The Influence of Planning on the Quality of Teaching in Public Universities

1,* Luija Marie Ezati Azikuru
marieezati@gmail.com
Makerere University, College of Education and External Studies
P. O. Box, 7062, Kampala, Uganda

[2,] David Onen
donenotoo@cees.mak.ac.ug
Makerere University, College of Education and External Studies

[3,] Betty A. Ezati
bezati@cees.mak.ac.ug
Makerere University, College of Education and External Studies
* Correspondent

Abstract

This study examined the influence of planning on the quality of teaching in public universities in Uganda. Kyambogo University was deliberately chosen to represent the other eight public universities in the country. The investigation was prompted by the numerous complaints different stakeholders have been raising concerning the deteriorating quality of teaching in public universities in Uganda. Positioned mainly in the positivist paradigm, the study majorly employed the quantitative approach in which the descriptive cross-sectional survey research design was specifically used. Data were collected from a sample of 14 academic managers, 111 academic staff, and 285 undergraduate university students using semi-structured questionnaires and interview guide. The data were analyzed with the use of appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical techniques as well as content analysis method. Study results revealed that goal setting (B=.297; p=.001), and monitoring and evaluation (B=.429; p=.000) of teaching have statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. Meanwhile, strategy identification (B=.056; p=.564), and teaching plan implementation (B=.087; p=.361) have statistically insignificant influence on the quality of teaching. However, overall, the study revealed that planning (R=.699; R2=.470; p=.000) significantly influences the quality of teaching in public universities in Uganda. Therefore, it was concluded that effective planning of the teaching function would raise the quality of teaching in universities, other factors held constant. The study thus recommends that university managers and staff should always set teaching goals, clearly identify teaching strategies, effectively implement teaching plans, and ensure effective monitoring and evaluation of teaching in order to improve and sustain the quality of teaching in public universities, other factors notwithstanding

Keywords: planning, goal setting, strategy selection, monitoring, evaluation, quality teaching

1. Introduction

With the bulging enrolment of students in higher education institutions (HEIs) across the world met with an inelastic increase in the supply of educational resources, concern is now being raised by stakeholders about the quality of teaching and learning in these institutions. In Africa in particular, several scholars including Altbach (2004) have reported that the quality of higher education, in

general, is on the decline. This scenario, according to the scholars, is attributable to several factors - including to the way by which the students are being taught. But, both policy-makers and scholars would agree that effective planning could help to improve the quality of teaching in these institutions despite the exponential growth in student enrolment. This is probably the reason why pressure is mounting, day by day, especially on university managers and staff on the way higher education institutions are being managed, other factors notwithstanding. In this study, the researchers focused on analyzing the influence of planning on the quality of teaching in public universities in Uganda. The study was instigated by the persistent complaints different stakeholders have been raising concerning the deteriorating quality of teaching in public universities in the country in spite of the huge sums of money being invested in the sector. In this section, the researchers present the introduction to the study and study objectives.

According to Ssekamwa and Lugumba (2000), up to 1988 when there was only one university in Uganda (Makerere University), there were hardly any concerns raised about the quality of teaching in higher education institutions in the country. By then, student enrolment was low, expatriate staff were dominant, and the staff-student ratio at Makerere University was more or less ideal. But, with the birth of the Islamic University in Uganda (IUIU) in 1988 and over 30 other universities in the country, concerns about quality of education in general and that of teaching in particular have become commonplace. In fact, according to the National Council for Higher Education [NCHE] (2011), many lecture rooms in universities in Uganda today - including at Makerere University - are over-crowded with students due to unplanned enrollment. Yet, the universities have continued to employ majorly traditional methods of teaching despite the bulging class sizes (Kasozi, 2005). These, and many other developments are instigating stakeholders to mount pressure on university managers to effectively plan whatever takes place in the institutions - including the way by which teaching occurs. However, the effectiveness of planning in universities in Uganda still leaves a lot to be desired. The case of public universities is not any exception; thus, the genesis of this investigation.

