The one-on-one interviews allowed individuals to 'confide' in me and say things that they might not have said in the 'public' group discussions. The main focus of individual interviews was to explore further the themes that were discussed during group interviews in a more 'private' and confidential, setting.

In conducting interviews, I was mindful of Bogdan and Biklen's (1982) stipulation that there should be a good rapport between me (the researcher) and participants (the researched), because an "interview is a purposeful conversation, usually between two people...that is directed by one [person] in order to get information" (p.133). In this regard, I always ensured that a relaxed atmosphere was established before beginning an interview. This was necessary as it is very difficult for an interviewee to divulge information if he or she is not in a mindset conducive to doing so.

Interviews were conducted using the straightforward technique of posing questions to participants and giving them time to respond; other than in situations in which participants were willing to complete interview items on their own. Even in such instances, I played a core role in ensuring that respondents followed the prescribed order in answering questions. In addition, I utilized supplementary prompts, particularly in instances in which participants required further explanation in order to understand questions more fully. As proposed by Blaxter et al. (2006), I also engaged the participants in brief meta-discussions about the questions. These exchanges were crucial as they helped participants reach well reasoned answers and also facilitated the expression of opinions in support of their responses.

The interview processes were faced with several challenges. The interview data were recorded using audio recording devices, which sometimes malfunctioned even when I tried to make sure that they were properly functioning prior to the interview session. Sometimes, interviews were re-arranged with some participants. As such, I took notes which I sometimes relied on when my when the recorder malfunctioned. The main challenge was participant's availability given that all participants are senior administrators. Time, as constraint was more pronounced due to the unpredictable work schedules of participants. I allowed the participants to determine the venue and location of interviews to reduce the risk "Manipulation or forced recollection" of data because, that "would constitute a violation" of participants' autonomy (Daniluk & Haverkamp, 1993:18).

3.5.2 Documentary data

The main documents studied for this research are the University of Education Winneba Act, 672 of 2004 and the University of Education Winneba Statutes (2008). These documents are the main policy texts, which contain directives on university policy development and implementation. Thus these documents assigned roles to the Governing Council, management and other stakeholder groups. My proposition is that these documents provided the basis for policy development and implementation.

The relevant issue that warrants the collection of documentary data is the view of policy documents as organizers of institutional life (Wright, 2003). The works of institutional ethnographers view policy documents as functioning to organize ruling relations within social institutions (Devault & McCoy, 2001; Smith, 2005). As Wright (2003) suggested dominant institutional culture is mediated by documents constituted externally but which form/construct relationships within the institution (Smith, 1987:3).

Thus I conceptualised policy texts as fundamental to understanding how ideologies are transported to extended social relations such as the engagement of people in policy development and implementation. I read the policy documents over and over to identify the policy practices (Wright, 2003) in terms of the degree of power allocated to different stakeholders. Therefore, I studied policy documents to understand how the privileged culture transports and allocated power to some groups and not others. I analysed the influence of various stakeholders in policymaking as discussed in the analysis chapters.

The process of studying documents was not a simple matter. I needed to glean the important sense making frames in the documents and to make sense of the policy provisions. As mentioned earlier, I read and re-read the documents trying to understand their policy implications for the different stakeholders in terms of who has authority to make policies. I also tried to understand the ways in which policies are to be developed; and, I tried to glean how the documents provided for stakeholders engagement.

3.6 Data Analysis

Qualitative research using interviews for data collection generates large amounts of naturally occurring data (Silverman, 2010). As Denzin and Lincoln (2005) assert, research that generates large chunks of raw data requires carefully coordinated and timely analysis procedures that allow the two processes of collection and analysis to be carried out concurrently. Accordingly, the data analysis in this study was begun as soon as data collection started. While I was collecting data, I was reflecting and thinking what the data was speaking to, discerning patterns and establishing categories that I needed to

explore further, and hence for ease of framing the strands/themes in further analysis.

Also, I followed Hsieh and Solomon's (2005:1278) idea that qualitative research analysis entails the "subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns". Also, I worked with Patton's (2002) idea that the process of analyzing raw data from interviews involves the singling out of key themes from a set of raw data and using these themes to extract meaning. So, after each interview, I produced transcripts. Then I engaged in a purposeful scrutiny, repeatedly reviewing the transcripts to identify how the comments speak back to particular patterns and organizing themes. Key comments pertaining to the research topic were identified and jotted down as memos (Patton, 2002).

Embodied in the analysis was task of interpretation involving continual reflection about the data to ensure that my identity as a senior administrator did not become a barrier to what Schostak (2002) calls *authorial collaboration* (including participants' voices in the representation of the findings). I needed to question my authorial visibility because of my status as the measuring instrument. In so doing, I realised that making meaning of accounts and experiences of policymaking require critical discourse analysis (van Djick, 2001; Cohen et al., 2011). Critical discourse analysis (CDA) involves critically examining policies, practices and researcher-researched discourses (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997; Fairclough, 2003, 2006). As Fairclough suggested, CDA involves systematically linking policy development practices with provisions in policy texts that set the context. It also involves interpreting texts and the language of participants during interviews. Therefore, in the analysis, it was my task to link three properties – policy provisions, the participants' perspectives and my personal insights.

Therefore, the analysis tidily written here involved negotiating meanings between texts and different participants view points. As may be observed from the analysis chapters, I usually quote participants comments verbatim, and run commentaries on these with propositions in the literature in order to make

sense of what, in my opinion, their opinions refer back to or gaps they highlighted in the literature. I needed to engage with the data (secondary and primary) to make sense of it; and often critically questioning the way it was being constructed by myself. I have had to re-write the entire analysis several times because there were several dilemmas, frustrations and puzzling experiences during the processes of making choices about how to frame the analysis. It was my task to make sense of policy texts; to reflect on the interview data; to make assumptions about the data from my theoretical standpoints. Sometimes, I had methodological confusions, and misapplied some theories in the process of linking data to theory. I have moved back and forth – from theory to data and from data back to theory.

In representing participants' perspectives, I needed to read and re-read several time before I could knit the fragmentary experiences into some kind of multi-dimensional whole. In Schostak's (2002) terms, this involves *multivocality* (textualizing the plural perspectives and voices of different participants) and the knitting of pieces of *narratives* (context-bound personal form of theorization). I needed *open-endedness* by dramatizing the tensions in data while presenting an organised piece using themes into which the various comments tumbled to produce a meaningful thesis that can be read and critiqued for what it is worth, encouraging the readers to form alternate understandings.

3.7 Ethics and reflexivity

My role as registrar had important roles in choosing the topic and facilitated the study in terms of selection of participants, data collection and the identification of gaps in policy development emerging from the analysis. In a developing country context, it has power dynamics positioning me as a senior University administrator who is seeking data from colleagues within the same system. It also meant that I was inviting people to express critical views on the processes of policy development and implementation that I have part of for more than a decade. As such, I had to work with colleagues at senior levels of University administration who could engage more with me without much recourse to power imbalances. Despite that, it is important to note that my position made it easier for me to approach colleagues for data collection. A junior officer would have

struggled to get audience with the category of people I interviewed. My knowledge of the statute facilitated the discussions and identification of the extant gaps in policy development and implementation highlighted by the data and its analysis. It had influence in the fact that they were willing and made time to participate in the study. Also, I used University resources to collect data so that the process was at little costs to me. Thus an effect of researcher status in this research is investable.

What I noticed is that ethics have significance for the empirical and “theoretical disclosure of the field under study and is not simply a problem, which has to be solved technically” (Flick, 2006: 230). It demands reflecting critically on the self as researcher; and the multiple identities that represent the fluid self in the research setting (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000: 183). It includes understanding myself as automatic part of the research, and explaining how I built that into the research strategy (Dunne et al, 2005).

I would argue that giving voice to stakeholders partly underlined my commitment to empower the participants in the construction of the text, while recognising my role as the thesis’ author who structured their views in order to present meaningful academic arguments. Dealing with the oxymoron includes presenting proof that my actions did not mediate the findings in a loop-sided way. Therefore, many of the ethical complexities I faced in the field were dilemmas related to how I questioned my personal values and how I negotiated power relations not only in data collection but also in the construction of the text.

I entered the research with the awareness that my professional roles, as a member of all policy making structures in UEW, can lead to questions about social desirability responses. So, I needed measures to ensure that the research did not constitute risk to the participants whilst still obtaining valid information. I had to negotiate access as an on-going multi-layered process (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995) by drawing on elements of empowerment in participatory action research (Stoecker, 1999). I had to continuously adjust my agenda and negotiate access by securing day-by-day consent/assent with due

regard to the individual agency of participants and the regulatory processes within the school.

Before data collection, prospective participants were given the opportunity to read an information sheet and consent form stating the research purpose. I carefully explained the purpose of the research to guarantee that the participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the research at any given moment and, that each one understood my researcher obligations to anonymity and confidentiality. I explained to each participant that participation in the research is voluntary and that they have the right to choose whether to be in the research or not. Prospective participants were allowed to ask questions related to the research purpose, the process of data collection and their rights and responsibilities as participants. Each participant came into the research only after they gave a verbal consent. Throughout the period of data collection, each participant was made aware of the right to withdraw from the research or to withdraw data during the process of data collection. The participants were told that they were free to contact me to express any concern without any penalty or fear of punishment.

The thesis' experience showed me that, one of the difficult tasks that researchers can face is how to gain access to participants who are busy people. A very complex ethical dilemma was the decision on the setting and timing for and of interviews. I was careful about how often I interrupted or disrupted the work life of the participants. This has practical implications for issues such as how many interview sessions, time of holding interviews, where to hold interviews and for how long. The decision had to be made together with the participants. Respect for participants, created situation where they could refuse to meet me at particular times for interviews. Given my status within the research institution, such actions including the idea that participants were active agents in choosing what they were willing and not willing to disclose, epitomised how I empowered the participants. I respected my participants because as Schostak (2002) argued, they were humans who have purposes - making judgements, forming opinions, and taking decisions.

Therefore, the question of ethics was not a simple experience in this research's process. I faced several ethical dilemmas, because there were chasms of distance between me and the participants related to positioning within the institution. I needed to approach interviews with great responsibility and sensitivity to the unequal power relations between me and the interviewee(s), to the consistent advantage of the former (Asif, 2001). I needed to build a bond of mutual trust and respect. Based on ethics of caring and accountability, I operated with the view Mander's (2010) view that listening to people's 'stories' as recalled by them, and their lived realities – is consciously not detached: the search for truth involves me (the researcher) and the researched.

Given that I was studying one institution where I am also a senior administrator presents several related and additional complexities. The decision to use pseudonyms in recording the data and in the analysis so that it will not be possible to link information back to an individual participant in any way interfaces with how much I can guarantee that I will not use my personal position against them in any way. I was conscious that potential readers in the university may attribute voice to certain individuals; and query how much I gave voice to the participants. In negotiating the difficulty I drew on Mander's (2010) advice to remain non-judgemental, and act in an accepting way as possible, to try to take no moral positions overtly or covertly. Throughout the research processes and the construction of the text, it was my task to exercise commitment to patience, willingness to learn from others and respect for views which I might not share. Also, I used thematic analysis instead of essentially presenting individual stories. This thematic analysis, in addition the use pseudo names, was vital in assuring confidentiality and anonymity of research participants. I did not reveal the identities (names) of the research participants in the analysis chapters or elsewhere in the text of this thesis.

The question of ethics also requires clarifying how I engaged with epistemological concerns such as: How the research question, the design of the study and the methods of analysis limited what was found; how the research questions could be investigated differently; and how a different researcher using a different epistemological framework could have produced different findings.

With my many years of involvement in policy development and implementation in UEW, it was my task to constantly on guard against allowing my personal beliefs and experiences to cloud the data and discussions because I seek to bring stakeholder concerns to the fore by projecting their voices. In privileging participants' voices during my analysis, I was aware that my research practice will produce counter-discourses that speak back to deficits in policy making and how processes of policy development and implementation can be improved. As indicated in the closing paragraph of section 3.3 and in 3.6, what I have tried to do was to privilege participants' 'voices' so that a reader of analysis chapters, get a sense that the data is actually coming from the participants and the conclusions are based on interpretations of their views.

3.8 Study Limitations and Problems

As in most social research projects, there was the risk that some participants might have been tempted to give untrue information, particularly because of my professional position within the study institution. Also, determining the genuineness of information provided in interviews was not an easy undertaking for me. I needed to read beneath the participants' comments to know what they are really saying given my insider characteristics, particularly my position as secretary to the principal policymaking bodies – Council, Academic Board and member of the University management. Despite that I employed a number of measures such as crosschecking of information in a second interview to enhance validity and reliability of the data, it must be acknowledged that the success of such strategies was to some extent limited given that there was nothing to stop a participant from reiterating an originally false account in a second interview. In this regard, I could only rely on the goodwill and sincerity of participants when it came to analyzing, extracting meaning, and drawing inferences from the data collected.

Also, I experienced significant logistical challenges, particularly in travelling between the three campuses of Winneba, Mampong and Kumasi when conducting fieldwork. Getting participants to attend interviews was also a substantial problem as described in section 3.7 of this chapter, perhaps due to

tight work schedules. This occasioned significant delays when I was obliged to reschedule an interview for another day or even another week.

Despite these challenges, I have collected data, made sense of it and produced knowledge that adds to the existing body of literature on higher education in Ghana and elsewhere. The following two chapters present the analysis and discussion of the data.

CHAPTER FOUR

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION IN UEW

4. Introduction

This chapter and the following chapters discuss policymaking and policy implementation in UEW in terms of stakeholder engagement. This first analysis chapter discusses how policy development is outlined in the University's policy texts, the perspectives of stakeholders on policymaking practices and how policy implementation is enacted at the study University. Chapter Five continues the discourse in terms of and the engagement of different stakeholder groups in the process. The discussions in both Chapters indicate my thinking about applying stakeholder theory (Brinkerhoff and Crosby, 2002), and to explore perspectives on improving stakeholder participation in policy development and implementation. Stakeholder is used here to mean anyone who may influence, benefit, or alternatively debate and enter into conflict with policy.

The data analysed in this chapter are mainly drawn from university policy documents and interviews with the principal officers. The analysis is focused on structural questions: What are the processes of policymaking in the University? Who are to be involved in the policymaking process? How can stakeholder participation be improved? The discussion is organised in three sections. The first section discusses the policymaking roles of people in different power positions (such as the Chancellor, the University Council, the management, the academic board and others) within the institutional hierarchy processes in the University. The second analyses stakeholders' perspectives on policymaking practices. The third discusses the perspectives of various stakeholder groups in terms of how stakeholder participation in policymaking in the University can be improved?

4.1 Policy development in UEW

This section begins the analysis of policy development by analysing provisions in key policy texts that guides policymaking. The key policy texts analysed are the University of Education, Winneba Act 672 (2004) and the Statutes (2008).

According to the University of Education Winneba Act 672 (2004:5) “the governing body of the University” is the Council. This implies that primary decision authority is vested with the Council. This is more explicitly stated in the provision that “the Council may provide for any act or thing in relation to the University which it considers necessary or expedient in its capacity as the governing body of the University” (p.8).

The Council is composed of (a) four persons nominated by the Minister one of whom is chairperson; (b) the Vice-Chancellor of the University; (c) a representative of the Ghana Education Service; (d) the Director-General of the Ghana Education Service; (e) a representative of Professional Teacher organizations; (f) four elected members of Convocation; one from each of the Colleges of the University; (g) a representative of the Teachers and Educational Workers Union; (h) a representative of the Alumni; (i) two students (one for under-graduate and one for postgraduate); and (j) a representative of National Council on Tertiary Education (NCTE).

The University of Education, Winneba Act 672 (2004:13) vests the Council with the authority to enact statutes as follows:

23. The Council may enact statutes for carrying into effect the provisions of the Act, and in particular to
 - (a) regulate the appointment, conditions of service, termination of appointment and retirement benefits of the staff of the University and for determining the persons who are the academic staff of the University;
 - (b) determine the persons who are authorized to sign contracts, cheques and other documents on behalf of the University, and to regulate the procedure in relation to transactions entered into by the University;
 - (c) approve the academic calendar of the University;
 - (d) ensure that the seal of the University is kept in proper custody and is used only by its authority; and
 - (e) provide for any matter which is required by this Act to be prescribed by statutes.

Given that the statute is the primary governing document of the University the Act prescribed the procedure for enacting statutes as follows:

24. (1) For the purpose of enacting a statute, a draft of the statute shall be circulated to the members of the Council at least fourteen days before the meeting at which the statute is to be considered.
- (2) After consideration at the meeting the draft may be provisionally approved either with or without amendment.

(3) The statutes as provisionally approved shall be circulated to the members of the Council and where in the opinion of the Council, the statutes affect academic matters, the statutes shall be circulated to the members of the Academic Board at least seven days before the meeting at which the statute is to be confirmed.

