THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Management Practices in Teaching and Learning for Production of Quality Graduates in Universities in Kenya

Kanyiri Lucy Ikiara
Senior Assistant Registrar, Quality Assurance and Curriculum Development,
Kenya Methodist University, Kenya
Alfred Mutema
Professor, Department of Medical Education,
Meru University of Science and Technology, Kenya
Peter Alfred Kamau
Associate Professor, Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources,
Kenya Methodist University, Kenya

Abstract:
Universities play a critical role in contributing to economic development of any nation. Universities develop manpower which is a significant driver of economic growth. Management practices are linked to the success of universities in producing holistic graduates who have the necessary knowledge, skills, competencies and values that are required in a globally competitive society. Literature available indicates that there exists an astounding difference in the quality of graduates produced in different universities. The universities in Africa, Kenya included, have been lagging behind in the yearly ranking of the universities worldwide. Regardless of the criteria being used whether in terms of research output, presence in the web or skills and competences of graduates, African universities have continued to trail behind. The question has been what the African universities have failed to do to be able to compete favorably with other universities in the world. Further analysis of literature also indicates good management practices in teaching and learning could be able to drive the universities to produce quality graduates. This take cognizant that universities offer approved curricula that have met the criteria for design and implementation. The study sets out to establish the best management practices teaching and learning that support production of quality graduates. The study was guided by an objective of determining the application of best management practices in teaching and learning implemented by the universities to support production of quality graduates. The research used descriptive survey research design. The target population was 66 accredited universities in Kenya where six universities were sampled. The study point out the need for the universities to identify and entrench management practices in teaching and learning. The university management needs to endeavor to establish teaching and learning practices that work best for her and ensure continuous implementation and support. This will give graduates produced in the universities a competitive edge in the global market.

Keywords: *Management practices, teaching, learning, quality graduates*

1. Introduction

Effective teaching and learning is fundamental in producing quality graduates (Wiliam (2007). It involves actions and practices that are adopted by teachers to bring about intended learning outcomes. Learning is taken to mean change in the behavior caused by experiences of the learners (Kember & Leung 2005).It is in view of this that universities need to focus on the management practices that promote effective teaching and learning. Management practices are defined as a way of doing things in the organization which has been developed over a given period of time and yielded positive results (Evans & Davis (2005). Applied in this study it is taken to mean best practices in teaching and learning that are identified and used by universities to promote outcome based learning. The study investigated the influence of management practices in teaching and learning towards producing quality graduates.

1.1. Objectives of the Study

The study sought to address the following objective

To determine the influence of management practices in teaching and learning in production of quality graduates in the universities in Kenya.

2. Literature Review

Faculty is the most powerful influence on the student learning. They effectively implement the curriculum by translating it with effective teaching and learning through meaningful learning experiences. Therefore teaching and learning involves the process of imparting knowledge, skills, attitudes and values to the learners where the outcome is

known, Mutema, Ngatia and Kangethe (2006). Effective teaching and learning should promote outcome based education. According to Christopher, Gavin, Trevor and Ronnie (2013), outcomes based education implies that when programmes are planned desirable learning outcomes are identified and considered in the formulation of the plans. Course content, learning activities and assessment are designed so as to be consistent with the achievement of the desired learning outcomes. Evidence is then gathered to determine whether the desired outcomes are being achieved. This evaluation of evidence provides feedback to ensure that elements in the teaching and learning environment are acting in concert to facilitate the nurturing of the desired outcomes.

Mutema et al (2006) posit that in an effective learning environment there exist functions of the faculty which are important in facilitating outcome based learning. This includes modeling, coaching, and fading. Modeling involves making sure that the students have considered critical reasoning in the process of learning to enable them deal with problems. Coaching involves encouraging and challenging students in the learning process which involves providing guidance to the students in the learning process. Fading involves deliberate and progressive withdrawal or fading of the faculty in the learning process to allow students to learn independently. Mutema et al. (2006) suggests that a teacher must be able to understand and create an avenue for students to apply principles of student-centred learning as opposed to teacher centred, be able to keep learning active whenever necessary, ensure students go through steps of problem based learning, handling group dynamics by managing various areas through questioning, challenging, stimulating, discussions, giving students opportunity to manage their learning activities, assisting students to determine their abilities and problems i.e. reasoning ability, use of concepts, study skills, and depth of knowledge in an non-directive way, and also assisting students to assess their individual performance in a group, through self, peer and teacher evaluation.

According to Anstey and Bull (2006), basic roles in the process of learning include facilitating learning, advising and guiding, informing, participating unobtrusively and withdrawing silently. Effective teacher must exercise these classroom practices. The student on the other hand has a responsibility to facilitate teaching and learning. Students must understand that they are the change agents by playing the following key roles; Acting as catalyst where they energize the teaching/learning process by being supportive, encouraging and reasonable during learning activities.The other aspects are to also enhance the process of learning by actively participating, brainstorming, suggesting ways of solving problems and sharing responsibility for learning, being a solution giver in that he/she may already have prior knowledge of aspects of what is to be learnt and share with other students alternatively the student may have the resource such as books, journal, video, tape that contain the information being sought, (Anstey and Bull 2006). In this sense the students do not have to rely entirely on the teacher for solutions.