This study was premised on the theory of total quality management (TQM). This theory is the brain-child of American scholars well known for quality such as Phillip Crosby, Williams Deming, Joseph Juran and Armand Feigenbum (Harvey & Green, 1993). According to these scholars, TQM is a management approach centered on quality, based on organizational inclusiveness, aiming at long term success, achieved through customer satisfaction, and it benefits all members of the organization and society. In fact, Crawford (1991) reveals that central to TQM success are principles of top management commitment to quality service, employee empowerment, customer focus and continuous improvement strategy, a principle termed “kaizen”. Kaizen, Juran (1992) says, implies worker empowerment, which agrees with the autonomy principle on which higher education institutions are based. The TQM theory was chosen as an anchor for this research because its principles are in general agreement with the principles on which universities are founded and on which they operate best. The researchers believed that if the university managers engaged all its relevant staff in planning the teaching function, this would enhance the quality of teaching in the institutions, other factors notwithstanding.

This study focused majorly on two main concepts, namely: planning and the quality of teaching. Generally, planning is the activity concerned with developing short and long-term guides for ensuring optimal use of available resources to achieve specified objectives. Dror (1963) however, defines planning as the process of preparing a set of decisions for actions in future directed at

achieving goals by optimal means. Meanwhile, Aggarwal and Thakur (2003) consider planning to be the formal process of making decisions for the future of individuals and organizations, and that, it involves dealing on aims and objectives, selecting the correct strategies and program to achieve the aims, determining and allocating the resources required and ensuring that plans are communicated to all concerned. This implies that planning requires decision making; that is, choosing from among alternatives future courses of action to be taken in order to realize given desirable conditions. Borrowing the definitions of planning from Dror (1963) and Aggarwal and Thakur (2003), planning in this study was looked at in terms of goal setting, strategy selection, plan implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.

The second key concept in the study was quality of teaching. The concept quality of teaching has no universally agreed upon definition. In fact, scholars often define quality of teaching by inferring to the meaning of the word quality which on its own is another elusive concept. According to Juran (1992), the word quality refers to fitness for use or fitness for purpose. In other words, something is said to be of good quality if it serves the purpose for which it is intended. Harvey and Green (1993) meanwhile look at quality in terms of 'excellence' or 'value for money' or 'fitness for purpose'. With regards to this study, quality of teaching was looked at in terms of the way the teachers (or lecturers) were teaching to achieve set goals (or purpose). These goals were looked at in terms of the indicators and standards set by the Uganda's National Council for Higher Education (NCHE), the body responsible for regulating and monitoring the operations of higher education institutions in the country.

Ideally, universities are revered for offering high-level quality teaching. However, in the recent past, different stakeholders have been lamenting about the deteriorating quality of teaching in most public and private universities in Uganda. In Kyambogo University for instance, complaints over different issues including on how the students were taught have been raised in the recent past sometimes resulting into student demonstrations and violent strikes. Yet, effective planning of the teaching function would enhance the quality of teaching in universities in Uganda. This scenario prompted the researchers to ask "How is planning influencing the quality of teaching in public universities in Uganda?" thus, the genesis of this investigation.

1.1 Study Objectives

Overall, this study was intended to investigate the influence of planning on the quality of teaching in public universities in Uganda. Specifically, the study aimed at investigating the influence of (i) goal setting; (ii) strategy selection; (iii) plan implementation; and (iv)monitoring and evaluation on the quality of teaching in Kyambogo University.

2. Review of Literature

Over the years, a number of scholars worldwide have taken interest in investigating the linkage between planning and the quality of teaching in higher education institutions. Aloi (2005) for instance, investigated the best practices of strategic planning that would enhance the performance of higher education institutions in the USA, including on their quality of teaching. She discovered that effective planning requires institutions to maintain a mission focus, acquire and develop personnel in whatever they do, integrate planning and assessment into existing organizational and operational practices - including teaching. These practices, Aloi (2005) revealed would enhance the overall performance of any higher education institution. In Uganda, however, not all these practices seem to

be integrated into the planning of the teaching function in higher education institutions – including universities. This could account for the deteriorating quality of teaching in these institutions.