(4) A provisional statute may be confirmed without amendment at a meeting of the Council which shall be held within six months after the meeting which the statute was provisionally approved.

The provision above has several consequences in terms of Rumball et al.'s (2001) views on promoting collegial participation and responsibility in academic policy formulation. The provision may support greater engagement across the institution. First, it may be argued that it vests the Council with discretionary powers to adopt a statute for the University without consultation with key stakeholders. The provision does not require that the Statute is circulated among members of the University community – the management of the University, staff (teaching and non-teaching) and students for comments. Although it may be argued that these groups have representatives on the Council, there seemed to be a gap in terms of processes of consultation applicable in theories of stakeholder participation in policy making. What can be argued is that representatives of groups on Council may not necessarily be communicating the opinions of their groups, particularly where their individual opinions may be in conflict with their groups' position.

Second, the provision outlines only two stages of engagement – a first draft to be provisionally approved and a second draft to be confirmed within six months. This leaves little room for effective stakeholder engagement – iterations between members of the University community and the Council. For example, there is little information provided on how non-teaching staff and students are to be engaged in matters that are of concern to them. Brinkerhoff (2004) would argue that the provision does not contribute to the strengthening of democracy by encouraging more active involvement by communities and other stakeholders.

The third consequence relates to the engagements regarding academic matters. The provision, that the statutes shall be circulated to the members of the Academic Board at least seven days before the meeting at which the statute

is to be confirmed, has consequences. Although seven days is the minimum allowable time, it does not leave enough space for academic Board to schedule qualitative meeting to discuss the consequences of a matter relating to institutional statutes with the academic community in order to present an organised opinion. This leaves questions about the quality of stakeholder engagement in the policy development process. One question relates to the policymaking function of the academic Board as prescribed in the University's Act (University of Education, Winneba Act 672), which also requires that

(1) The Academic Board shall, subject to the powers of the Council

- a) formulate and carry out the academic policies of the University
- b) devise and regulate courses of instruction and study;
- c) regulate the conduct of examinations and the award of degrees, diplomas and certificates;
- d) advise the Council on the admission of students and award of scholarships and bursaries; and
- e) report on such matters as may be referred to it by the Council

It is difficult to discuss the effectiveness of the Academic Board in policy development given that the University of Education, Winneba Act 672, 2004 the Council seems to be the only legitimate policy making body of the University. The difficulty concerns broad acceptability of University policy given the suggestion by Rumball et al. (2001) that initiatives endorsed by an academic board receive a relatively higher profile and greater engagement across the institution. Alternatively a 'semblance of engagement' of the Academic Board in policy development implies that policies will receive relatively lower profile among the members of the academic community. This may be true given the composition of the Academic Board as stated Statute 23 of the University of Education Winneba Statutes (2007:10), which states

The Academic Board shall consist of the following:

- Vice-Chancellor, Chairperson
- Pro Vice-Chancellor
- Principals of Colleges of the University
- Directors, Deans of Faculty, and Dean of Student Affairs
- Professors and Associate Professors
- Heads of Academic Departments, Schools, Institutes and Centres
- Librarian
- Members of Convocation on Council who are not members of the Academic Board in any other capacity

- One member not below the rank of Senior Lecturer, elected from each Faculty by the Senior Members of that Faculty
- The Registrar shall be Secretary to the Board.

Whereas it is important to recognize the Council as where the buck stops, the significant question concerns the quality of stakeholder engagement in general. For example, as the University does not have a general meeting, and the Council has the final authority in policymaking, it is important to ensure that the Academic Board and other bodies and associations do not become a 'policy bypass', a ceremonial part of the policy superstructure that may be of little value in practice. Discussing the policy provisions in terms of the quality of stakeholder engagement is a question with no simple answers. The problem with the provision in the University of Education Winneba Act 672 (2004) is that it does not support quality stakeholder participation on several grounds. First, it is silent about how the Administrative Staff, students and other support staff should be engaged in policy development. Second, it does not provide enough space for the engagement of the Academic staff and define how the Academic Board to be engaged in policy development. A study of the University of Education Winneba Statutes (2007) did not reveal any significant provision on stakeholder participation in policy development except that Schedule A (6), grants the Grant Steering Committee the powers to "To formulate policy on programmes and project management in the University" (p.24). Therefore, it is difficult to glean the processes of policy development and stakeholder participation from University policy documents. Within this context, the next section discusses stakeholders' perspectives on policy making practices in UEW.

4.1.1 Stakeholders' perspectives on Policy development practices in UEW

The analysis in this section is framed in terms of the influences that various stakeholder groups have in policymaking at the university. It is discussed within the context of Leach et al.'s (2008) suggestion that the policymaking process in Ghanaian institutions of higher learning traditionally forces academic staff, junior staff, and students to adopt a peripheral role, and sometimes not to play any substantial part at all. The data is drawn from the interviews with the fifteen (15) participants as described in section 3.4.2 of chapter three. The key questions

explored to elicit data for this section include: How are policies made, who are involved, how are people involved and at what stage?

In terms of how policies are made one participant outlined the process as follows:

I was trying to say that their decisions [management decisions], most of them ... become policies and when [these] matters are sent to the Council for discussion and deliberations at the end of the day they will approve it ... but where certain issues come up during their deliberations and it needs further or thorough work for it to become a comprehensive policy they will delegate either management or they will ask the Vice chancellor to tell the management to look at it and bring a proposal. So a Committee is constituted then the committee will do the actual formulation of policies the nifty gritty and they will send it back to the Council for final either adoption or amendment of the policy (Participant 1, Male Lecturer).

The participant's comments seemed to have highlighted the vertical power relations that come to play in policy development. It bespeaks how policy development revolves around power and authority to negate Rumball et al. (2001) arguments about the principles of collegiate participation that help to enhance community participation and, in turn, ensure the ownership of policies. What is interesting about the comment is that policies originate as management decisions. The suggestion is that when management decision is challenged, it is presented to Council for approval. Where there are complex challenges to the adoption of the decision by management, it is referred back to management or the Vice-Chancellor to develop a proposal for the consideration of the Council. The argument is that it is under such circumstances that a Committee is established to work on a draft proposal for the consideration of the Council. Although this practice does not conflict with what is provided in the University of Education Winneba Act 672, it deviates from principles of stakeholder participation and democratic values propounded in Sabatier's (1991) assertion that policy development processes mostly succeed when policymakers actively involve stakeholders. Contrary to Sabatier's ideas and the stakeholder participation propositions of Brinkerhoff & Crosby (2002), the participant's comments speak of a domineering stance than an all-inclusive process of policy

development. Brinkerhoff and Crosby (2002) argued that institutional leadership does not benefit from a domineering stance.

A broad question that various stakeholders were asked was - How are different stakeholders involved in policy making? Regarding the participation of junior members in the University policy development, a participant commented:

I will say no, and at a point I will also say yes. Why do I say this? When it comes down from the senior staff to the junior staff level, I doubt whether there is that consultation, am saying this thing because at the Council level, they have a representative, but the Council is ... such that they say they... take an oath of secrecy, and because of the oath of secrecy, one wonders whether their representative at the council does not somehow have his hands tied to the oath of secrecy ... but for the senior members and the rest, whether you like it or not, a university is a class society, whether you like it or not, it is there. (Participant 4, Male Lecturer)

This participant's perspectives are informative given that the participant is a Member of the University Council; a Member of the Executive Committee; a Member of the Academic Board; and, a Member of the Strategic Planning Committee. From the participants' argument, the formulation of policy is done at Council level. The argument being advanced in the comment is that, although different groups within the University have representatives at the Council, it is not very easy to put a finger on how these component groups are allowed to seek their members' opinions to inform policy development. The existence of an oath of secrecy may not necessarily be blamed for the situation. The argument can be made that the participant is unaware of a clear process by which Council Members are allowed to engage or to consult with stakeholder groups in the processes of developing a policy.

The later part of the participant's argument bespeaks to the influence that various stakeholders have in policy development. The suggestion about a class culture prevailing where some groups (senior members) have more influence than the others (junior members) in terms of influencing policy development is made. The dangers of such policy making is highlighted in the work of Barton and Tomlinson's (1984) who argued that policymaking is not about indulging the most powerful stakeholders while disregarding those considered to be

inconsequential. As Barton and Tomlinson argued, it is often unscientific and irrational, particularly when one or two social classes are favoured over others. In terms of the policy reform agenda, the participant's statement about a 'class culture' concerning the influence that various stakeholders have in policy development, brings to the fore the consequences of not having clarity about clear democratic processes of stakeholder participation in policy development. The suggestion is that representatives of senior members and other groups do not feel intimidated by the oath of secrecy or other impediments in consulting their members on policy decisions. This is further supported by the statement of a University management member that,

Policies that are not approved by the Academic Board cannot be implemented ... important decisions are made at that level, which helps in university governance. (Participant 15, Female Administrator)

The implication is that the academic Board is not bypassed in policy development. The argument is that policies that did not have the 'blessings' of both the Governing Council and the Academic Board, could not be implemented. As such, senior members of the University who dominate the Academic Board, seemed to be respected more in policy development. This would ordinarily suggest that junior members are the most vulnerable because the Act establishing the University made hardly any reference to them. As such, they are considered more inconsequential than the senior members. Within that context, it may be argued that some policies emerge from decisions of the Academic Board; and, that the Board plays a central to policy making. It can be argued that senior members are perceived to have such influence because of the work of the Academic Board which comprised the most senior personalities within the University who, are perceived to be well-versed in university policies and are deemed possessed the professional competence to formulate policies.

Also, it can be deduced that policy formulation at UEW takes the form adheres to the University Statutes in terms of the role of the Academic Board in policy making. The challenge is how it encourages broad participation of other groups of stakeholders. The comments above may also be interpreted to mean that whereas all staff groups may be involved in human resource policies, only a few stakeholders – most probably academic and administrative staff – were likely to

be included in policymaking relating to academic practice. Perhaps this was because most junior staff members are not considered to be 'affected' by the nature and scope of academic programmes. In this regard, attempting to define academic practice and human resources policy reforms in the same context as other university policy areas by adopting identical framework(s) might not be justifiable given that the modalities of initiating them are completely different.

Participants explained their experiences with policy development as follows:

I have been there [on several committees] and each case the committee will meet and develop some areas. It will share to the entire university community mostly on faculty bases and department sections and sometimes we involve the unions and even the students; sometimes we solicit their inputs but I am not sure all of them do [provide inputs]... (Participant 5, Female Lecturer)

Normally the consultative issues ... take into consideration the various stakeholders in the committee so you may think that they come with their groupings' views. For instance, if there is a union representative there [in the committee] it is expected that the views of the union person will articulate the collective views of the staff segment they represent but I think largely they do some consultations. (Participant 9, Male Administrator)

The comments suggest that both administrators and academic staff, whether male or female, thought that policy development was usually done through the committee system. Ad hoc committees were usually formed to help develop policies. That was not surprising because all participants (no matter how long they might have been involved) were involved in policy development and have been aware of the processes involved. In terms of how committees develop the policies, the statements suggest that representatives of various stakeholder groups were recruited into the Committees when there is policy that affects their interest. From that understanding, it might be argued that the constitution of Committees for policy development entailed intensive analysis of the stakeholders to be involved (Brinkerhoff, 2004). The challenge is whether those representatives are nominated by their constituents or that they were appointed by the University Council or University management. The comments do not speak to the uncertainties about how stakeholder representatives are selected, in addition to how "discontinuities, compromises, omissions and exceptions" necessary for policy survival, are managed (Ball, 1990:3). This argument relates

to postulations in the literature that policy innovations do not occur instantaneously because the process entails significant processes of adaptations and adjustments (Schein, 1995), and that these only take place when the forces promoting this are stronger than those that oppose it (Robbins, 2003). The concern here is that it is important to interrogate the policy development as sites where the negotiations taking place can either strengthen or weaken possibilities for change, (Epstein, 1993), as discussed in terms of apathy in the next chapter.

With regard to the overall effectiveness of committees responsible for formulating policy, participants made the following observation.

The composition of a board or committee is very selective and management ensures that they have the best brains for such positions (Participant 10, Female Lecturer)

It appears that only senior staff members are involved ... (Participant 6, Male Administrator)

Middle-level and junior staff are not involved (Participant 7, Female Administrator)

These statements further corroborate how the views of some stakeholders are marginalised in terms of staff involvement in policy development. All categories of participants (male and female, administrators and academic staff) identified that some stakeholders (women and junior staff) were being excluded from policy development in UEW. In terms of gender, this raises questions about inclusiveness in policy development. Also the statement does not support the implementation of affirmative action initiatives that can explicitly support the participation of vulnerable (women and junior staff) groups such as women and junior members. Again, it can be argued that senior members are privileged because of the perception that they possessed the professional competence to formulate policies. The suggestions indicating marginalisation of some groups such as junior members speak to the suggestion that policy making in some African institutions remain in a ruinous state due to the overwhelming extent of the deterioration that has engulfed them over the years (Bollag, 2004; Leach et al., 2008).

Other participants stated:

if you are making a policy you should get the input of people who have relevant background and experience so that you can come out with an informed policy and then the policy can cover as many relevant areas as possible. ... (Participant 11, Female Lecturer)

Normally [in UEW] a committee will be set up; we were compelled to consult people with knowledge, experience and knowledge of the policy to be able to come out with good policy. At times we were limited in so many ways, we could not do much consultations with people within. (Participant 13, Male Administrator)

These participants have been members of several committees that developed policies for the University. The comments provided some positive insights about how policies are developed. They highlight that the processes begins with 'hunting' for technical views from people who have relevant background experience. The positives of seeking expert opinion is outlined in the participants' comment - *so that you can come out with an informed policy and then the policy can cover as many relevant areas as possible* - to be able to come out with good policy. However, the comment ended with a concern that much of the consultation excludes stakeholders within the institution.

Generally, the comments provided hints that despite sex and professional category (administrator or lecturer) the participants might belong to, they were overtly aware that exclusion of some stakeholders from the policy development process is a minus to the process. In my view, the non-engagement of stakeholders in policy development may be interpreted as an indication that they lacked adequate information on the nature, scope, and impact of reform in most policy areas. This approach contrasts with Mine's (2007) argument that policy development processes should be framed such that there is an open and dual communication channel to create a free and friendly atmosphere, social spaces of engagement that cultivates a sense of trust among stakeholders.

Also, insufficient consultation may occur as a result of time allocated to the entire process of policy development. Members of policymaking committees

might have been tempted to bypass some critical procedures or insufficiently engage with some stakeholders, if they thought that there was too little time. From my insider understandings that employees are not properly inducted upon engagement by the university, such scenarios may significantly undermine the successful passage of policy reform initiatives and their implementation. This is aside from the implication that policies are developed without much consultation with stakeholders, which has grave implications for acceptance and adoption of the policy among stakeholders. Two participants explained this point further

It is very necessary to do this consultation because we looked at the diverse parties in the university; we have different categories of people so when you are formulating a policy that affect all of them it is important to obtain their views and opinions. (Participant 3, Male Lecturer)

For instance one reason for a strategic planning committee when they go out to consult is to ensure ownership of the strategic plan ... The issue is if the university community don't see themselves as the owners of final product they will not implement it. I mean they wouldn't put much efforts to implement it, so it is very necessary. (Participant 14, Female lecturer)

The comments indicated that all categories of the participants were concerned that there was need to consult all stakeholders if policies were to have broad ownership across the system. Thus their views call attention to Barton and Tomlinson's (1984) long standing argument, that policymaking should ideally be inclusive and broad, taking on board all the beliefs, values and tastes of those affected by the policy. Similarly, the comments bespeak the importance of stakeholder consultation in policy development and highlight the gaps that may be created when policies are made without effective participation of stakeholders or what Rumball et al. (2001) called principles for promoting collegial participation. Finally, the comments explained the importance of taking time to navigate "the changing discursive assemblage of contesting and unequal power relations [that are usually] subjected to incessant reconfiguration and reconstruction" (Liasidou, 2009:108) during participative policy making processes. One participant sums-up the deficit in policy development in UEW in noting that it takes the form of "*a top down approach*". A management member further confirmed that,

There are occasional lapses ... The policymaking process does not involve grassroots input. (Participant 12, Male Administrator)

This gives credence to the argument of Leach et al. (2008) that the policymaking process in Ghanaian institutions of higher learning gives a peripheral role to various stakeholders such that they sometimes do not play any substantial part at all. The consequence, as Walt and Gibson (1994) warned, is that emphasis on technical expertise and evidential research tend marginalise stakeholders and jeopardize the successful achievement of envisaged goals. I would argue, additionally, that over reliance on the opinions of Council Members and Academic Board members may have undesired consequences. My argument is that the two bodies may not always be meticulous in their work and significant policy lapses as admitted above, may be witnessed sometimes, perhaps due to the fact that there were no grassroots links between policy decision-making bodies on the one hand, and junior university employees and members of the public representing the immediate community on the other. I would argue that this is more than a lapse, it actually speaks back to the heart of the matter - is authoritarian top down approach to policy making and imposed stakeholder participation.