In a study conducted in Uganda by Mande and Nakayita in 2015 to understand the correlation between resource mobilization as an aspect of planning and the quality of teaching in universities, they found out that the quality of teaching was to a large extent dependent on resource availability. This, by extension, meant that the more effective the planning processes in a particular institution, the better the quality of teaching, other factors notwithstanding. Nonetheless, a study conducted in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) by Fernandes, Ross and Meraj (2013) found out something slightly different with that of the Uganda's study. Fernandes and others (2013) discovered that quality teaching and variables that are directly associated with the students' programs were the ones that significantly explained variations in the quality of teaching. This finding by Fernandes and others thus downplayed the role of planning in explaining variations in the quality of teaching in higher education institutions. Nonetheless, this particular study focused on investigating the linkage between elements of planning and the quality of teaching in public universities in Uganda.

3. Methodology

This study was positioned basically in the positivist research paradigm; though the descriptive cross-sectional survey research design was specifically used to undertake the investigation. The choice of this research design was informed by the nature of the problem, which needed to investigate the status quo of planning and its influence on the quality of teaching in Uganda's public universities. Specifically, data were collected from Kyambogo University, one of the largest but not so old university in Uganda. The researchers believed that Kyambogo University ably represented all the other public universities in the country since it apparently has all the characteristics of the older universities like Makerere as well as the younger ones such as Busitema University or Gulu University. The researchers collected data from a sample of 14 academic managers, 111 academic staff, and 285 undergraduate university students totaling to 410 respondents using semi-structured questionnaires and interview guide. These tools were preferred because of the large number of respondents that were targeted in this study. Analysis of data was undertaken using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical techniques as well as content analysis method. In the next section of the paper, the results of the study are presented.

4. Results

4.1 Background Information on Respondents

Of the 410 respondents, their different background characteristics were captured and are presented here in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of staff and student respondents by background characteristics

	Staff			Students		
Background Characteristic	Attributes	Frequency	%	Attributes	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	62	55.9	Male	168	58.9
	Female	49	44.1	Female	117	41.9
	Total	111	100	Total	285	100

Age	< 30 years	5	4.5	<20 years	5	1.8
	30 – 39 years	30	27.0	20 – 24 years	142	49.9
	40 – 49 years	41	36.9	25 – 29 years	67	23.5
	>50 years	35	31.5	30+ years	71	24.9
	Total	111	100	Total	285	100
Faculty	Education	24	21.6	Education	52	18.3
	Science	23	20.7	Science	79	27.7
	Arts & Social Sciences	20	18.0	Arts & Social Sciences	44	15.4
	Engineering	11	9.9	Engineering	26	9.1
	Special Needs	14	12.6	Special Needs	45	15.8
	Management & Entrepreneurship	12	10.8	Management & Entrepreneurship	25	8.8
	Vocational Studies	7	6.3	Vocational Studies	14	4.9
	Total	111	100	Total	285	100
Length of Service in years (Staff) & Year of Study (Students)	< 5 years	12	10.8	Year 1	83	29.0
	5– 9 years	20	18.0	Year 2	111	39.0
	10– 14 years	27	24.3	Year 3	84	29.1
	>15 years	39	35.1	Year 4	7	2.5
	Total		100	Total	285	100

Results in Table 1 reveal that more male staff (62 or 55.9%) and students (168 or 58.9%) participated in this study than their female counterparts. This was in agreement with the records of the Departments of Academic Registrar (DAR) of Kyambogo University that indicate that the University has male staff and students than females (DAR, 2016). Second, the results also show that the bulk of the staff (76 or 68.4%) that were involved in this study were 40 years and above old - implying that the majority of them were mature enough to appreciate the importance of the issues under investigation. In the case of students, the majority of them (142 or 49.9%) who participated in the study were within 20 to 24 years of age. This is the age-group when most Ugandans are actually enrolled in higher education institutions. Third, the results also show that most staff respondents were drawn from the faculties of Education (24 or 21.6%), Science (23 or 20.7%), and Arts and Social Sciences (20 or 18.0%) respectively. While for the students, more respondents were drawn from the faculties of Science (79 or 27.7%), Education (52 or 18.3%), and Special Needs (45 or 15.8%) respectively. These distributions were more or less in proportion to the sizes of student enrolment in the different faculties of the University. Lastly, the results in Table 1 indicate that the