Overall, it may be argued that stakeholder perspectives on policy development practices within UEW contradicts Muller's (2007) concerns that academic institutions are nurtured through the adoption of sound policies through wide faculty consultation. Also, it can be argued that stakeholders have little influence in policy development, save their representation on the Governing Council of the University. The participants' views suggest there is very little of what Bouchard and Carroll (2003) would call 'policy discretion', that is, the ability to choose to act without rigidly following rules. It seemed that the powers of the Governing Council is adhered to in a manner that affects the use of policy discretion in terms of allowing or delegating policy development functions to other bodies and groups within the University. As such, I would suggest that stakeholder groups, including parents of students, members of local communities in which the university is situated and donors, and who do not have representatives on the Governing Council usually miss out in policy development. These may have implications for policy implementation as discussed in the next chapter. The next section borrows from Rumball et al.'s

(2001) arguments about principles of collegiate participation, to explore participants' views how to enhance stakeholder participation policy development.

4.1.2 Stakeholders perspectives on improving policy development practices in UEW

This section explores the ways in which participants thought policy making can be improved. The discussions are informed by Sabatier's (1991) contention that success of any policy development process is chiefly determined by the ability of policymakers to actively involve stakeholders and inform them about the facts underlying reform proposals. It explores the deficits in present policy development practices in UEW and how participants thought stakeholder participation in policymaking can be improved.

Participants were asked, 'What can be done to improve this process of policy formulation?'. In response, participants made several suggestions. One noted that,

I think if we want, what I call both top down and bottom down compromise should be part of UEW policy making. (Participant 1, Male Administrator)

The contention of this participant is that there is a need to recognize that policy initiators and stakeholders need to engage effectively in the development of policies. The argument that can be advanced is Ball's (1990) - that although society consists of classes of power, and those at the top of the societal ladder wield more power than those at the bottom, engagement is key to creating an image of an ideal society.

Participants' views in terms of how to engage the stakeholders, included the following:

we need to broaden the consultative base so that sectors or segments of the community will have the chance to make inputs into this, when it comes down to academic programmes, then we are focusing on teaching ... so even that, both from the Vice Chancellor to the new lecturer must have an input ... Then I think if we do things this way, then people will even be aware of the policies, yes, and that will ensure ... people own the policy. (Participant 3, Male Administrator)

The university usually adopts a top-down mode in the development of policies; a bottom-up approach could help in some cases since members know what is best for them (Participant 5, Female Lecturer)

The point in the comments of both participants is that policy development processes that exclude active engagement of all stakeholder groups are defective and lacking cogency. It suggests that the various groups of participants recognise the need for broad participation in policy development. The suggestions highlight Sikwibele's (2003) explanation, that policy development can be improved through constituency building - a process whereby active support is sought from groups that see proposed policy affecting their interest. It further supports Sikwibele's view that stakeholder participation gives legitimacy to drive the policy forward. The participant is convinced that one way to improve stakeholder participation in policy development is to consult all segments of the university community as stakeholders. The argument is that including the views of all stakeholders will both make people aware of the policy and encourage shared ownership of the policy. A similar view is expressed by another participant who noted that,

For us to improve upon it, I believe we need to broaden the way we vary in terms of membership and even dissemination, the way people are ... brought together to formulate the policies and the way people are even ask to disseminate. (Participant 15, female Administrator)

Unlike the first comment, this participant's comment added an interesting dimension – a reconsideration of the way people are brought together. This speaks to the question of how people are selected on to committees that formulate policies, as already discussed in Section 4.3.

As I said I don't know much about other the policies but those that I have worked with we could still improve upon it. When it comes to about consulting people ... the general situation is that most members of staff may be either engaged in teaching and something else, some may not want to come and participate. So upon that basis we have to improve upon it or going a bit further not only a forum but perhaps solicit for other opinions which obviously is very difficult (Participant 12, Male Administrator).

The comment appeals to the need for staff to take interest in policy development processes. It suggests that one way to improve upon stakeholder

participation in policy development is to provide discussion forums where opinions can be sought from the grassroots. However, he was concerned that using that strategy to promote stakeholder participation is a very difficult adventure. He gave an example of how the difficulty plays out.

I remember a strategic plan committee at a point we said faculties should meet various departmental members and come up with their view but at the end of the day it was clear that most faculties did not meet, it was just a matter of things been put together either by the heads' or the dean's office and it was brought to us. That was the challenge getting members to come together to deliberate on various issues is quite difficult. We need members [of the University community] to change their attitudes. (Participant 4, Male Lecturer)

The comment indicates that the deficits in stakeholder participation are not related to non-invitation by policy initiators. It also has to do with the willingness and enthusiasm among stakeholders to participate. As the participant argued, members of the university community have some apathy to participation in policy development. What has to be queried is whether the unwillingness among members is as a result of non-involvement over time or that they have been forced to adopt peripheral roles as suggested by Leach et al. (2008). As such there is a need to investigate whether staff unwillingness to comment on proposed policies emanates from a feeling that their views may not be privileged in the final policy. Whatever the reason, it may be argued that one way to improve stakeholder participation in policy development is to work for a change in attitude among faculty members. Another respondent made similar observations about the difficulties associated with getting stakeholders involved and proffered suggestions to get around it.

Getting people's opinion was obviously difficult but perhaps I know the ICT people's have been doing something - normally they put a survey on a website for people to just fill and responses are very quick. (Participant 9, Male Administrator)

The comments suggest the adoption of an online survey model as a way of promoting stakeholder participation in policy development. Whereas it is difficult to understand how effective an online survey model will work as a method of promoting stakeholder participation, it seems plausible as the previous comments above indicates, that stakeholder forums do not seem to be effective.

It also seems as the previous comments suggest, that faculty members do not seem to have time to participate in organised forums. In the context of change theory elucidations by Robbins (2003), I would suggest that the lack of interest might be related to non-engagement over time or a feeling that their contributions may not be effectively regarded in the final determination of the policy. This is something that can be explored further.

4.2 Policy implementation in UEW

This sub-section continues the analysis by focusing on implementation of policies at the University. The data analysed in this chapter is mainly drawn from interviews with stakeholders at the University. The analysis proceeds from the framework that before embarking on any policy programme, it is important to give adequate consideration to how it will be implemented. The discussion is organised as follows: section 4.2.1 discusses policy dissemination within the University; section 4.2.2 discusses University management's views on policy implementation; and, section 4.2.3 discusses stakeholder perspectives on their involvement in implementation.

4.2.1 Policy dissemination in UEW

This section begins the analysis of policy implementation in UEW by discussing dissemination. It takes off from Walt and Gibson's (1994) argument that policymakers and implementers alike should maximize stakeholder participation through the dissemination of information. In so doing this section discusses interview data concerning stakeholders' perspectives on policy dissemination, as there is little to glean from documents.

In terms of staff awareness of policies prior to implementation participants stated during interviews that

Members of staff are almost always inadequately informed [of policies], which leads to apathy (Participant 7, female Administrator)

I know quite a large number of our staff members are ignorant to some issues of policy. (Participant 14, Female Lecturer)

I am a professor who has been here for about 20 years but there are many policies I am not aware of. (Participant 2, Female lecturer)

These all female comments might indicate that female staff have some common concerns about policy awareness although the ignorance of policies divaricates the ranks and is not necessarily dependent on the number of years someone served in the institution. The comments indicate that the females have suffered the consequences of male dominated policy making over the years. As a result, they felt that policies were not properly disseminated. Whiles that is true, it is equally true that females have been less informed because they have been excluded from policy development as argued earlier in this chapter. The comments of Participant 7 suggested that one impact of lags in policy dissemination is apathy among stakeholders towards the policies. Apathy in this case may refer to a lack of support for the policy, which can lead to tensions within the university community. One argument that can be presented is that apathy of some sections of the University's community who seemed to flounder in grasping the relevance of new policies may have resulted from the failure of policy makers to engage them in the process or that they had not been properly briefed on the policies after adoption. Thus policy reforms may fail to achieve set goals. Two other participants also stated that

... only senior staff members are involved in and understand policy issues (Participant 4, Male Lecturer)

Relevant constituencies are promptly notified of changes in policy (Participant 6, Male Administrator)

The all-male comments sought to suggest that changes in policies are disseminated, appropriately. That raises contradictions with the view earlier expressed by the females suggesting lags in policy dissemination. Thus a cursory observer may argue that there are tensions in the views of males and females about policy dissemination in UEW. These comments by male respondents seem to have corroborated the earlier suggestions in section 4.1.2 that there is some classification system within the University where the male dominated very senior staffs were more frequently represented in policy making over other members. As indicated in the previous comments, relevant

constituencies in this case may refer to the different categories of senior members and representatives of other regulatory bodies. This also corresponds with earlier comments about selectivity in the composition of committees during policy formulation. However, relevant constituencies may also include bodies such as the Ministry of Education and the National Council for Tertiary Education (NCTE) which plays critical roles in influencing the type and shape of reform at tertiary levels of education on behalf of the wider society. For example, the NCTE has norms for enrolment, which any enrolment policy must oblige. Policies also need to conform to policy directives issued by the GoG through the Ministry of Education and other state agencies. These external forces have significant leverage on the process of university reform, perhaps because of the keen desire on the part of the policy makers concerned to strengthen competitiveness in both local and international arenas.

Participants were asked how policies are disseminated in order to find out how policies are disseminated to promote awareness as a first step towards implementation. This was to understand how policy information was communicated to various UEW stakeholders. In response to the question of the manner in which they became aware of university policies, a participant noted that

If ... [the policy] is not voluminous the registrar will communicate in writing to the university community but it has to be [a] document and ...- papers are made and they are circulated to the faculties, departments for members to read. As to whether the staff reads it or not I can't tell. (Participant 12, Male Administrator).

From these comments, it would seem that some policies are disseminated through writing to the University community. Again, the views of Participant 12 contradicted the views expressed by the females by arguing that changes in policies are disseminated and consolidating the tensions in the views of males and females about policy dissemination in UEW. Another male (Participant 1) added, that the policies are communicated “*Via workshops, memos, letters and committees.*” This would suggest that the University’s management does put in efforts to communicate policies to stakeholders within the University, although it is uncertain how policies are communicated through committees. The likely

explanation is that when committees are reviewing policies, they are also given sets of existing policies to study. The concern is whether members of the university community have opportunities to have access to such policies. Another participant added that

... once a policy has been developed and documented it is assumed that you know so if you go against it then it will be invoke against you, as they say ignorance of the law is not an excuse. It is a very critical issue as you [are] getting staff actually doing what they are expected to do, that is where we need to do an extra work? (Participant 10, female Lecturer)

The import of the views expressed by Participant 10 is that policies are not communicated. While it further indicates the divergence in the views of the female participants as against those expressed by males, it highlights the need to invest more efforts in policy dissemination. It sought to suggest that there is no excuse that a staff may provide that he/she is not aware of a policy to warrant a waiver of a disciplinary action. It may therefore be argued that much work needs to be done in terms of maximising policy dissemination as suggested by Walt and Gibson (1994).

Two participants' commented that:

If the policy ... is that type of voluminous policy, just a few points ... need to be communicated to the staff. ... The registrar will communicate it through a letter, a memo to the entire university community. And so it goes heads of sections, the heads of sections who will post it to the notice board for other members to read ... (Participant 10, female Lecturer)

In terms of the parts or the role being played or the collaboration I think the heads of department and other sections all have their part to play. ... whether the staff will have the time to read is another thing. (Participant 9, Male Administrator)

The views further highlight tensions between male and female views on policy dissemination although both participants agreed that the University's policies could reach stakeholders through a range of different means. As may be observed, Participant 10 further adds more future tense, indicating for example that, *just a few points ... need to be communicated to the staff* and that *The registrar will communicate*. However, the male participant stated his views more

in the past tense, talking about *the role being played*. Also, it suggests that different stakeholders such as Heads of Departments were expected to be active in promoting policies. From an insider perspective, the primary communication is to Deans of Faculty and Heads of Departments, Units and Sections. These groups become the main channels through which information is expected to get to all members of the university community. The communication of aspects of the policy may have its deficits such as misinterpretation of the policy because it is taken out of its larger context. The memo or letter communicating the policy may not always state the background and considerations leading to the adoption of the policy. Given the concerns about gaps in stakeholder participation, it is most likely that stakeholders may misinterpret the policy objectives. Another deficit may be that staff may not read it when it is posted on notice boards. This later problem may have to do with staff who may have travelled within the period and may return at a time when the information is updated and replaced with newer information.

In terms of gender, the later deficit is more likely to affect women on three months maternity leave, who may miss out on information posted on notice boards. In that case, they are more likely to be victims of ignorance of policies. Given that policies regulations that are binding on everyone at the institution regardless of gender, seniority or belief, it is important that steps are taken to ensure that all people are informed of the latest policy edicts. The likely impact is a lack of knowledge of the policy which may affect implementation and broad acceptance of the policy. Heads of Departments, Units or Sections who may be inadvertently missing from the distribution list, may be unfairly accused of inefficiency in policy implementation or non-compliance with policy decision. This can lead to conflicts that can affect smooth running of the university. Also, staff who may have travelled might accuse UEW University management of unfairness in its application of policies, as suggested in the comment above that ignorance is not an excuse.

Another participant also explains that,

When it comes to the statutes, the statute is there, copies are there available to everyone. But perhaps maybe is either the human resource

section or the staff training section to take it upon them and organize proper orientations for dealing with specific issues in the university.
(Participant 5, Female Lecturer)

The comment would suggest that policies are physically available to staff. Considering the finding that the Statute, the main policy document of the university, is available to all staff is a major policy step. It suggests that the university management takes steps to make policies available to all staff.

In terms of policies that have general application another participant added that,

It depends on the policy because if has to deal with staff development going on further studies the policy have been made of five years or three years at work you can't go on study leave with pay. With such a policy it communicated with the entire staff of the university community for that one you know and so that case it has already been implemented and as and when you apply that clause is invoked. We have a lot of policies they are relevant to particular issues is only when the issue comes up contains you that is when you apply. (Participant 8, Male Lecturer)

In terms of gender, the comment above corresponds with the earlier comment that males thought policies were disseminated while females disagree. That may also be attributed to number of years spent in the University and positions held by the participants. As argued earlier in Section 1.2, males dominated the very senior positions such as registrar, Vice Chancellor, Pro-Vice Chancellor, Finance Officer, Development Officer, as well as the positions of Deans and Directors within UEW. Although it is not clear whether physical copies of staff development policies are available to all staff, the comments indicate that policies that concern all staff are disseminated to all. The implication is that the authorities take steps to disseminate some policies to stakeholders within the University community, suggesting that some policies are given to all staff. However, a female participant commented that,

There are some breakdowns in communication since many do not check their mail or read the float files² (Participant 11, Female Lecturer)

This comment from a female participant would suggest that if policies are disseminated, then there were some missing-links in the way policies are

² Files on notices and information that are required on a daily basis and kept for quick reference in departments throughout the university.

disseminated. It suggests, for example, that some policies are disseminated through electronic mailing systems. The comment suggests there might be lapses in that mode of communication where some staff might not check their mail regularly. Also, float files kept in offices might not be readily accessible to all staff. As such, some may not have access to information that is deposited in the float file.

Overall, however, the lesson that can be gleaned from the comments is that there is some disagreement between the views of males and females about the quality of policy dissemination which might have some implications for policy implementation. It is not to say that males believe policies are disseminated while females disagree. The data suggested that females think that the quality of policy dissemination is less qualitative than males thought. That disagreement might relate to the number of years spent within the institution as there are more males in senior management positions than there were females (see section 1.2.1 of Chapter One). Thus the disagreement is not only based on gender but number years one has had experience of policy making in UEW as indicated in section 3.4.2 of Chapter Three. As policy dissemination is critical to policy implementation, it is important to explore stakeholders' perspectives on policy implementation itself. This is the focus of the next section (4.1.2).

4.2.2 Stakeholders' views on policy implementation in UEW

This section discusses stakeholders' perspectives on policy implementation in UEW. The objective of the section is to understand the best practices and gaps that need addressing. It discusses the institutional capacity to implement policies and the processes of policy implementation in general, including questions of uniformity, consistency and fairness.

In terms of how policies facilitated University administration, management members noted the following:

Academic Board decisions derive from policy guidelines. (Participant 8, Male Lecturer)

Policy documents facilitate streamlining and responding to daily issues that arise (Participant 13, Male Administrator)

University policies guide day-to-day operations (Participant 2, Female Lecturer)

These comments indicate that males and females, academics and administrators recognized that policies were vital to support the 'smooth' running of the University. The suggestion is that the University management applies policies in day-to-day operational life. What is interesting is the suggestion that Academic Board decisions derive from policy guidelines. This shows a complexity in terms of operationalising policy application. For example it suggests two things. First, it suggests adherence to policy regarding the fact that Academic Board complies with University Statutes in discussing new policies. On the other hand, it may be argued that policies are implemented within the prevailing government policy, as well as a means of fulfilling the social duty that requires tertiary institutions to act within policy guidelines.

Other participants stated the following regarding policy implementation.

They [policies] help with the smooth running of the university, as they can easily be cited in correspondence to support a point or issue (Participant 11, female Lecturer)

Procedures are followed and feedback provided to enhance smooth administrative practices in the university (Participant 15, female Administrator)

Most decisions taken in the university are guided by these policies (Participant 1, Male Lecturer)

The above comments also suggest that all categories of participants were of the view that policies facilitate university administration, indicating that effective policy implementation can reduce, for example, promotion-related conflicts. They suggest a strict implementation of policies within UEW. This suggestion seems too farfetched; it seems to 'suffer' social desirability bias. From my experience within the institution, I am aware that policy implementation also includes the exercise of policy discretion. This is evident when their comments are synchronised with the following responses that were derived when the participants talked about the impact of policy on university performance:

Implementation is not monitored (Participant 4, Male Lecturer)

Inadequate time is allotted for implementation so we know little about how policies are actually implemented (Participant 7, female Administrator)

Evaluating participants' comments in terms of educational performance raises concerns expressed by Muskin's (1999) and, Leu and Prince-Rom (2006), about how we can be sure that policies contribute to the production of graduates that may be considered to be qualified in terms of their capability to successfully integrate into the community and use the skills and knowledge they have acquired productively. The comments suggested that both administrators and academic staff felt there was little policy monitoring and evaluation occurring in UEW at the time this study was conducted. Further both males and females agreed that policy implementation needs to be monitored in order to address questions of efficiency in terms of value added to UEW's administration and general operational life of the institution. As another participant explained, the lack of mechanisms is not as a result of capacity to implement policies but unwillingness on the part of management to use the human resources available to facilitate policy implementation.

Capacity is there because we have the staff available maybe they will think about other resources. I don't think it involves so much, it is just about organizing some orientations if it is planned throughout the year. (Participant 3, Male Lecturer)

The participants also noted that there are Units within the University that support policy implementation if they are harnessed properly.

Yes, for instance the internal audit is there; ... they have to make sure the policies are followed. I know the finance office is also there they will make sure the university's financial system and policies are being followed. The HR is also there, making sure that human resource policies are followed. ... the academic affairs section is also there to make sure that policies are been followed. (Participant 12, Male Administrator)

... largely the systems are there, for example the internal audit serving as checks and balances; and the quality assurance office ... is gradually evolving but I think that when it becomes well established [it] will become very instrumental. (Participant 9, Male Administrator)

The comments bespeak Osborne (2003a) and Girdwood's (1999) arguments that, structural deficits including administrative capacity and resource allocation mechanisms constitute constraints, impeding policy implementation. It can be observed that both administrators and academic staff thought that there were existing structures within the University that could be used to monitor and implement policy effectively. In reference to quality assurance units in Ghana, some have suggested that ineffective quality assurance mechanisms leave questions about the quality of higher education institutions and their products (Dattey, 2013; Effah, 2013). Quality assurance in that context entails examination of the nature and scope of both existing and new policies and programmes; strategic plans made in the process of implementing such policies; interaction between the various stakeholders; the magnitude of external inputs; and the overall impact of policies on the education system (Muskin, 1999).

Based on the discussions, my argument is that it is the work of the quality assurance unit to assess institutional quality and check compliance with policy. In consequence, a weak quality assurance unit would imply some ineffectiveness in institutional self-reviews that are crucial for policy reforms. Therefore, the next section explores the participants' views on the ways in which policy implementation can be improved.

4.2.3 Stakeholder perspectives on improving policy implementation in UEW

This section continues the analysis of policy implementation in UEW by discussing how the process can be improved.

The following were some of their responses:

There is a need for a follow-up mechanism (Participant 1, Male Lecturer)

Effort should be made for constant evaluation of policy implementation at the grassroots level (Participant 11, female Lecturer)

In order for a policy to make an impact on any organization, it ought to be monitored and evaluated regularly (Participant 9, Male Administrator)

These comments might account for why some are convinced that there is not enough monitoring evaluation systems to assess the implementation of policies as discussed in section 4.2.2. From the comments it seems that the participants are concerned about the monitoring mechanisms that are available to measure the impact of policies in order to facilitate review from time to time. These are important points because Leu and Price-Rom (2006) argued that policies should be evaluated in terms of the generation of well-qualified graduates. As explained in chapter two of this thesis, their view is that policies in higher education should lead to academic efficiency. So, the comments ask questions of how we can examine 1) the progress made in the actual implementation of existing policies; 2) the impact of such policies; and 3) the interaction between different inputs that contribute to the success or otherwise of the implementation process and the gaps that need addressing.

It may be observed that both administrators and academic staff agreed that policy evaluation is a significant issue that should be part of UEW's policy development and implementation processes and practices. The female participant took it further in arguing that policy evaluation should not be a knee-jerk reaction but systematic practice that considers the views of stakeholders. However, that is not essentially a female concern because all categories of respondents thought exclusion of various stakeholders groups was a deficit in UEW's policy development processes.

Another set of participants' comments were that

...if there is a new policy it should be disseminated at programmes where faculty members are all present. Staff meetings should be used ...
(Participant 7, female Administrator)

It actually depends, if faculty seminars are being held, if they invite human resource persons that come and give us a brief or a talk on university policies. It will depend if faculty will demand for the human resource person. It will be a positive direction because in every gathering we can ask them to come and talk. So an avenue for implementation is what I was looking for. (Participant 14, female Lecturer)

Several concerns can be drawn from the comments. First, the comments would suggest that policy dissemination is an important concern to the participants. As argued, policies should be made available and accessible to all staff. The second point is a concern that Human Resource officials should be present at staff meetings and convocation meetings to bring policy issues to the attention of members of the University community. This raises human resource capacity and resourcing issues that Osborne (2003a) and Girdwood (1999) would argue, constitutes structural constraints impeding successful implementation of education policy. The comments also indicated that female participants were of the view that policy dissemination should intensify with human resource officials using innovative approaches. I would argue that the participants' suggestions imply that policy implementation requires that human and material resources are allocated to policy dissemination.

Other participants' comments regarding improving policy implementation are as follows:

One part that can be utilize effectively is when the staffs come and they are taking through policies will be available when they will appear to the orientations (Participant 10, female Lecturer)

We do not induct new staff. We do not give them any orientation of policies. Orientation for new students is also not very effective. We need to improve this by giving good orientation about University policies to new staff and other members of the university. Even new Council members do not receive any good induction. (Participant 6, Male Administrator)

In tandem with the discussions about gaps in policy implementation and dissemination discussed in 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, these statements might suggest that UEW has a poor record in effectively inducting and orientating new members of its community, including staff members, students and other stakeholders. My suggestion is that the participants speak to the literature that eulogise support for enhancing accountability and collective participation, thus instituting an effective mechanism for developing the institution from within (Osborne, 2003a; Leu and Price-Rom, 2006). In that context, it looks like UEW

will need to activate systems that can support the dissemination of policies as a first step towards effective implementation.

4.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, I drew on stakeholder theory to discuss development and implementation practices in UEW. The discussion highlights gaps in terms of stakeholder engagement – how UEW actively incorporates stakeholders (students, lecturers, administrators etc) into policy development and implementation processes. I argued that some policy reforms only involved members of the Governing Council and, by extension, the Academic Board. Indeed, these two bodies were, as by law established, are the main policy making structures. The Governing Council and the Academic Board, with their sub Committees, are involved in all policy reform processes. They comprised the most senior personalities who, are privileged and are well-versed in the University's policy requirements and were deemed to have possessed the professional competence to formulate policies. From the analysis, I argued that grassroots input is minimal in policy development and implementation. I asserted that policy development and implementation practices at UEW, essentially, exemplify a top-down approach. The consequences of this approach to policy development and implementation are the discussed in the next chapter where I further examined the data through several theoretical lenses.

CHAPTER FIVE

GAPS IN POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION IN UEW

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is a critical interrogation of the issues discussed in Chapter Four. It focused more on discussing the tensions in policy development and implementation at UEW. Aside from stakeholder theory, I draw from policy evaluation propositions to discuss what the priorities in policy development and implementation; the relevance of various stakeholders in the process; and the trade-offs to be made by various stakeholders to develop and implement policy effectively. I continued the analysis by interrogating how UEW evaluates policies and the effectiveness of the University's policy development and implementation processes. As such the chapter is organised in four sections as follows. Section 5.2 discusses the priorities in policy development and implementation at UEW, reflecting back on the gaps in the data concerning policy development and implementation discussed in sections 4.1 and 4.2 of Chapter Four. Section 5.3 examines the gaps in terms of the relevance of various stakeholder groups and the trade-offs to be made to develop and implement policies effectively. Section 5.4 is where I interrogated how UEW evaluates policies and the effectiveness of the University's policy development and implementation processes. Section 5.5 sums up the discussions and highlights how UEW can improve its policy development practices and implementation processes.

3.2 Opportunities and tensions in policy development at UEW

The discussion in chapter four explored policy implementation and presented various arguments that bespeak several opportunities and tensions in policy development and implementation. This section reflects back on the gaps in the data concerning policy development and implementation at UEW as discussed in sections 4.1 and 4.2 of Chapter Four. It highlights the opportunities and tensions concerning question about how is developed and implemented within the institution. The key questions that guided the discussion here were: How is

policy at UEW developed and implemented? What criteria guide policy and its implementation at UEW? How do we know the next steps?

In terms of opportunities, policy development and implementation at UEW has several legal avenues and institutional structures that are pre-determined. The data from the document analysis presented in Chapter Four shows that the roles and responsibilities of various complex structures are clarified in the University of Education, Winneba Act (2004). The responsibilities and rights of the Governing Council and the Academic Board as the main determinants of the University's policy directions were not matters of dispute. The composition of both the Governing Council and the Academic Board, the principal policy making structures are also clearly listed in the Act. The tenure of Office of members of these policy making bodies were also spelt out. As such, there is little contestation as to who has right to determine what policy.

Also, UEW, as many other Universities, have different stakeholders including stakeholders (students, lecturers, administrators, junior staffs, Government of the Republic of Ghana, etc) who are either affected by its policy development and implementation practices or are interested in its activities and products. In the context of stakeholder theory, that represents a huge constituency with diverse groups that for the University's policy makers could consult to generate soft and rich ideas that might be beneficial to policy development and its implementation. Within stakeholder theory propositions (Freeman, 1984), those groups constitute the external environment of UEW, and have fundamental implications for the policy development and implementation behavior within the institution. Given the composition of the University Council, it may be argued that the University has a fair representation of those groups in its highest decision making structure (the Governing Council).

However, there were questions to glean in the context of Sikwibele's (2003) framework about how policy makers and implementers can navigate the practical complexities associated with policy development and implementation. These questions represent gaps that might be of concern to a critical analyst of the Universities policy development and implementation practices. The first set

of concerns includes whom the University identifies as their primary stakeholders in terms of academic decision-making? What relationship does the University has with those stakeholders in making academic decisions? How does the University handle policy conflicts with its stakeholders?

The evidence suggested that students are not represented on the Academic Board, for example. That seemed problematic given that the Academic Board has responsibility to “Formulate and carry out the academic policy of the University and, generally, regulate and approve the programmes of instruction and examinations in the University” (UEW, Statute, 2007, p.11). In that case, for example, the views of students - those most affected by educational policy and programmatic decisions, are absent from policy decision making processes. Given the composition of the Academic Board within the UEW Statute, it is difficult to understand how students could be represented excepting the provision in Schedule B. It is provided in Schedule B (12) that there shall be a Student-Staff Consultative Committee to receive reports from the Faculty/Departmental Staff and Student Consultative Committees, and make appropriate recommendations to the Academic Board. The problem is that the academic Board can accept or reject any recommendation at its seating (where students are not represented). Although the presence of students does not guarantee that their views may be accepted, their absence is a missing element in terms of the limitations it placed on their expressive capacity: the opportunity to “democratically engage, to question how things are done or to demand rights as full members of the institution” (Adzahlie-Mensah, 2013, p.134).

Another tension relates to the fact that there is little notice in the University of Education Act (2004) and the UEW Statute (2007) concerning how policy should be disseminated to stakeholders. As such, the data about policy dissemination suggested that principal policies such as the statute have been made available to all members of the University community. Aside from that, policy dissemination took the form of the registry circulating memos and letters to heads of departments or posting information on notice Boards. In my view, policy implementation could have been significantly enhanced through the organization of policy launch seminars, and awareness and capacity-building

workshops. The argument that can be advanced is that the absence of those in UEW's policy development and implementation practices resulted in the data indicating that some University members were unaware of some policies. Among the group most likely to suffer from the gaps in policy dissemination were pregnant women, who might be away for months on maternity leave. That might happen as staff might not be neither engaged in policy development nor informed, individually, of new policies. Thus policy implementation might become an arduous task for those enforcing new policies because of the tensions it might generate between them and those affected by the policy decisions being implemented.

In terms of criteria, the policy development and implementation regimes discussed in Chapter Four did not speak concerning the criteria that guides policy practices in UEW. So, it is difficult to know whether UEW's policy making considers the following themes identified as most prevalent across the global economic divide: 1) expansion and diversification of enrolment, participation rates, and numbers and type of institution; 2) fiscal pressure as measured in terms of low and declining per-student expenditure, and as evidenced in overcrowding, low-paid (or unpaid) faculty, lack of academic and library resources, and dilapidated physical infrastructure; 3) increasing pursuit of market-orientated solutions and government funding; 4) demand for greater accountability on the part of institutions and faculties, and on behalf of students, employers, and those who pay for the education of the former; and 5) demand for higher quality and greater efficiency in the form of more rigour, more relevance, and more learning (Johnstone et al., 1998, p.2). Again, Johnstone et al. suggested that an almost uniform trend across the global higher education sector is an "avowed orientation to expansion and diversification, driven by the demands of a growing, upwardly mobile (or at least upwardly aspiring) population and to the needs of an increasingly competitive technologically sophisticated economy" (p.1). In my view, it is important for stakeholders, especially lecturers, students, government and society to know how UEW policy and its implementation have responded to or benefited from that orientation.

Therefore, whilst some respondents (mainly in senior management positions) agreed that policy documents facilitated effective administration, others did not think so. As it emerged in Chapter Four, UEW did not have proper follow-up mechanism for evaluating and reinforcing policy reform. This observation is corroborated by answers to a question on whether the University has a monitoring and evaluation mechanism to enhance commitment among its members as discussed more in section 5.4 of this chapter. I would argue, in view of change theory (Schein, 1995; Robbins (2003), and stakeholder theory propositions that UEW clearly outlines, in a policy development and implementation document, the general processes it follows in the design, development and implementing of policies. It is important for the University to develop inclusive systems and mechanisms for developing and implementing policies. Further I would argue, within the theoretical frameworks underlying this research, that UEW policy leaders should consider policy change as a process with profound psycho-social and political consequences involving painful unlearning and relearning; and cognitive restructuring of staff and student's thoughts, perceptions, feelings and attitudes (see Schein, 1995). My assertion is that policy development, dissemination and implementation processes should be constructed so as to be inclusive, fair and mindful of the welfare, interests and needs of the University's stakeholders.

Girdwood (1999) and Leach et al. (2008) have asserted that, institutions need to embrace a spirit of collectiveness, consulting widely in order to generate broad support and quality thinking, to come up with practices and policies whose impact can position the institution as a centre of academic excellence. Accordingly, it seems that finding strategies that work in terms of achieving productivity in institutions of higher learning takes more than mere rigidity in the formulation and implementation of new policies (Bollag, 2004, p.26). In my view, policy development and its implementation would be most effective when the process is more transparent, clearly outlined and more representative of the needs, interests and aspirations of the wider groups of stakeholders. At the same time, a higher institution such as UEW should balance stakeholders' needs with the institution's mandate and the desire to achieve academic excellence in research and teacher training.

Further, the data asked questions concerning whether UEW develop different policies with different rules. For example, we do not know whether financial policies are made using different processes depending on the nature and scope of the particular issue being addressed (Johnstone et al., 1998). In my view, that needs to be clear. Additionally, the UEW Statute needs to be clearer on the responsibilities that policy making structures have to people who are affected by the policies, especially in terms of unfreezing their limited possibilities for democratic engagement. Evidently, the discussions in Chapter Four also highlight apathy towards policy implementation indicating that policy development and implementation are daunting phenomenal tasks requiring careful engagement with stakeholders. This task, I would argue with Melton (2009) and Orr (2006), can be made less fraught by incorporating as many actors as possible. How stakeholder participation could be built and the trade-offs that are required are subjects that were further discussed in the next section (5.3).