majority of the staff respondents (66 or 59.4%) have worked at Kyambogo University for at least 10 years. This implies that most of the respondents were knowledgeable about the issues that were under investigation. For the case of students, the results indicate that the majority of the respondents (111 or 39.0%) were second-years. This is actually the year when students are often very active in different university activities - including in participating in studies of this kind.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics on the Independent Variable – Planning

The researchers presented several questions on the independent variable – planning, that was conceptualized as goal setting, strategy selection, plan implementation; and monitoring and evaluation whereby the respondents were to indicate their opinions on a scale with responses ranging from 1= not at all true, through 2 = slightly true, 3 = true about half the time, 4 = mostly true to 5 = completely true. However, the results were finally collated into three categories coded as 1= not true (NT), 2 = true about half the time (TAHT), and 3 = true and presented here in Table 2 for both staff and student respondents.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics on respondents' views over planning for teaching

Questionnaire Item	Staff Response Category				Students Response Category			
	NT F (%)	TAHT F (%)	T F (%)	Mean	NT F (%)	TAHT F (%)	T F (%)	Mean
1.Teaching goals often set	19 (17.1)	33 (29.7)	59 (53.2)	2.36	55 (19.3)	69 (24.2)	161 (56.5)	2.37
2. Teaching strategies often identified	17 (15.3)	32 (28.8)	62 (55.9)	2.41	54 (19.0)	81 (28.4)	150 (52.6)	2.33
3.Teaching often effectively done	14 (12.6)	27 (24.3)	70 (63.1)	2.50	61 (21.4)	75 (26.3)	149 (52.3)	2.31
4. Teaching often effectively monitored and evaluated	17 (15.3)	23 (20.7)	71 (64.0)	2.49	74 (25.9)	64 (22.5)	147 (51.6)	2.26

The results in Table 2 indicate that more staff (59 or 53.2%; mean=2.36) and student (161 or 50.2%; mean=2.37) respondents agreed that teaching goals at institutional and departmental levels at Kyambogo University are often set prior to the beginning of every new semester. These suggest that the stakeholders involved in teaching at the University are aware of, and often focused at achieving these goals. Second, the results also reveal that the majority of both staff (62 or 55.9%; mean=2.41) and student (150 or 52.6%; mean=2.33) respondents agreed that teaching strategies at Kyambogo University are often systematically identified. Third, results also indicate that more staff (70 or 63.1%: mean =2.50) than student (149 or 52.3%: mean =2.31) respondents agreed that actual teaching at Kyambogo University is effectively carried out. This implies that the staff were rating their teaching performance more favorably than their clients, the students. Finally, the results in Table 2 reveal that more staff (71 or 64.0%: mean=2.49) than student (147 or 51.6%: mean =2.26) respondents agreed that teaching at the University is being effectively monitored and evaluated. This could have happened because the staff were defending the quality of their teaching performance; yet, the students indicated that they still expect better quality teaching than the status quo. Overall, the results showed that the quality of teaching at Kyambogo University is moderate with mean responses ranging from 2.26 to 2.5 - implying that there is still room for improvement.

During the interviews held with some academic and non-academic staff involved in managing and conducting actual teaching, several interviewees expressed different opinions regarding the planning of teaching at the University. While a large number of interviewees expressed satisfaction with the manner in which the teaching function was being planned, many were equally dissatisfied with the way in which it was conducted. In fact, one head of department observed that "while we do carry out planning of how the teaching function of our department should be done, the actual implementation of the plans is often another story. Most often, we fail to implement what we are meant to do due to the availability of limited resources and time". Another interviewee meanwhile said "it is our bosses that often let us down because they do not provide the teaching leaning facilities on time. This affects the way we teach". All in all, while the majority of the interviewees agree that there are efforts made to plan the teaching function at Kyambogo University, there is a consensus that the plans are never effective due to several factors. They also agree with the fact that this scenario could be hurting the quality of their teaching.