5.3 The relevance of various stakeholder groups in UEW policy development and implementation

In this section take the discussions further by specifically interrogating the relevance of stakeholders in UEW's policy development and implementation. The discussion benefits from Sabatier's (1991) argument that the success of any policy development process includes informing stakeholders and involving them in the process. The key questions that guided the discussion in this section were: How influential are the different stakeholder groups in the development and implementation of policies at the university? How can stakeholder participation be built?

The discussions in this and the previous chapter so far suggested that some principal stakeholders (especially students and junior staff in UEW) have little role in policy development and implementation. Whereas government, senior management and academic staff have several representation on Council, students and junior staff in UEW have only two and one representative respectively. The dearth of representation and inclusivity in policy making is far

worse concerning the composition of the academic Board where students and junior staff have no representation at all. That condition is highly problematic in terms of the change theory as advanced by Schein (1995) and the elucidations by Robbins (2003) as well as the stakeholder theory propositions of Brinkerhoff and Crosby (2002) discussed in Chapter Two. As Brinkerhoff and Crosby (2002) asserted, one way of creating accountable public institutions and to infuse them with democratic principles is to actively engage members in searching for innovative policy measures. Thus excluding some members of the institution from some policy making arenas is to suggest that aspects of the University exist in isolation. In that case, achieving inclusivity and an integrated system of working would be problematic. To address that gap implies that UEW would need to initiate processes that will enhance stakeholder participation in policy development and implementation.

Whereas it is true that different stakeholders have different needs and interests, it is equally true that their needs should coalesce around the mission and vision of the University. Thus there is an intersection or point of convergence where the needs and interests of all stakeholders congeal. For example, it might be foolhardy to suggest that the processes of developing and implementing labour policies regarding lecturers have little consequence for students. As the literature suggested, policies become effective and efficient when stakeholders have a sense of ownership (Ball, 1994; Sabatier, 1991) formed whether through their direct participation in policy development and implementation or through their representatives (Fitz and Halpin, 1994; Sabatier, 1999). So, I would argue, for example, that if administrators are detached from the processes of academic policy making they might equally have less attachment to its implementation. Similarly, students might be less co-operative in embracing academic policies if they and their leadership are not effectively engaged in the processes of formulating academic decisions. Thus I would argue that improving stakeholder participation enhances policy ownership and the chances that policies need to achieve their intended objectives.

Given that one of the functions of the Academic Board within the UEW Statute (2004, p.11) is to "Make regulations for the discipline of Junior Members of the

University” it is incongruous to deny representation to Junior Members on that body. Similarly, students have several academic interests that are affected by decisions of the academic Board to the extent that their exclusion from the Board becomes inconsistent with democratic principles of equity, justice and rights. In fact, students are affected by regulations relating to courses of study and degrees; and recommendations for the award of degrees, diplomas, certificates and other academic distinctions to persons who have pursued a programme of study or research approved by the Academic Board and have passed the prescribed examinations (see provisions on the Powers and Functions of the Academic Board in UEW Statute, 2004, p.11). Although the SRC has the right “to appeal to the Academic Board and ultimately to Council whose decision shall be final” its rights of “Presenting the views of the students of the University to the appropriate body or bodies depending upon the nature of the matter” seemed to be short-circuited by their exclusion from the Academic Board, in particular.

In that context, some may argue that the exclusion of students and Junior Members from the Academic Board suppressed the crucial views that normally emanate from junior stakeholders, particularly when a bottom-up approach is adopted. Thus policy development and implementation practices that essentially reinforced rigid adherence to the University Statutes might be counterproductive. It therefore seemed that policymakers in UEW should endeavour to facilitate proper planning that allows space for the various stakeholders to participate in policy development.

A reading of the policy practices in terms of the degree of power allocated to different stakeholders suggested a lop-sided policy development and implementation practice which marginalises majority views. Within the Academic Staff, the most senior (professorial ranks) are more represented in policy making. This leaves questions about the extent to which the needs and interests of the junior ranks are served. However, the lack of inclusivity may also be read as discrimination against women as they tend to occupy junior positions relative to men. Again, students, who are more in number and are

affected by nearly all aspects of the University's policies, tend to be marginalised policy making.

The data that new staff members are not inducted may be likened to what Brinkerhoff and Crosby (2002) term, a 'business as usual' approach among policymakers. Yet what tend to be most affected are the newcomers' needs of effective integration into the system. Based on stakeholder theory as explored by Brinkerhoff and Crosby (ibid), it can only be concluded that failure to carry out proper induction of new employees in the nature and scope of policy reform, existing policies, and the modalities of engagement in policy formulation, is tantamount to assuming that they will not be making any substantial impact on any part of the process. Perhaps such a situation can be interpreted as indicative of the natural disputes and misunderstandings among stakeholders that Tomlinson (1984) argues are common, particularly when large numbers of actors are involved. This argument is given added credence by the fact that UEW employed a workforce in excess of 1,465 as of the 2008/09 academic year (Vice-Chancellor's Report Annual Report, 2009).

Given the gaps in stakeholder engagement discussed in Chapter Four, and which are highlighted in the discussions in this section, I would suggest that policy development and implementation within UEW has serious deficits. As Muller (2007) asserts, policies relating to academic and faculty practices constitutes the most vital aspect of a University's operation, and I would suggest, that deficits in engaging academic staff as stakeholders can further confound successful policy development, implementation and achievement of policy goals. As the data suggested, UEW has a tradition of informing stakeholders before the implementation of policy although stakeholders are not sometimes notified of critical information during the initiation and development of policy.

I would argue that there is need to reduce tensions in policy development and implementation through the development of democratic principles to guide both processes. By democratic principles, I mean the creation of transparent processes and opportunities for different stakeholder groups to be clear about

the policy development and implementation procedures. That includes clear guidelines about how policy should be developed, how different stakeholder groups should be involved. It is also important that policy development and implementation guidelines are clear about the locus of responsibilities in terms of how policies should be developed, disseminated and implemented.

In my view, the deficits in UEW's policy development and implementation can be addressed by creating space for broader participation of all stakeholder groups. Each group may be allowed to participate in consultative processes where they are allowed to articulate their collective views on the policy question being considered. That can be achieved through the creation of constituent assemblies, for example, in the case of developing key policy documents such as the University's statute. Participation in constituent bodies would allow stakeholder groups to communicate their collective opinions via representatives to the committees developing policies. In such cases a constituent assembly would provide space for stakeholder engagement necessary for interest articulation and aggregation. My argument is that quality opportunities for the expression and aggregation of interests is an engagement that is vital in creating opportunities for 'trade-offs' necessary to enhance policy buy-in.

Aside from allowing representatives to participate in constituent groups, stakeholder participation can be enhanced by providing opportunities for stakeholder groups to make critical inputs into draft policy texts. My view is that policy development process should include invitation to various stakeholder groups to write memos concerning the policy question being addressed. Their critique should include among others, an analysis of the existing scenario, what they think should change, what should be sustained and why. Each stakeholder group may be required to support their position with the benefits to be derived from a particular suggestion and how their proposal is applicable to the context and how it could be implemented and by whom.

Committees leading policy development ought to engage stakeholders at both individual and as collectives to provide opportunities for debate and discussion of policy proposals. This would enhance the committee members' understanding

of what the feelings, interest and needs of stakeholders are towards the policy direction being advocated. Given the data discussed in Chapter Four, such engagement would provide opportunities for sensitisation of stakeholders about the policy questions being asked. I would argue, additionally, that such engagement would address some misconceptions assumptions about the policy direction to the consistent advantage of those proposing the policy and stakeholders whose interests might be at stake.

Where expert panels or committees are used to develop vital policies, I would suggest that they provide stakeholders with the necessary comparator analysis detailing the benefits to be derived from a particular direction and how that direction is applicable to the UEW context. Based on the propositions about using experts in policy development, which essentially contradicts the underlying propositions of stakeholder theory, it is important to conclude this section by suggesting that expert policies may crash during implementation if there is little stakeholder buy-in and commitment. Thus it is essential to engage stakeholders in more qualitative ways as discussed in this section if UEW seeks to achieve effective policy development and implementation.

Therefore, in my view, policy development should begin with a stakeholder analysis that takes into consideration who is to be involved and who should not; the consequences of exclusion and inclusion of specific people; and the benefits of being flexible or rigidity. Consultation with stakeholders would provide vital information on how they are experiencing the present situation, their concerns about new directions, and their dilemmas that the expert committee might need to engage with in formulating policies for the governing and administration of the institution. Achieving efficacy in stakeholder analysis and a mapping of the policy development and implementation process raises questions of policy evaluation which is take further in the next section (5.4).

5.4 Evaluation of policy development and implementation in UEW

The discussions in Chapter Four also raised questions about policy monitoring and evaluation. By policy evaluation conducted for checking the effects of the policies of respective ministries and for evaluating the policies in terms of

necessity, efficiency, validity, etc. to improve the planning and implementation process. In my view, policy evaluation helps to understand the policy contexts in terms of its exigencies, tensions and opportunities that can enhance policy development and implementation. This section looked back across the data to discuss how university policymaking could be improved at UEW.

The comments suggest that the final stage of policy implementation, which involves setting up and using systems to monitor implementation progress, is hard to find in the way policy making happens within UEW. The participants' comments suggest that despite the arguments that policies are implemented, the University lacked proper policy monitoring and evaluation procedures. Morley et al (2010:7) made similar suggestion about policy implementation in Ghanaian Universities when they stated that "monitoring and Evaluation was uneven and unsystematic". The comments suggested a certain conviction that the University has some control systems that could be used to check that policies are adhered to. Some of these systems such as the finance and expenditure monitoring systems are established, and participants are convinced, ensured that policies are implemented. However, the quality assurance Unit is believed to be evolving, and less established. Thus the comments validate the recommendation made in the works of Morley et al. (2010) concerning quality assurance that enhanced monitoring, accountability and quality assurance of public and private higher education institutions is needed. Morley et al argued that quality assurance mechanisms need to include student centred-services and structured systems for student feedback.

The comments indicating the dearth of mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating policy and its effectiveness implies that we do not know the criteria that informs policy development and its implementation. Therefore, it is difficult to understand how policy development and implementation processes in UEW have increased education productivity. The dearth of knowledge exists in four areas (which I take on in the next paragraph) as postulated by Johnstone et al. (1998).

First, it is difficult to understand how policy development and implementation in UEW contributes to effective teaching. By effective teaching, I mean application of 'good' instructional techniques and utilization of appropriate resources such as libraries, laboratories, scientific equipment, computers, and internet accessibility. Second, it is difficult to map out how policy development and implementation in UEW contributes to effective learning, including appropriate student time-on-task and facilitation of the ability to focus and concentrate. Third, it is difficult to map out how policy development and implementation in UEW contributes to development of appropriate curriculum. Appropriate curriculum refers to curriculum that has an intellectually challenging content, is up-to-date, and appropriate to the mission of the institution.

Fourth, it is difficult to map out how policy development and implementation in UEW contributes to an efficient managerial and administrative structure (Johnstone et al., 1998, pp.6–7). Whereas such factors could be further interrogated, their absence leaves us in doubt as to how policy development and implementation processes practically impinge on the work life, work ethics of UEW's staff and productivity within the institution. The data provided little information about the social and financial costs of implementing particular policies within the institution. As such it is difficult to know what analysis occasions policy development within the institution.

The original propositions of stakeholder theory, as delineated by Freeman (1984, p. 83) hold that an institutions should know "what it stands for" and look for congruency or fit between that and its stakeholders. In terms of the data about policy development and implementation at UEW, there is an unanswered question about this fit between mission and stakeholder interest. That question concerns how policy development and implementation processes have contributed to curriculum that promotes the University's responsibility of producing professional educators to spearhead a new national vision of education aimed at redirecting Ghana's efforts along the path of rapid economic and social development (see UEW, 2014). The lack of policy evaluation mechanisms also creates a gap in knowledge about the extent to which policy development and implementation processes have positioned the University to

fulfil its special mandate of playing a leading role in the Ghana's drive to produce scholars whose knowledge would be fully responsive to the realities and exigencies of contemporary Ghana and the West African sub-region (UEW, 2014).

As Leu and Prince-Rom (2006) argued, policy reform at the tertiary education level should not only achieve set administrative goals but also lead to educational quality using five robust indicators – exceptionality, consistency, fitness-for-purpose, value for money, and transformative potential. Given the data about absence of policy evaluation and monitoring systems, as indicated in Chapter Four, it was difficult to put a finger on the indicators that UEW considers in policy development and implementation. The argument has been made by Morley et al. (2010) that monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are required for implementing policies including admissions procedures, student retention policies and other measures for the purpose of facilitating equity in the administration of policies. It is difficult to argue that UEW considers those factors.

The data about quality assurance mechanisms reverberated arguments made by Morley et al. (2010) that “Government led Quality Assurance procedures were cited as monitoring mechanisms” in Ghana (and in Tanzania). In my view, that should raise concern about lack of policy monitoring, accountability and how equity is achieved through policy development and implementation. In terms of monitoring and evaluation, Morley et al. and other researchers argued that policies are not accompanied by strategic action plans and effective evaluation procedures (Deem et al., 2005). The effect Morley et al. identified is that

The lack of systematic attention to monitoring and accountability, including the analysis of performance data, the poorly developed management information systems and the reliance on impressionistic evaluation raise questions about the nature of structured interventions to support students to achieve and complete their programmes ... it is uncertain who is at risk, and what kind of support is required. (Morley et al., 2010:40)

In terms of accountability, Morley *et al.*, found that it has been “mainly conceptualised in relation to the state, rather than to consumer groups” (ibid). Similarly, Morley (2003) argued that policy reforms often fail to be intersected with quality assurance procedures. In terms of equity they argued that equity initiatives frequently remain at the level of aspiration in many national locations. Within the UEW context, equity is assumed to be the work of the Gender Mainstreaming Directorate. Thus discussions about how gender is considered as a cross cutting issue that integrates concerns around power relations and how that is employed, diffused and distributed across the policy making arena in UEW.

My proposition is that without proper evaluation, it seems difficult to understand how factors, aside from the requirements of government policy, influence policy development and implementation in UEW. As such, it is important that policy monitoring and evaluation is taken seriously within the institution.

5.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I argued that policy development and implementation within UEW has serious deficits in terms of the dissemination, stakeholder engagement and quality assurance monitoring and evaluation systems. I asserted such deficits can negatively affect achievement of policy goals. I argued that deficits relating to the absence of policy evaluation and monitoring mechanisms, in particular, make it difficult to understand what yardsticks guide policy development and implementation in UEW. Little is known about the impact of policy on the mission of the institution and the consequences (social and financial) of implementing particular policies. Overall, it is equally difficult to understand how UEW measures success in policy development and implementation in the absence of monitoring and evaluation systems.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Introduction

This thesis explored the perspectives of stakeholders on policy development and implementation in Ghanaian Universities using the case of UEW. This last chapter aims to summarise the main conclusions and the implications of the findings and the contributions of the thesis to knowledge on policy development and implementation in public universities; and, the propositions for further research. The chapter is organised in four sections. The first section summarises the main conclusions that have emerged from the analysis chapters. The second section, addressed the implications of the findings. The third section is where I presented the contribution of the thesis to knowledge. Finally, the propositions for further research are outlined in section four.

6.2 Summary of Research Findings

The aim of this research was to explore the critical issues in policy development and implementation at UEW in order to understand the practices and the gaps that need improvement. In so doing, the study drew on stakeholder theory to explore the participation of stakeholders in policy development and implementation at UEW. This section draws the main findings of the two analysis Chapters together. The main questions that were explored, and which the findings speak back to answer includes:

1. How is policy at UEW developed and implemented?
2. How influential are the different stakeholder groups in the development and implementation of policies at the university?
3. How can stakeholder participation be built?
4. How can the University policymaking be improved at UEW?

6.2.1 Higher education policy development and implementation at UEW

The summary in this section speaks back to the first research question: *How is policy at UEW developed and implemented?* The evidence discussed in the

analysis chapters highlights several interesting scenarios concerning policy development, dissemination and implementation.

In terms of policy development, the University of Education Winneba Act 672 (2004) and the Statute (2008) primarily vested in the Governing Council. There is hardly any provision in on the processes of policy development including the participation of stakeholders. The discussions in Section 4.2 of Chapter Four suggests that aside from the provision in Schedule A (6) which grants policy formulation regarding programmes and project management to the Grant Steering Committee, there is very little policy space for the participation of other entities, including the Academic Board, in policy development.

The discussion in Section 4.3, further assert that the institutional policy development practices do not nurture adoption of sound policies through wide faculty consultation and inclusive processes. It highlights that stakeholders have little influence in policy development aside from their representation on the Governing Council of the University. Junior members were the most excluded while academics and the senior administrators seemed to have more influence primarily because they have more representation on Council and, sometimes, on committees that are formed to do further work on some proposed policies. This leaves questions about principles of collegiate participation as argued by Rumball et al. (2001). As discussed in Section 4.4 the stakeholders interviewed proposed several ways of improving policy development. The participants suggest the adoption of online surveys as a way of gathering stakeholder opinions during the formulation and development of policies. Although they proposed convening policy forums, they argued that online surveys seemed quicker and also were reliable moreover, because faculty members do not seem to have time to participate in policy forums they would be a good pragmatic option.

In terms of policy dissemination, the discussion in section 5.2 highlights that several mechanisms are used to disseminate policies. The methods of dissemination include making hard copies available to staff; writing memos; writing letters to deans and heads of departments; and, submission of copies to

members of committees when they are asked to review policies or to work on draft policies. It was also claimed that policies are disseminated through the emails and float files in departments. Given that float files are kept in one office many staff do not have access to these policies. The discussions provide evidence that many staff, irrespective of seniority numbers, do not seem to be aware of some existing policies. This argument that many members within the institution do not seem to be aware of some existing policies bespeaks the quality of policy dissemination within the University.

As argued in Chapter Five, some stakeholders including the Ministry of Education, the NCTE, the NAB seemed to be more informed of policies than people within the University itself. This is because such entities are regulatory bodies that oversee higher education delivery in the country. The implications of the gaps in dissemination of policies to stakeholders within the institution coupled with their non-engagement in policy development are grave. The main challenges are that there is apathy that affects policy implementation; and, some staff lack knowledge. As UEW adheres strictly to implementing policies, those who suffer the most disadvantages are junior staff, nursing mothers on maternity leave, and people who travel within a period when a policy might have been adopted. Yet the main question that non-inclusive policy development processes coupled with ineffective dissemination raises is the question of accountability in terms of Brinkerhoff and Crosby's (2002:7) suggestion about the need to modify how public agencies operate in order to infuse democratic principles.

In terms of policy implementation, the discussions in section 5.3 and 5.4 indicate that there are less questions about human resource capacity to implement policies. However, there are several questions about institutional capacity. A central concern is that finance and internal audit sections do work to implement financial policies but the quality assurance unit is weak. As such the impact of financial policies is far more influential than other areas as Johnstone, Arora, and Experton (1998) have argued in their work. Trucano (2006) discussed the effects of this excessive focus on financial policies determined by the objective of minimizing costs while at the same time increasing revenue

generation sources. As Trucano argued, this raises questions about the quality of academic policy and human resource performance monitoring. The main arguments have concerned the lack of institutional monitoring systems for the monitoring and evaluation of policies and their implementation. Therefore, it is difficult to have clear responses from participants concerning the question of what policy reform comprises; what the policy directions of the institution are; and, whether the levels of policy compliance. In particular, how policies contribute to academic prowess of the institution and the production well-grounded graduates was difficult to determine.

The ineffectiveness of monitoring mechanisms, particularly the Quality Assurance Unit, makes it difficult to understand how policy implementation gives credibility to Johnstone et al.'s (1998) views that tertiary education reform should target the improvement of teaching quality through the recruitment of a team of well-trained and motivated tutorial fellows. It highlights the difficulty in ascertaining the impact of policies in the context improving the academic and professional qualifications of teaching staff; the revision of curricula and enhanced student evaluation measures; and, upgrade critical facilities such as libraries and laboratories. Inefficient monitoring and evaluation of policies should be a matter of concern because, as UNESCO (2004) argued, policy reform in the education sector should facilitate not only improved academic performance but also promote good citizenship especially in terms of instilling the values of accountability, peace, equality, and respect for cultural diversity.

6.2.2 Influence of stakeholders in policy development and implementation

My second claim in this thesis is that, the generality of stakeholders have little space in policy development and implementation save their representation on the Governing Council of the University. This claim speaks to the second research question: *How influential are the different stakeholder groups in the development and implementation of policies at the university?*

The analysis of policy documents in section 4.2, and as mentioned earlier in section 6.2.1 indicates that there is no mention of how stakeholders should be

engaged in policy development and implementation. The discussion suggests that policies primarily emanate from management decisions. Such policies are approved by the Council and in some cases the Academic Board. The arguments of the participants suggest that there is little policy discretion where staff and stakeholder representatives are allowed to participate in the development of policies. This leaves many questions about stakeholder influence.

It may be argued that parents of students, members of local communities in which the university is situated and donors who do not have representatives on the Governing Council, tend to miss-out in policy development. Also, there are questions about the effective representation of junior members, who have only one representative on Council. There are also questions of the time and space provided for consultation during policy development. In terms of democratic participation and consultation between constituent groups and their representatives, the discussions raise concerns about the constraining effects of the applications of the oath of secrecy. The argument is that some Council Members do not consult with their constituents and miss out on effectively represent their interest in policy development. In situations where the Council appoints a committee, stakeholders are concerned that the committees are lopsided in terms of the representation of junior members.

Also there are concerns that stakeholder representatives that serve as Committee members are not nominated by their constituent groups. In terms of the Committee work itself, participants who have served on committees explained that they had little space to do much consultation with stakeholders. The primary argument is that committee recommendations are more informed by expert opinion and the views of committee members than views obtained from inclusive consultation processes.

In terms of policy implementation the discussions in sections 5.2 and 5.3 illustrates that stakeholders that stakeholders are less engaged in policy implementation. The discussions did show that the university management makes efforts to disseminate policies to stakeholder groups as noted in sections

5.2 and 6.2.1 above. Yet the participants, including management members admitted gaps in policy implementation in terms of stakeholder engagement. As the data suggests, senior members have more roles to play in policy implementation than junior members. The senior members are involved as Deans, Directors or Head of Departments. Deans, Heads of Departments, Units and Sections are expected to be involved in policy implementation. Excepting However, there is little evidence in the data about how other groups of staff are involved in policy implementation. This would suggest, Brinkerhoff (2004) argued, that there is need for more investment in stakeholder participation. The arguments of Sabatier (1991) and Brinkerhoff & Crosby (2002) are that investments to promote stakeholder participation in policy development and implementation usually have great influences on the overall success of the policy reform in terms of instilling a sense of awareness and responsiveness among stakeholders in an organization.

6.2.3 Ways of improving stakeholder participation in policymaking

The third claim in this thesis is that, the stakeholders involved in this research perceived university policy development and implementation as non-inclusive, requiring the introduction of systems that provide space for both democratic engagement and the co-construction of policies. This claim speaks to the third and fourth research questions: *How can stakeholder participation be built?* and *How can the University policymaking be improved at UEW?*

The summary that answers these research questions is drawn from the discussions in section 4.4 of Chapter Four and section 5.4 of Chapter Five. Given Sabatier's (1991) arguments that the success of any policy development process is chiefly determined by the ability of policymakers to actively involve and inform other interested parties about: the facts underlying reform proposals; the timely provision of support services and finally the need for communication.

In terms of policy development, the discussion suggests the participants are not favourably disposed to domineering and centralized policymaking practices that vest all authority in the Governing Council. They primarily argued for an all-inclusive practice that can enhance a sense of collective ownership of policies.

It may be argued that the central premise behind this postulation is reflected in Sabatier's (1991) view that the success of any policy development process depends on the ease with which team members are able to obtain high quality, relevant information and knowledge essential to ground the policy within the needs and aspirations of the stakeholders. I would support this proposition because, in terms of policy reform debates, Sabatier (1991) and Brinkerhoff (2004) have warned that new policies are more often than not prone to many forms of uncertainty, and the timely mitigation of such challenges through stakeholder participation definitely strengthens the viability of the policy. Yes a lucid summary The point that the stakeholders' perspectives projected in line with arguments in the literature is that participation in policymaking and implementation is necessary to attract optimum acceptance of policy among stakeholders.

In terms of improving stakeholder participation in policy implementation, the discussions highlight the need to develop monitoring mechanisms that assess 1) the progress made in the actual implementation of existing policies; 2) the impact of such policies; and 3) the interaction between different inputs that contribute to the success or otherwise of the implementation and the gaps that need addressing. Another realisation was the need to use spaces around staff meetings or gatherings such as convocation meetings and student general assembly meetings, to disseminate policies. The discussions further highlight that policies disseminated through the distribution of physical copies of policies.

The discussions suggested that to achieve successful stakeholder engagement in policy development and implementation, legal regimes that guide the practicalities of policymaking must explicitly provide for the roles of stakeholders. Otherwise those responsible for the process of initiating new policies should endeavour to meet democratic requirements by exercising policy discretion as Bollag (2004) suggested. In the context of policy reform the present practice where stakeholders suggest policy development and implementation is non-inclusive, highlights the point in the literature that policy reform in tertiary institutions in developing nations is long overdue (Bollag, 2004; Johnstone et al., 1998; Badu & Loughridge, 1997). Part of the suggestion

from stakeholders is the need to develop quality orientation programmes for new staff and students.

6.3 Implications for Professional Practice

This section attempts to look at broader implications of the findings of the research. This is done with caution, as it is foolhardy to make policy recommendations based on a case study involving fifteen participants from one institution that is chosen from among the others because of its uniqueness. However, it can be asserted that this study established a set of findings that are unique, as well as highly critical of professional practice in public universities in Ghana in particular. But also it can be argued that some findings offer analytic insights that can be tested elsewhere.

The findings that participants were concerned about stakeholders' participation in policy development and implementation, speaks to the argument of Meek et al. (1996) that policies successfully fulfil their roles when developed in a collaborative manner. They assert that tertiary institution policy reform plays a variety of roles in enhancing diversity; some of which include the determination of positive discrimination strategies, enhancement of equal opportunities, and uniformity and consistency of tuition. Thus tertiary institution governors and management need to ensure that all stakeholders are involved in all stages of policy reform. For me, it is reasonable to assume that effective stakeholder involvement will ensure that they play their roles effectively as they should be aware of the 'what', 'when', 'how', 'why', and 'with whom' of planned innovation. By effective stakeholder involvement, I mean allowing the participation of stakeholders in all aspects of policy formulation, development and dissemination and implementation. It includes allowing stakeholders to nominate their representatives to attend policy reform discussions and empowering representatives to consult extensively with their constituents. In my view, such practice is necessary if policymakers are interested in capturing of all the pertinent information about the policy; and, in order that appropriate actions are taken.

In relation to the importance of incorporating a wide range of stakeholders in the policymaking process this work highlights the need to follow the propositions of Brinkerhoff and Crosby (2002) that, anyone who may influence, benefit, or enter into conflict with policy should be actively incorporated into policy development and implementation processes. Thus the study results highlight the imperative that the university actively embraces all stakeholders, particularly within the university community, if the goals of social accountability and enhanced academic productivity are to be achieved. The findings, that some stakeholders who are not represented on the Governing Council may be left out of policy development and implementation, bespeaks the need to broaden consultations during policy development and to provide space for grassroots input. It means that one step to effective stakeholder participation in policy development would be to conduct stakeholder mapping to identify those who may become actors in the policy development and implementation process. This is necessary given that all policies may not necessarily affect the same group of people.

In terms of emphasis on implementing and monitoring financial policies to the detriment of academic and general quality assurance, the findings suggest that the university is yet to recognize the point that policy reform that addresses the area of academic practice constitutes the most basic element of the overall management of an institution of higher learning (Muller, 2007). The implication is that the reform of academic practices at UEW did command the greatest of attention contrary to Muller's assertion that policies related to academic practice tends to receive more attention than any other category of innovation. In line with Muller's (2007) contention that academic practice is the essence of the institution's mission, I would argue that there is need for institutions of higher education to accord academic policies a central position. The reason is that it is very important to grasp the relationship between policies and academic efficiency. As such it is necessary for tertiary institution managers and governors to analyse financial efficiency (cost saving) in terms of the cost to academic efficiency, by analysing, for example, the impact of financial cost saving measures on the present and future academic quality of the institution.

Also, the stakeholder concerns about monitoring and evaluation mechanisms speak back to the assertion that any policy reform at an institution of higher learning must be well strategized and implemented in order to achieve optimal efficiency (Johnstone et al., 1998; Muller, 2007; Osborne, 2003a; 2003b). The concerns suggest that policymaking processes must not only be inclusive, it must be associated with an implementation, monitoring and evaluation plan if it can fully achieve the intended impact. I would suggest that institutions of higher learning need to develop policy impact assessment plans. Impact assessment of policies should include and not be limited to measuring 1) community participation; 2) the extent of stakeholder ownership; 3) the quality of academic programmes offered; 4) management and governance accountability; 5) fairness in implementation; 6) the efficient operation of departments and faculties; 7) the quality of staff and students that are produced; 8) the implications of future achievement of the institution's core mission among others.

In consequence of the above, proposals for new policies should be questioned in terms of how it contributes to build the capacity of staff, students, and members of the wider institutional community to support institution's capacity to deliver on its core mandate. For example, at UEW, policy spanning the realms of academic practice, student welfare, finance, security, administration, sports, sanitation, staff welfare, and community services amongst many more areas should be queried in terms of how they contribute to address the goal of promoting "research, disseminating knowledge and [initiating] education policy and development" (UEW, 2011). This, I would argue is necessary if the institution's influence, in terms of quality of its graduates and staff, is to span both local and international market demands.

In terms of the change theory framework (Schein, 1995; Robbins, 2003) and the operations of stakeholder propositions (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002; Brinkerhoff, 2004) discussed in Chapter 2, the findings suggesting apathy towards policy implementation speaks to several issues. First, it implies that tertiary institution policymakers must strive to fully convince all members of their community that there is need for change and gradually take them through the process of

innovation. It also speaks to Brinkerhoff and Crosby (2002) proposition that, the policymaking process is as technical as it is political; therefore, by incorporating the views of a wide range of stakeholders such policies become representative. Stakeholder participation makes the process of implementation easier – receiving wider acceptance. Melton (2009) and Orr (2006) made similar points, that although policymaking in education institutions is a daunting task, it can be made less fraught by incorporating as many actors as possible. It further suggests that stakeholders must have a sense of ownership of policies if they are to be effective and efficient (Ball, 1994; Sabatier, 1991). As Fitz and Halpin (1994) and Sabatier (1999) suggested, incorporating all stakeholders, whether directly or through their representatives, enhances policy ownership and thus the chances that such policies will achieve their goals.

My argument is that, initiating reform without consulting the full range of interested parties (more so in respect of junior employees) is more likely to detract from achieving the goals because it may be seen as applying more pressure rather than improving the welfare of interested parties (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002; Local Government of Ghana, 1999). In terms of questions about stakeholders' welfare, for example, it is virtually impossible for senior members of academic boards, governing councils and related committees that enjoy immense power, to fully consider the interests of junior stakeholders if they are excluded from membership of such bodies.

It can be argued that these findings corroborate the views of Muller (2007) and World Bank (1994) that policies plays a vital role in streamlining and monitoring programmes to ascertain the quality of the institutions' academic standing. As such, the process of implementing new policies – and, by extension, the impact of such policies on the day-to-day operation of tertiary institutions – should be seen as a sensitive issue that should be approached judiciously, through meticulous stakeholder engagement processes. The centralisation of policy making in the Governing Council and operational marginalisation of consultation and broad stakeholder engagement, does not support meticulous and democratic policy development. In the context of change theory (Schein, 1995; Robbins (2003), and stakeholder theory, no form of change just happens, it is

phenomenal – a profound dynamic psycho-social and political processes involving painful unlearning and relearning by cognitively restructuring one's thoughts, perceptions, feelings and attitudes (Schein, 1995). In this regard, policy development, dissemination and implementation processes should be constructed so as to be consistent, fair and mindful of the welfare of university community members; and, above all, to enhance the equality and of the institution's academic performance.

Accordingly, it seems that finding strategies that work in terms of achieving productivity in institutions of higher learning takes more than mere formulation and implementation of new policies (Bollag, 2004, p.26). Rather, as Girdwood (1999) and Leach et al. (2008) assert, institutions need to embrace a spirit of collectiveness, consulting widely in order to generate broad support and quality thinking, to come up with practices and policies whose impact can position the institution as a centre of academic excellence.

Overall, the results of the present study show, policy reform at UEW can be described in terms of Brinkerhoff and Crosby (2002), and Meek et al. (1996) propositions as lacking inclusive. To give face to the spirit of policy reform, policy development needs to be all-inclusive: it should cover a myriad of other areas in addition to those specifically targeted as requiring immediate attention (Johnstone et al., 1998). This is more so as policy development practices are perceived as lacking a full picture of the needs of junior members of the university community. Perhaps to emphasize the importance of incorporating the views of a wide range of actors, it is helpful to draw on Sawyer's (2004) view that policy impediments brought about by varying stakeholders' opinions can only be addressed if those responsible for initiating reform are willing to consult all concerned parties. Such a position is important because it is invariably reasoned that policymaking becomes easier the greater the variety of stakeholders involved. Rumball et al. (2001) strengthen this argument by arguing for principles of collegiate participation that help to enhance community participation and, in turn, ensure the ownership of reform, given that they address aspects of power and authority on the part of policy initiators. In order to achieve the main goal of education productivity, as envisaged by Girdwood

(1999), Johnston et al. (1998), and Muller (2007), I would argue that UEW and other universities should develop policies that not only improve the quality of service delivery but do so in an equitable manner. In this context, 'equity' can be taken as meaning the representation of a wide range of university community members' opinions and/or expectations.