4.3 Descriptive Statistics on the Dependent Variable – Quality of Teaching

The researchers put forward questionnaire items on quality of teaching that the respondents could indicate their opinions by selecting an appropriate response from a range of responses on a scale with responses ranging from 1= not at all true, through 2 = slightly true, 3 = true about half the time, 4 = mostly true to 5 = completely true. However, the results were finally collated into three categories coded as 1= not true (NT), 2 = true about half the time (TAHT), and 3 = true and presented here in Tables 3(a) and (b) below.

Table 3(a): Descriptive statistics on staff respondents' views over quality for teaching

Statements on Quality of Teaching	Response Category			
	Not True F (%)	True About Half the Time F (%)	True F (%)	Mean
1. qualified staff is recruited	5(4.5%)	15(13.5%)	91(82.0%)	2.77
2. varied pedagogies	8(7.2%)	22(19.8%)	81(73.0%)	2.66
3 teaching hours effectively used	7(6.3%)	18(16.2%)	86(77.5%)	2.71
4. course content is covered in time	7(6.3%)	20(18.0%)	84(75.7%)	2.69
5. students satisfied with the teaching	6(5.4%)	22(19.8%)	83(74.8%)	2.69
6. staff satisfied in this university	13(11.7%)	30(27.0%)	68(61.3%)	2.50
7.undergraduate semester grades are high	10(9.0%)	22(19.8%)	79(71.2%)	2.62
8. undergraduate graduation rates are high	6(5.4%)	17(15.3%)	88(79.3%)	2.74

The results in Table 3(a) reveal that the staff perception of the quality of teaching was excellent for the most part. Out of the eight constructs to measure quality of teaching, seven were given a score of "true", while one, staff satisfaction with the university, scored "true about half the time". These statistical results indicated that the staff perception of the quality of teaching in their University was very good on seven dimensions, and fair on one dimension. It was reasonable to state that the quality of teaching was very good.

During interviews held with staff, many expressed different opinions on the quality of teaching at Kyambogo University. For instance, one staff said that "the quality of teaching at Kyambogo University is good"; while another observed that "it is fair". The statements requesting staff to

indicate measures to be taken to improve quality of teaching yielded answers as follows: “improve library resources”; “increase the provision of ICT and internet connectivity”; “University should emphasize staff development, staff motivation and the mentoring of students”; and “everyone - including students and staff should emphasize time management”. Overall, the staff respondents reported that the quality of teaching in the University was “good”. This result was in consonance with the managers’ overall rating of the quality of teaching which also revealed that the quality of teaching “is very good”.

Meanwhile, the student respondents were also asked to rate their opinions about the quality of teaching at Kyambogo University. The results are presented in Table 3(b) below.

Table 3(b): Descriptive statistics on student respondents’ views over quality for teaching

	Response Category			
	Not True F (%)	True About Half the Time F (%)	True F (%)	Mean
1.My lecturers care about me	86(30.2%)	48(16.8%)	151(53.0%)	2.56
2.My lecturers are approachable	41(14.4%)	44(15.4%)	200(70.2%)	2.56
3. My courses have relevant content	19(6.7%)	30(10.5%)	236(82.8%)	2.76
4. My lecturers concerned about my success	32(11.2%)	42(14.7%)	211(74.1%)	2.63
5.The instruction given to me is excellent	38(5.4%)	22(19.8%)	188(66.0%)	2.53
6.My lecturers are fair to all students	42(14.7%)	59(20.7%)	184(64.6%)	2.50
7.My lecturers are knowledgeable	32(11.2%)	47(16.5%)	206(82.3%)	2.61
8. My lecturers are committed to their teaching job	33(11.6%)	46(16.1%)	206(82.3%)	2.61
9. My lecturers conduct reasonable course .assessment	34(11.9%)	57(20.0%)	194(68.1%)	2.56
10. Intellect. growth obvious	63(22.1%)	62(21.8%)	160(55.2%)	2.34
11. lecturers provide acad. Feedback	38(13.3%)	53(18.6%)	194(68.1%)	2.55
12.Course requirements clear	38(13.3%)	53(18.6%)	194(68.1%)	2.55
13. I get required info. on campus	52(18.2%)	60(21.1%)	173(60.7%)	2.42
14. I am aware of campus affairs	73(25.6%)	58(20.4%)	154(54.0%)	2.28
15. My lecturers are available	72(25.37%)	57(20.0%)	156(74.7%)	2.29
16. lecturers are specialists	26(9.1%)	35(12.2%)	224(78.7%)	2.69
17.channels for students’ academic complaints	72(25.3%)	46(16.1%)	167(58.6%)	2.33