6.4 Contribution to knowledge

This study adds substantially to the small but growing literature (Girdwood, 1999; Badu & Loughridge, 1997; Kwapong, 2007; Dai et al., 2008; Leach et al., 2008; Morley et al., 2010; Varghese, 2013) on tertiary education in Ghana. Unlike previous studies, this research though established a set of findings that specifically provide insights into higher education policy development and implementation in Ghanaian public universities in terms of stakeholder participation.

The findings of the present study are thus unique, as well as highly critical of professional practice in public universities, using the case of UEW. It highlights the deficits in the over-concentration of decision-making authority in the Governing Council such that the role of stakeholders is largely minimised. It brings to the fore significant deficits in policymaking, dissemination and implementation. My proposition is that policy development processes, in line with the deficits in the Act establishing the University, are neither very inclusive nor consultative. Although the findings suggest that the University is committed to strict adherence to policy, it questions the exclusion of stakeholders, especially junior members, from the policymaking processes.

Therefore, this thesis adds substantially to knowledge in higher education policymaking in terms of providing insights that are necessary for charting educational change in which inclusion and inclusiveness are seen as paramount. From a stakeholder analysis perspective and in terms of democratic participation in policymaking, this thesis asserts that the Act establishing the University over-concentrates decision-making authority in the Governing Council. The argument is not against recognising the Council as final decision

making authority; it is about the dearth of requirements that decisions should be made in consultation with or after consultations with stakeholders – people who will benefit or whose interests, actions and work will be affected by the policy in one way or the other. Based on the central analysis of this research I assert that further research on higher education policy making is necessary to understand the scope of prevalence of stakeholder marginalisation in higher education policy development in order to provide insights that can inform practice in the field of higher education governance, management and administration.

6.4 Recommendations for future research on Higher Education policy development and implementation

There has been several works on higher education in Ghana as referenced throughout this thesis. However, from the evidence presented and the experience outlined in this thesis several suggestions can be made for further studies in the field of higher education.

This research is a case study limited to one institution, and so, does not provide national data that can be drawn upon to make concrete arguments about higher education policy development and implementation in Ghanaian public universities. What can be argued is that the findings of this thesis eulogises support for further empirical, and large scale studies, into higher education policy making in Ghana. Empirical evidence is needed to understand the processes of policy development, dissemination and implementation across the higher education sector. Follow-up studies are needed to understand institutional capacity for policy making; the applications of stakeholder engagement theories; and the observance of democratic principles.

This study has been limited to a public institution. Whereas the insights may be hypothesised and argued to be of some semblance to the situation in other public higher education institutions, it may not necessarily be argued to be the case for private universities. As such, comparative studies may be necessary to juxtapose the situation in public and private universities in order to understand the convergences, and the divergences. Studies are needed to understand how

stakeholders are engaged in different institutions and the organizing principles that guide stakeholder engagements in institutional policy matters. Such studies will help provide data for situational analysis of higher education policy development, dissemination and implementation. It will provide insights into the differential practices across institutions and to 'tease out' the best practices that can be adopted.

In reference to engaging students, for example, studies are needed to understand how higher education policy making prepares students for exhibiting and expressing citizenship values such as participation and democratic engagements. Several student protests have emerged because of policies regarding fee increases and other policy matters which have led to closure of institutions and the suspension of the academic activities. Given that policies are implemented to mitigate previously existing or even anticipated problems (O'Toole & Laurence, 2002; Mine, 2007), it would be wise to conduct studies about how higher education policymaking processes address deficits in policymaking to ensure institutional cohesion and stability.

In terms of public accountability of institutions, this thesis provides insights to suggest the need for the public to be concerned about how higher education policies are developed. The questions that remain for research include (but are not limited to), the following:

How can public higher education institutions promote public engagement in policy development and implementation?

How can the public hold higher education institutions accountable for deficits in policy development and implementation, given the current dearth of legal requirements?

What are the options for different stakeholders such as Union representatives who feel that the views of their constituents are not sufficiently factored into policy development and implementation?

Aside from apathy that affects effective policy implementation, what are the macro and micro level consequences of stakeholder marginalisation in higher education policy making?

These questions need to be explored with a view to creating accountable public institutions by actively engaging members of the public in designing innovative measures necessary to redress institutional conflict, the erosion of democratic values and corruption of system processes. The findings will help in developing higher education policymaking. The knowledge so generated can help regulatory bodies such as the NCTE, the NAB and the Ministry of Education and Parliament to make necessary macro-level policy decisions that may serve the interest of various stakeholders in the higher education sector including the institutions of higher learning and the people within them.

REFERENCES

- Ader, H. J., Mellenbergh, G. J., & Hand, D. J. (2008). *Advising on research methods: A consultant's companion*. Huizen, The Netherlands: Johannes van Kessel Publishing.
- Adu-Yeboah, C, and Dzama Forde, L, (2011) "Returning to Study in Higher Education in Ghana: Experiences of Mature Undergraduate Women." *Research in Comparative and International Education* 6(4): 400-414.
- Adzahlie-Mensah, Vincent (2014) *Being 'nobodies': school regimes and student identities in Ghana*. Doctoral thesis (PhD), University of Sussex.
- Agyepong, I. A. & Adjei, S. (2008). Public social policy development and implementation: a case study of the Ghana National Health Insurance scheme. *Health Policy and Planning*, 23:150–160.
- Anderson, W.T. (1995). *The Truth about the Truth (New Consciousness Reader)*. New York: Tarcher.
- Annan, K. (August 3, 2000). Information Technology Should Be Used to Tap Knowledge from Greatest Universities to Bring Learning to All, Kofi Annan Says. Press Release No: UNIS/SG/2625 Release Date: 3 August 2000.
- Anthony, J. H. (2009). Access to Education for Students with Autism in Ghana: Implications for EFA. Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2010, 2010/ED/EFA/MRT/PI/10.
- Aryee J.R.A. (2000). Saints, wizards, demons and systems: explaining the success or failure of public policies and programs. Inaugural lecture at the Amegashie Auditorium School of Administration, University of Ghana, 4 May 2000. Accra, Ghana: Ghana Universities Press.
- Association of African Universities (AAU) (2005). Report of the Executive Board to the 11th AAU General Conference. 61st (special) Meeting of the Executive Board Cape Town, South Africa, February 17 & 18, 2005.
- Atkinson P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, J. & Lofland, L. (2007) *The Handbook of Ethnography*. London: Sage.
- Babbie, E. (2004). *The Practice of Social Research* (10th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Badu, E. E. & Loughridge, B.L. (1997). Towards an information provision strategy for university libraries in Ghana. *Information Research*, 3(2).
- Ball, S. (1990). *Politics and policy making in education: explorations in policy sociology*. Routledge.

- Bartlett, J.E., Kotrlik, J.W., & Higgins, C. (2001). Organizational research: Determining appropriate sample size for survey research. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, 19(1) 43–50.
- Barton L. & Tomlinson S. (1984). *Special Education and Social Interests*. U.K: Croom Helm LMD.
- Bassey, M. (1999) *Case Study Research in Educational Settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., & Tight, M. (2006). *How to Research*. Open University Press.
- Bloom, D., Canning, D., & Chan, K. (2006). *Higher Education and Economic Development in Africa*. Harvard University, Human Development Sector, Africa Region.
- Bogdan, R. C. and Biklen, S. K. (1982) *Qualitative Research for Education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Allyn & Bacon Inc.
- Bouchard, G. & Carroll, B.W. (2003). *One size does not fit all: A contingency theory approach to policy-making*. A paper presented at the CPSA meeting (Public administration section) Halifax, Nova Scotia May 29 – June 1, 2003.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. C. (1990) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bryman, A. (2004) *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: University Press.
- Brinkerhoff, D.W. (1999). *Exploring State Civil Society Collaboration: Policy Partnerships in Developing Countries*. *Non-Project and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(4); 59-87.
- Brinkerhoff D.W. (2004). Accountability and health systems: towards conceptual clarity and policy relevance. *Health Policy and Planning* 19: 371–9.
- Brinkerhoff, D.W. & Crosby, B. (2002). *Managing policy reform: concepts and tools for decision-makers in developing and transitioning countries*. Kumarian Press.
- Burke, P & Jackson, S (2007) *Reconceptualising Lifelong Learning: Feminist Interventions*. London: Routledge.
- Cibuka, J.G. (1994). *Policy analysis and the study of the politics of education*. *Politics of Education Association yearbook*, 105-125.
- Cobbe, S. (1990). *Education Indicators for Policy Purposes in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Ministry of Education and Culture.

- Cohen, L. Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2011) *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA" Sage.
- Cummings, W.K. (1997). Management Initiatives for Reaching the Periphery. In H. Dean Nielsen and William K. Cummings, eds. *Quality Education for All: Community-Oriented Approaches*. New York: Garland.
- Daniluk, J. C. & Haverkamp, B. E. (1993) Ethical issues in counseling adult survivors of incest. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 72, 16-22.
- Deakin University Governance Unit, (2008). Retrieved January 12, 2011, from: www.deakin.edu.au/executive/vpais/governance/
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.) (2005). *The sage handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed.)*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Denscombe, M. (2007) *The Good research guide for small scale social research projects*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003) *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Devault, M. L., & McCoy, L. (2001) Institutional ethnography: Using interviews to investigate ruling relations. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium eds. *Handbook of interview research: Context and method*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Dunne, M., Pryor, J. & Yates, P. (2005) *Becoming a Researcher: a research companion for the social science*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Epstein, D. (1993) *Changing Classroom Cultures: anti-racism, politics and schools*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.
- Essuman, S. & Otami, S. P. (2011) TESSA and the University of Education, Winneba, Ghana. Available at <http://www.tessafrica.net>
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The critical study of language*. London, UK: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analysing discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. L. & Wodak, R. (1997) Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk ed. *Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. 2. London: Sage.

- Flick, U. (2006) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
- Fielding, M. & Moss, P. (2011) *Radical Education and the Common School, A Democratic Alternative*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Fisher, C.M. (2007). *Researching and writing a dissertation: A guidebook for business students*. Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Fox, N. F. (2003). *The new sartre: Explorations in postmodernism*. New York, London; Continuum.
- Freeman, R. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Ballinger: Boston, MA.
- Garcia, L. N. (2014). The End of MOOCS and the future of education. The UBYSsey. The UBYSSEY.
- Ghana (2002). *Meeting the challenges of education in the twenty first century - Report of the president's committee on review of education reforms in Ghana*. Accra: Education, Adwinsa Publications (Gh) Ltd.
- Gibbons, M. (1998). Higher education relevance in the 21st century. Association of Commonwealth Universities.
- Glassman, A., Reich. M.R., Laserson, K., & Rojas, F. (1999). Political analysis of health reform in the Dominican Republic. *Health Policy and Planning*, 14:115-26.
- Glatthorn, A. & Joyner, R. (2005). *Writing the winning thesis or dissertation: A step-by-step Guide*, (2nd Ed.). Corwin Press.
- Grindle, M.S. & Thomas, J.W. (1991). Public choices and policy change: the political economy of reform in developing countries. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Hammersley, M & Atkinson, P. (1995) *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. London: Routledge.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times*. London; Cassell.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- HEPI (2009) *Male and female participation and progression in Higher Education*, Oxford, Higher Education Policy Institute.
- Hesse, M. (1980). *Revolution and reconstruction in the philosophy of science*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

- Hill, M.J. & Hupe, P.L. (2002), *Implementing Public Policy; governance in theory and practice*. SAGE Publications London.
- Hsieh, H. F. & Solomon, S. E. (2005) Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288
- Huisman, J., Meek, L. & Wood, F. (2007). Institutional Diversity in Higher Education. A cross-national and longitudinal analysis. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 61.
- Huyssen, A. (1986). *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism or, the cultural logic of late capitalism*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Johnstone, D.B, Aora, A., & Experton, W. (1998). The Financing and Management of Higher Education: A Status Report on Worldwide Reforms. The World Bank. Retrieved December 17, 2010, from: <http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/educ/postbasc.htm/>
- Kearns, K. (2007). *The business of childcare*. Pearson Education, Australia.
- Kogan, M. (1975). *Education policy making; A study of interest groups and parliament*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Kvale, S. & Britmann, S. (2008). *Interviewing: Learning the craft of qualitative interviewing*. London: Sage.
- Kwapong, O.A.T.F. (2007). Widening access to tertiary education for women in Ghana. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE*, 8 (4).
- Lather, O. (1991). *Getting smart; feminist research and pedagogy in the postmodern*. New York and London; Routledge.
- Lather, P. (1986). Issues of Validity in Openly Ideological Research: Between a Rock and a Soft Place. *Interchange*, 17(4); 63-84.
- Leach, F. et al (2008). *Widening Participation in Higher Education in Ghana and Tanzania: Developing an Equity Scorecard*. An ESRC/DfID Poverty Reduction Programme funded Research Project, Working Paper 4: A Profile of Participation in Higher Education in Ghana and Tanzania.
- Leathwood, C. and Read, B. (2009) *A Feminised Future? Gender and the Changing Face of Higher Education*. London: SRHE & Open University Press.

- Leu, E. & Price-Rom, A. (2006). *Quality of education and teacher learning: A review of the literature*. U.S. Agency for International Development Cooperative Agreement No. GDG-A-00-03-00006-00.
- Liasidou, A. (2009). Critical Policy Research and Special Education Policymaking: A Policy Trajectory Approach. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 7(1); 130.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985), *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Lisa, M. G. (2008). *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, Vol.2, pp.697-698
- Lyotard, J. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by Geoff Bennington, and Brian Massumi. Vol. 10 of *Theory and History of Literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Malen, B. (1991). *The micropolitics of education; mapping the multiple dimensions of power relations in school politics*. Politics of Education Association Yearbook, 147-167.
- Mander, H. (2010) Words from the Heart: Researching People's Stories. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 2 (1), 252-270.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (1999) *Designing Qualitative Research*. London: Thousand Oaks.
- Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative Researching*, London: Sage.
- Maxfield, M.G. & Babbie, E. (1995). *Research Methods for Criminal Justice and Criminology*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- McLean, M., Ashwin, P and Abbas, A (2011) Access to 'pedagogic rights': the teaching and learning of social science in English universities *Society for Research into Higher Education Annual (SRHE) Conference*, 7-9 December 2011, Celtic Manor, Newport.
- Meek, V. L. Goedegebuure, L., Kivinen, O., and Rinne, R. (Eds). (1996). *The Mockers and Drocked: Comparative perspectives on differentiation, convergence and diversity in higher education*. Oxford. Pergamon Press.
- Melton, A. (2009). Leadership matters: A mixed-methods study of South Carolina superintendents' change style preferences, longevity and student achievement. *Dissertation, University of South Carolina*. Retrieved January 11, 2011, from: <http://www.proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=1745453501&Fmt=7&clientId=79356&RQT=309&VName=PQD/>

- Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons, Boston.
- Mine, G. (2007). *Making Policy: A Guide to the Federal Government's Policy Process*. Ginsler and Associates. U.S.A.
- Morley, L., Leach, F., Lussier, K., Lihamba, A., Mwaipopo, R., Forde, L. D. & Egbenya, G (2010) Widening Participation in Higher Education in Ghana and Tanzania: Developing an Equity Scorecard. An ESRC/DFID Poverty Reduction Programme Research Project. Draft Research Report.
- Morley, L (2010) Gender mainstreaming: myths and measurement in higher education in Ghana and Tanzania. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 40(4): 533 - 550.
- Morley, L (2003) *Quality and Power in Higher Education*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Muller, A. (ed.) (2007). Trends in curriculum reform and the transformation of higher education *Management Insights*, vol. 2. Paper presented by UJ Faculty of Management staff as part of the Management Insights staff paper series.
- Muskin, J.A. (1999). Including Local Priorities to Assess School Quality: The Case of Save the Children Community Schools in Mali. *Comparative Education Review*, 43 (1): 36-63.
- Naoum, S. (2007). *Dissertation research and writing for construction students*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Newman, F. (2000). Saving higher education's soul. In: *Change*, 33(5), 16-23.
- Ohene, I (2010) *Gender and Leadership In Higher Educational Institutions: Exploring Perceptions and Practices in University of Cape Coast, Ghana*. International EdD Thesis, University of Sussex.
- O' Toole, L.J. (2002). Research on Policy Implementation: Assessment and Prospects. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2): 263-288.
- Orr, M. T. (2006). Learning the superintendency: Socialization, negotiation, and determination. *Teachers College Record*, 108(7), 1362-1403.
- Osborne, M. (2003a). Increasing or Widening Participation in Higher Education? — A European overview. *European Journal of Education*, 38(1); 5-24.

- Osborne, M. (2003b). Policy and practice in widening participation — a six country comparative study of access as flexibility. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 22, pp. 43–58.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newberry Park, CA, Sage Publications.
- Prah, M (2002) Gender Issues in Ghanaian Tertiary Institutions: Women Academics and Administrators at Cape Coast University. *Ghana Studies*, 5: 83-122.
- Pressman, J. & Wildavsky, A. (1984). *Implementation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Prochaska, J. and DiClemente, C. (1983) stages and processes of self-change in smoking: toward an integrative model of change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 5, 390-395
- Prouty, D. & Tegegn, W. (2000). *This School Is Ours. We Own It: A Report on the Stocktaking Exercise of the BESO Community Schools Activity Program*. Addis Ababa: World Learning Inc.
- Ravsberge, F. (2013) *Cuba in Cuba, What is left of 20 years later*. Havana Times.org Retrieved from www.havanatimes.org/p=98815
- Robbins, S. (2003). *Organizational Behavior* (10th Ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ruwaard, D., Kramers P.G.N., Jeths A, & Achterberg, P.W. (1994). *Public Health Status and forecasts*. National Institute of Public Health and Environmental Protection, Netherlands.
- Sabatier, P.A. (1991). Toward Better Theories of the Policy Process. *Political Science and Politics*, 24(2); 147-156.
- Salamini, L. (1981). *The sociology of political praxis: An introduction to Gramsci's theory*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Salmi, K. (1992). *Higher education and economic development: Strategies for reform--A policy brief*. Paper presented at the Senior Policy Seminar on Enhancing effectiveness and efficiency in African Higher Education. The World Bank, EDI, March 1992, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Sawyer, A. (2004). Challenges Facing African Universities: Selected Issues. *African Studies Review*, 47(1); 1-59.

- Schein, E.H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Schein, E.H. (1995). *Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning*. Working Paper 3821.
- Scheurich, J.J. (1997). *Research method in the postmodern*. The Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis, Inc.
- Schostak, J. (2002) *Understanding, Designing and Conducting Qualitative Research in Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Shields, R. A. (2013) Globalisation and international student mobility: A network analysis. *Comparative Education Review*, 57 (4) pp. 609-636.
- Shields, R. A. And Edwards, R. (2010) Student mobility and emerging hubs in global higher education. In Portnoi, L. Rust, V. And Bagley, S. Eds. *Higher Education, Policy and the Global Competition Phenomenon*. Pp. 235-248
- Shields, P. & Tajalli, H. (2006). Intermediate Theory: The Missing Link in Successful Student Scholarship. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 313-334.
- Sikwibele, A. (2003). *Assessment of Education Policy: Issues and challenges*. Retrieved December 30, 2010, from: www.dpms.org/publications.Bulletin/Jan-o3/editorial.html/
- Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.) Sage Publication, London.
- Silverman, D. (2010) *Doing Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE
- Smith, D. E. (2005) *Institutional ethnography: A sociology for people*. Toronto: Alta Mira Press.
- Smith, B. (2003). *Public Policy and Public Participation: Engaging Citizens and the Community in the Development of Public Policy*. Halifax: Health Canada, Atlantic Region, September.
- Smith, K. B. (2002). Typologies and the Benefits of Policy Classification. *Policy Journal*, 30; 379-395.
- Somekh, B. (2006). *Action Research: A Methodology for Change and Development*, Maidenhead, Open University Press.
- Spasoff, R.A. (1999). *Epidemiologic methods for health Policy*. Oxford University Press.

- Stanley, L., & Wise, S. (1983). *Breaking out: Feminist consciousness and feminist research*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Stark, S. & Torrance, H. (2005) Case study. In B. Somekh, & C. Lewin, eds. *Research methods in the social sciences*. London: SAGE.
- Stockley, B. (2011) *Global Trends in Higher Education*. Beijing
- Stoecker, R. (1999) Are academics irrelevant? Roles for scholars in participatory research. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42 (5), 840-854 .
- Tettey, WJ (2008) *Comparative Analysis of Next Generation's Academic Indicators*. Prepared for the University Leaders' Forum, 22-25 November 2008, Accra, Ghana.
www.foundation-partnership.org/ulf/resources/tettey.pdf
- Tettey, WJ (2010) *Challenges of developing and retaining the next generation of academics: deficits in academic staff capacity at African universities*. Partnership for Higher Education in Africa.
http://www.foundation-partnership.org/pubs/pdf/tettey_deficits.pdf
- The World Bank (1994). *Higher Education: The Lessons of Experience*. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
- Torjman, S. (2005) What is Policy? Ontario: Caledon Institute of Social Policy
- Trucano, M. (2006). Education management information system: A short case study of Ghana. Cambridge Education, Working Paper, No. 4.
- Tsikata, D (2007) Gender, Institutional Cultures and the Career Trajectories of Faculty of the University of Ghana. *Feminist Africa*, 8, 26-41, available at www.feministafrica.org/uploads/File/Issue_8/05_issue8_article2.pdf
- University of Education Winneba Statutes (2008)
- UNESCO, (2004). *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005: Education for All - The Quality Imperative*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNICEF, (2000). *Defining Quality in Education. Working Paper Series*. New York: UNICEF.
- University of Education, Winneba (UEW) (2011). Retrieved January 12, 2011, from: www.uew.edu.gh/
- USAID/EQUIP2, (2006). *Stakeholder Collaboration: An Imperative for Education Quality*. Washington, DC: EQUIP2 Program.
- Usher, R. (1996) A critique of the neglected epistemological assumptions of educational research. In D. Scott and R. Usher *Understanding Educational Research*. London: Routledge.

- van Dijk, T. A. (2001) Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton eds. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Vidouich, L. (2001) A conceptual Framework for Analysis of Education Policy and Practices. Retrieved December 30, 2010, from:
www.aare.edu.au/01.pap/vid012_1276.htm/
- Walt, G. & Gilson, L. (1994). *Reforming the health sector in developing countries: the central role of policy analysis*. *Health Policy and Planning*, 9:353-70.
- Walt, G. (1994). *Health Policy: An introduction to Process and Power*. London and New Jersey: Zed Books.
- Wright, U. T. (2003) Institutional Ethnography: A Tool for Merging Research and Practice. 2003 *Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education*.
- Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Sample Interview transcript

R4: Non academic staff

This study is about UEW policy formulations, implementations and its impact on community. So I will be grateful if u starts with a little bit about yourself, a teaching or non- teaching senior member, the faculty or department of center and the number of years in this university.

Response: Ok thank you very much, senior member non-teaching, IEDE registry. Ok I have been in the university for about 14 years know.

Which of the faculties or department you have been to? I have work as a finance as an administrator and I moved to the registrar's office as an assistance registrar and then move to externally founder project office as administrator for monetary and violation officer and now I am at the IEDE office as the senior assistant registrar.

Q: Ok so if you cast your mind back to the time that you were recruited or offered an appointment what experience did u go through as you were into the university system. Describe how you went through your induction system?

Response: Well, upon the appointment, first I was taken orientation for a week and the orientation involves with working with a principal administrative office who was then in the registrar's so I was working with her, she was teaching the administrative work she was given me files to

study so I will know the trends of events and the correspondence, how it was recorded, how it comes in and go back and the processes involved so I was there for about a week before I was finally posted to senior administrative assistance as in charge of the finance section. So that is how I came by my induction system.

Q: Ok so were you introduced to some of the policies in the university?

Response: Err not specifically but as I was working with the woman an issues come up then she will draw my attention to the issue but not specifically to policies. With regards to policies think I got to know them as I worked.

Q: Can you share with us your experiences when you were working with the university or faculty or departmental policies? Did you work or has got experience like that the committees that were.

Response: I have work with a number of committees yes the formulation of policies for either faculties or departments

Most of my committees had been a statutory committees either developing committee or audit reporting implementation committee, congregation planning committees, adhoc committees and the rest. But I have not work a particular one as in formulating a policy not yet, may be the closest I came to is the one that I think I develop a proposal on, yes I did a memo on

development of a policy regarding naming of facilities in the university. Even after I submitted the proposal a committee was set up to look at the paper and curb out policy and that was not involved in that it doesn't not directly involve with a committee.

So what view about policy involvement in our university do u have an idea of how we develop policies here?

Initially like what I was saying is either a source is from somebody's memorandum or a paper that somebody generate in a proposal these are some recommendations and a committee is set up and look at it and then a policy is curb out and look at it. Which we look to other area if it talks about academic area then we talk to the academic board to look at it but perhaps is like what I was saying. Besides that because the university works generally function about the committee system it means that every policy that has to develop has to go with a developing committee and their report should be submitted to the bigger body of the commissar the issue committee officer if it has something to do with academic then we go to the academic planning then to academic board and finally ends up with the general university administration to end up with the council for finally approval before it becomes operational.

With your length of time here did you see some as a commutative I mean when they are developing an approval does it through some consultative or approach do they use that?

Yes I think this reminds me I was a member of a committee that develops an end of service benefits and in that with the constitution of the benefits we have some representatives from the union and some from the members from the academic staff constituted with that committee and whiles working some few consultations and I also work with the strategic committee I think this is the first time or the second time that I have been there and each case the committee will meet and develop some areas it to the entire university community mostly on faculty bases and department sections and sometimes we involve the unions and even the student bodies sometimes we solicit their inputs which finally committee works on the inputs and finally drafted a developing a strategic plan and this draft strategic plan is taken to the university committee to draft on consultative issues for sharing and so it was drafted to see their inputs before it is finalized so when it comes to the other committees some do consultative too but I am not sure all of them do but normally the consultative of the committee issue they take into consideration the various stakeholders in the committee so you may think that they come with their views groupings for instance if there is a union rep there it is expected that the views of the

union person will articulate the views of the staff that's is where they belongs but I think largely they do some consultations.

Are the voices of these unions and bodies incorporated in these policies?

Yes I least those that I have served them when we do the consultative meetings and receive their views we incorporate them into the plans. Some of their views are either already captured some of them too also come out with same views. Then we look at all of them and we pick the salient ones from it.

Why do you think it is necessary to do this consultative?

It is very necessary to do this consultation because we looked at the diverse parties in the university system we have different categories of people so when you are formulating a policy that affect all of them it is important to obtain their views and opinions for instance one reason for a strategic planning committee when they go out to consult is to ensure ownership of the strategic unit to plan when it finally come to that. The issue of the university community don't see themselves as the final product they will not implement it I mean they wouldn't put much efforts to implement it so it is very necessary.

So do you think the state of consultation is ok or we should improve upon it during the development of our policies?

As I said I don't know much about the policies but those that I have worked with we could still improve upon it when it comes to about consulting people we are having our general meetings where we invites people to our meetings when the issue is about attendance where we people will not be able to attend so we have to improve upon it perhaps they may have views to offer but the general situation is that most members of staff may be either engage in teaching and something else some may not want to come and participate so upon that bases we have to improve upon it or going a bit further not only a forum but perhaps solicit for other opinions which obviously is very difficult. I remember a strategic plan committee at a point we said faculties should meet various departmental members and come up with their view but at the end of the day it was clear that most faculties do not meet it was just a matter of things been put together either by the heads or the dean's office and it was brought to us. That was the challenge getting members to come together to deliberate on various issues is quite difficult and if I get members to change their attitudes.

So how do you think we can improve upon the consultative seeking opinion before policy formulation?

I was just trying to say something that possibly getting people's opinion was obviously difficult but perhaps I know the ICT people's have been

doing something normally they put a survey on a website for people to just fill and responses it is very quick and short questionnaire which involves some few minutes to do that.

But is it on policies or what they want to know?

For now what are doing is to find people's view on the internet but I'm thinking that we should extend it to policy issues where can get quick opinions from people that one we can get a number of from the university community.

So how much do you know about the university Statutes?

I have through some issues, which have seen that.

Can you tell us about some of the university issues when you through some of the policies being academic or the academic board can u remember anything?

I your view do think that the academic board of the university should play a key role in formulating and reviewing policies?

Yes they are already doing like I said earlier the issue been concerned with academic matters it always ends up with them either ends with them or from them to the council. Like I said when I present a paper to them the academic board adapts it so at the end of the day that that ever generates the proposal is not known it is the university.

So the developing committees too, do you see them to play a role in formulating or reviewing policies what did you think about them the process of developing the policies?

Actually some policies come from them and those from the bottom up as I was saying when issues come out in the proposal it ends up with them.

So with theirs how can it be top down?

You know when in a course of deliberating and issues where certain trends comes into it I think maybe that's is the time that they come out with an issues and knows where they can formulate policies. Their decisions become policies.

So they make the policy for us or they will see to the management see to developing the policy along that line?

Yes they do that the policy like what I was trying to say that their decisions most of them try to become policies and when matters are send to the council for discussion and deliberations at the end of the day what they will decide on it must become operational for the management to see through it that it is working but where certain issues comes up during their deliberations and it needs further or thorough work for it to become a comprehensive development they will delegate either management or they will ask the vice chancellor to tell the management to look at it for the proposal so the committee is constituted then the committee will do the

actual formulation of policies the nifty gritty and they will send it back to the council for final either adoption or amendment of the policy.

Now my second part of the interview is the implementation of the policies, did you feel that university policies are adequately discuss at staff and other bodies effectively?

If its issues that are not voluminous either the registrar will communicate to writing in the university community but it has to be document and that one either papers are made and they are circulated to the faculties, departments for members to read but as in whether members will read it or not I can't tell but at least one thing about it is ones a policy has been develop and documented is assumes that you know so if you go against it then it will evoke against you as they say ignorance of the law is not an excuse. Is a very critical issue as you getting staff actually doing what they are expected to do that is where we need to do an extra work?

How do we seek to the effective dissemination or implementation of policies?

When it comes to the status, the status is there, copies are there available to everyone. But perhaps maybe is either the human resource section or the staff training section to take it upon them and organize proper orientations for dealing with specific issues in the university status and policies and look at that one.

Do you think there's capacity to implement some of these policies we are talking about and their disseminations?

Is there because we have the staffs are available maybe they will think about other resources but I don't think it involve so much it is just about organizing some orientations if it is plan throughout the year may from faculties to other sections of the university organizing some vocational seminars and training.

As how supportive in the various constituent in the implementation of policies as you are saying the academic body, the supporting staff other junior staff members how are they supportive in the implementation of policies?

If the policy has to do with or if it is not that type of voluminous policy just a few points that needs to be communicated to the staff, that one registrar will communicate it through a letter, a memo to the entire university community. And so it goes heads of sections the heads of sections will paste it to the notice board for other members to read or copies are to the department sections for them to know. So in terms of the parts or the role been play or the collaboration I think the heads of department and other sections or has their part to play in them. When policy documents come it is been made available to the staff once again as the staff will have the time to read is another thing.

So does u think there are other ways to improve upon this implementation process?

That one is like writing letters to an individual staff member or given them copies.

It depends on the policy because if has to deal with staff development going on further studies the policy have been made of five years or three years at work you can't go on study leave with pay. With such a policy it communicated with the entire staff of the university community for that one you know and so that case it has already been implemented and as and when you apply that clause is invoked. We have a lot of policies they are relevant to particular issues is only when the issue comes up contains you that is when you apply.

What I'm going to say is an off record, I was thinking that at some faculties or seminars, there could be time that some of these policy would be available to those who went to the seminar. Like for instance you public or you perish is a policy we all know but usually if there is a new policy where faculty's members are all present.

It actually depends if faculties seminar are been held if they invite human resource person that come and give us a brief or a talk on university policies. It will depend if faculty will demand for the human resource person will be a positive direction because in every gathering when we ask you to come and talk, I know quite a large number of our staff members are

ignorant to some issues of the policy. So an avenue for implementation is what I was looking for.

One part that can be utilize effectively is when the staffs comes and they are taking through policies will be available when they will appear to the orientations

My last issue is on the impact, you know the policy is suppose to help the general governance of the university and I will grateful if you this describe how of these policies have impacted in the organizational structure and the performance of the university?

The policies are different. Like I was talking about staff development where number of years you spent before you can go on further studies and the fact that you need to be confirmed before you can go apply for sponsored. Directly the policies are there the officials who are there are in charge of those policies. In this case I actually don't know how it affects the structure of the organizations per say maybe is only when we are looking at specific policies that has to do with the processing and the processor of the university.

So do you think there is adequate monetary evaluation system to ensure policy implementation?

Yes for instance the internal audit is there, whatever processes they are going through they have to make sure the policies are followed. I know the

finance office is also there they will make sure the university financial system and policies are been followed. The HR is also there making sure that the human resource policy is been followed. Largely when we take the academic affairs they are also there to make sure that policies are been followed, faculties are doing same. So largely this systems are there for our checks and balances and the policy assurance office putting their efforts actually is gradually involving but I think that when it becomes well establish that is where one area will become very instrumental.