Results in Table 3(b) indicate that the students’ perceptions of the quality of teaching were largely positive. Of the 17 constructs used to measure quality of teaching including approachability of lecturers, reasonable course requirements, experience of intellectual growth, lecturers being knowledgeable, commitment to academic excellence in the University, and relevance of course content were all given a Likert score of “ true”, confirmed by the mean response ranging from 2.34 to 2.76. These statistical results implied that the students perceived quality of teaching to be favorable on 10 out of 17 constructs, fair on three constructs and poor only on one construct. On the basis of these results, the researchers could reasonably state that the quality of teaching in

Kyambogo University is 'very good'. This finding, however, contradicted with the data collected through interviews where some students revealed that some lecturers do not teach well and others were unavailable for consultation.

4.4 Verification of Research Hypotheses

This study was based on four research hypotheses, namely: H1: Goal setting statistically has a significant influence on the quality of teaching; H2: Strategy selection statistically has a significant influence on the quality of teaching; H3: Plan implementation statistically has a significant influence on the quality of teaching; and H4: Monitoring and evaluation statistically have a significant influence on the quality of teaching. To verify these hypotheses, first, the hypotheses were converted into null hypotheses. Thus, the tested null hypotheses were stated as follows: H01: Goal setting statistically has no significant influence on the quality of teaching; H02: Strategy selection statistically has no significant influence on the quality of teaching; H3: Plan implementation statistically has no significant influence on the quality of teaching; and H4: Monitoring and evaluation statistically have no significant influence on the quality of teaching. Second, the researchers generated indices to measure each of the variables, namely: goal setting (Goalset), strategy selection (Stratselect), plan implementation (Planment), and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) as well as quality of teaching (Teachingquality) using data generated out of the questionnaires administered to the staff and student respondents. Thereafter, the hypotheses were tested with the use of the multiple regression technique. The results of the tests of the null hypotheses are presented in Tables 4(a), 4(b) and 4(c) below.

Table 4(a): Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.699a	.489	.470	.45408

a. Predictors: (Constant), Goalset, Stratselec Planment, and M&E

b. Dependent Variable: Teachingquality

The results in Table 4(a) show that the correlation coefficient between planning and the quality of teaching is positive with an R value of 0.699 and R2 of 0.489. These results suggest that a unit change in planning brings about 0.489 (48.9%) increase in the quality of teaching, other factors held constant. The observed sig (p) value of 0.000, lower than the critical sig. value of 0.05, implies that planning has a statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. In other words, the more effective the planning of the teaching function, the better the quality of teaching, other factors held constant. However, to determine whether the overall regression model is a good fit for the data, the researchers proceeded to perform the F-ratio test which results are presented in Table 4(b).

Table 4(b): ANOVA Table

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	20.910	4	5.227	25.353	.000a
	Residual	21.856	106	.206		
	Total	42.765	110			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Goalset, Stratselec Planment, and M&E

b. Dependent Variable: Teachingquality

The results in Table 4(b) (F (5. 227) = 25.353, p < .05) show that the independent variables (goal setting, strategy selection, plan implementation and monitoring and evaluation) significantly predict the dependent variable (quality of teaching); that is, the regression model is a good fit of the data. Finally, to test for the influence of each independent variable on the quality of teaching, the multiple regression analysis was carried out. The results are presented in Table 4(c).

Table 4(c): Multiple regression results for influence of planning on quality of teaching
Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	2.283	.183		12.461	.000	1.920	2.646
Goalset	.174	.051	.297	3.426	.001	.073	.274
Stratselect	.034	.059	.056	.579	.564	-.083	.152
Planment	.048	.053	.087	.917	.361	-.056	.153
M&E	.223	.047	.429	4.793	.000	.131	.316

The results in Table 4(c) show that the coefficient relating goal setting, the first independent variable, with quality of teaching is positive with a beta value of 0.297. This result suggests that a unit change in goal setting brings about 0.297 (29.7%) increase in the quality of teaching, other factors held constant. The observed sig (p) value of 0.001, lower than the critical sig. value of 0.05, implies that goal setting has a statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. Therefore, the null hypothesis that "goal setting has no statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching" was rejected and the research hypothesis upheld.

Second, the results in Table 4(c) show that the coefficient relating strategy selection, the second independent variable, with quality of teaching is positive with a beta value of 0.056. This result suggests that a unit change in planning brings about 0.056 (5.6%) increase in the quality of teaching other factors held constant. The observed sig (p) value of 0.564, greater than the critical sig. value of 0.05, implies that strategy selection has no statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. Therefore, the null hypothesis that "strategy selection has no statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching" was upheld and the research hypothesis rejected.

Third, the results in Table 4(c) also show that the coefficient relating teaching plan implementation, the third independent variable, with quality of teaching is positive with a beta value of 0.087. This result suggests that a unit change in planning brings about 0.087 (8.7%) increase in the quality of teaching, other factors held constant. The observed sig (p) value of 0.361, greater than the critical sig. value of 0.05, implies that plan implementation has no statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. Therefore, the null hypothesis that "plan implementation has no statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching" was upheld and the research hypothesis rejected.

Lastly, the results in Table 4(c) show that the coefficient relating monitoring and evaluation, the last independent variable, with quality of teaching is positive with a beta value of 0.429. This result suggests that a unit change in monitoring and evaluation brings about 0.429 (42.9%) increase in the quality of teaching, other factors held constant. The observed sig (p) value of 0.000, lower than the critical sig. value of 0.05, implies that monitoring and evaluation has a statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. Therefore, the null hypothesis that "monitoring and evaluation

has no statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching" was rejected and the research hypothesis upheld.

5. Discussion

This study set out to investigate the influence of planning on the quality of teaching in public universities in Uganda. Study results revealed that: first, goal setting and monitoring and evaluation of teaching have statistically significant influence on the quality of teaching. These findings were in consonant with that of several earlier studies (e.g. Aloi, 2005; Munguatosha, Muyinda & Lubega, 2011; Sahney, Banwet & Karunes, 2010; Sultan & Wong, 2013; Tsinidou, Gerogiannis, & Fitsilis, 2010). This implies that for quality teaching to improve, effective planning involving the setting of strategic goals as well as carrying out of effective monitoring and evaluation need to occur. Without goal setting and effective monitoring and evaluation, the quality of teaching in an institution is likely to remain low. This is also in consonant with what Sahney et al. (2010) contend that clear and specific policies and procedures, strategic and operational planning, budgeting and accountability all have positive influences on the quality of any service provided. Breja, Banwet and Iyer (2011) equally concurred with the current findings when they established that strong and long term commitment to goals, and matching strategic options with aspirations sustained excellence. However, this study finding slightly differed with Jung's (2011) finding when he established that content evaluation and assessment did not contribute significantly to student satisfaction; and hence quality service. This difference in finding, however, could be attributed only to the contextual differences in the studies. Second, the study also established that strategy identification and teaching plan implementation have statistically insignificant influence on the quality of teaching. These study findings were however not in congruence with the hypothesized position that planning dimensions influence the quality of teaching in universities. This could be attributed to the difference in the exposure staff and student respondents have regarding how the planning function is carried out in the University that was studied. Finally, the study revealed that overall, planning significantly influences the quality of teaching in public universities in Uganda. This finding was in agreement with the findings of earlier studies. For instance, Aloi (2005) indicated aspects of mission focus, integrating planning and assessment as part of job performance, making data-driven decisions as antecedents of quality of performance, including teaching in the case of higher education institutions.

6. Conclusions

Basing on the study findings and the discussion that ensued, it was thus concluded that effective planning of the teaching function would raise the quality of teaching in universities, other factors held constant.

7. Recommendations

Following the above conclusions, the researchers recommend that university managers and staff should always set teaching goals, clearly identify teaching strategies, effectively implement teaching plans, and ensure effective monitoring and evaluation of teaching in order to improve and sustain the quality of teaching in public universities, other factors notwithstanding

References

Aggarwal, Y. P. & Thakur, R. S. (*2003*).*Concepts and Terms in Educational Planning*. New Delhi: NIEPA.

Aloi, S. L. 2005. Best practices in linking assessment and planning*: Assessment Update, 17*(3), EJ790769.

Altbach, P.G. (2004). *Citation higher education in the World 3: New challenges and emerging roles for human and social development*, URI http://hdl.handle.net/2099/8111

Crawford, F. (1991). Total quality management, committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals, occasional paper (London, December), cited in Hill, F.M. (1995). "Managing service quality in higher education: the role of the student as primary consumer", *Quality Assurance in Education*, *3*(3), 10-21.

Breja, D.K., Banwet, S.K., & Iyer, K.C., (2011). "Quality strategy for transformation: A case study". *The TQM Journal*, *23* (1), 5 – 20, http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17542731111097452.

Departments of Academic Registrar (DAR) of Kyambogo University (2016). *Annual report of the Departments of Academic Registrar, 2015.* Kampala: Author.

Dror, Y. (1963).The Planning Process. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* (Brussels) 29, no. 1, pp. 50-52.

Fernandes, C., Ross, K., & Meraj, M. (2013). "Understanding student satisfaction and loyalty in the UAE HE sector", *International Journal of Educational Management*, *27* (6), 613 – 630, DOI http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2012-0082.

Harvey, L. & Green, D. (1993). Defining Quality. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, *18(*1), 9-34, DOI: 10.1080/0260293930180102.

Jung, I. (2011). The dimensions of e-learning quality: from the learner's perspective. *Educational Technology Research and Development*. *59*(4), 445-464, 10.1007/s11423-010-9171-4.

Juran, J. (1992). *Juran on quality by design.* New York: Free Press.

Kasozi, A, B.K. (2005). *The development of a strategic plan for higher education in Uganda 2001-2005*. www.nuffic.nl/pdf/os/em/kasozi.pdf.

Mande, W. M. & Nakayita, M. (2015). Effects of fees policies on the quality of university education in Uganda. Makerere *Journal of Higher Education 6 (*2), 3-12.

Munguatosha, G.M., Muyinda, P.B., & Lubega, J.T. (2011). "A social networked learning adoption model for higher education institutions in developing countries", *On the Horizon*, *19*(4), 307 – 320, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.11 08/10748121111179439.

National Council for Higher Education (2011). *The state of higher education and training in Uganda 2010: A Report on higher education delivery and institutions. Kampala: NCHE Press.*

Sahney, S., Banwet, D.K. S. Karunes, S. (2010). "Quality framework in education through application of interpretive structural modeling: An administrative staff perspective in the Indian context", *The TQM Journal, 22* (1), 56 – 71, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17542731011009621.

Ssekamwa, J. C& Lugumba, S.M.E, (2000). *Development and Administration of Education in Uganda*. (2nd ed.). Kampala: Fountain Publishers

Sultan P. & Wong, H.Y. (2013). "Antecedents and consequences of service quality in a higher education context: A qualitative research approach*". Quality Assurance in Education*, *21*(1), 70 – 95, DOI http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684881311293070.

Tsinidou, M., Gerogiannis, V. & Fitsilis, P. (2010). "Evaluation of the factors that determine quality in higher education: an empirical study", *Quality Assurance in Education, 18* (3), 227 – 244, http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684881011058669.