Howells et al., (2016) argues that for an outcome to be developed there is need for an opportunity to practice its use. Generic capabilities are nurtured if programmes and curricula provide learning activities which require the deployment of the capability in question, (Kember and Leung 2005). Developing these capabilities occurs in courses which make intellectual demands upon students. Qualities like critical thinking develop through students engaging in analytical debate about key topics in the process of teaching and learning. As a result, well planned teaching and learning is demanding. Developing these capabilities is consistent with requiring students to practice using the higher-order intellectual skills needed for particular discipline. The best way to develop critical thinking is to make demands on students which require the practice of critical thinking. This may include requiring student to develop a project in their discipline area and preparing and presenting a report. There has been a long history of advocacy of the benefits of active learning for specific learning objectives. Of the families of models of teaching reviewed by Joyce, Calhoun and Hopkins (2009), almost all require some practice or application from the learner; so there should be no problem in accepting that good teaching involves the provision of active learning experiences.A survey on student engagement done by Kember and Leung (2005), discussed the practices that make up teaching and learning environment which promote student achievement which translate to a transformed learner. These were indicated as active learning, teaching for understanding, coherence curriculum, authentic learning, relationship between teachers and students, feedback to assist learning, relationship with other students and cooperative learning. The study revealed that teaching and learning environment is a facet of the broad curriculum that is congruent to the quality of graduates being produced in the institutions of higher learning.

Hattie (2012) links student learning outcomes to several highly effective classroom practices such as; effective lecture practices, group discussion triggers, thoughtful questions, reflective responses, learner's contributions, rewarding learners' participation, active learning strategies, and cooperative group assignment, goals to grades connection, modeling, double loop feedbacks, climate setting and fostering learner self-responsibility to learning. In this respect the teacher has to make deliberate effort to see learning through his/her students' perspectives. The teacher has to assume the role of facilitator of learning rather than domineering learning. Studies by Wells and Mejia-Arauz (2006) states that there must be a continuous dialogue between the teacher and the students for meaningful learning to occur. It is evident from previous researches that strong-performing colleges and universities devote thoughtful attention to the comprehensive and systematic assessment of teaching and learning. When management practices are employed in teaching and learning process, this becomes the starting point for determining the desired outcomes of the programmes and courses begin with the students' needs. This considers knowledge, skills and capabilities that students need upon graduation, Hattie (2012).

For example for a professional such as a teacher, this implies that the student needs to graduate as a competent professional in the field of teaching, knowing theories about teaching and is able to put theory into practice. This means that a teacher teaching such a student needs to select teaching theories that are practical to the students' everyday teaching life (Wells and Mejia-Arauz 2006). In addition the teacher applies examples in learning experiences which integrates theory and practice. The teacher also seeks ways that enable student practice what they learn. These create

confidence among students and help them to develop critical thinking and problem solving culture among them. Arising from the literature reviewed management practices that support effective teaching and learning are considered such as; creation of positive learning environment, classroom assessment and reflection, student engagement/active learning, instructional relevance and knowledge of the content. Each of the practice is explained as follows:

Marzano (2007) observes that teachers need to create safe learning environments in which high, clear expectations and positive relationships are fostered that promote active learning. These include environments where students are active participants as individuals and groups, motivating students and nurturing their desire to learn, students are encourage to accept responsibility for their learning, providing students equitable access to technology and tools, students are engaged in hands-on experiences, student work is valued, appreciated and used as learning tool. On the side of the student, accepts responsibility for his or her learning, student actively participates engaged in learning, student collaborates with other students, and student exhibits sense of accomplishment and confidence, student takes educational risk (Hattie2012).

The teacher and the student collaboratively gather information and reflect through a systematic process that informs instruction. Wiliam (2007) suggests that this happens when the teacher; uses multiple methods of continuously assessing student understanding, and uses student work, observations to reflect on and improve teaching practice, teacher revises instructional strategies based upon student achievement data, teacher co-develops scoring/rubrics with the students which provides clear expectations for quality performance, teacher provides regular and timely feedback to the students. The student in their role recognizes what proficient work looks like and is determined to take the necessary steps to improve, student monitors progress toward reaching learning targets, student uses teacher and peer feedback to improve his /her work.

To promote active learning as earlier alluded by Hattie (2009) the teacher must support and encourage a student's commitment to initiate and complete complex, inquiry based learning requiring creative and critical thinking with attention to problem solving. According to Marzano (2007), the teacher undertakes the following; instructs complex processes, concepts, and principles contained in the curriculum using differentiated strategies that make instruction accessible to students. The teacher scaffolds instruction to help students to reason, and develop problem solving strategies, teacher orchestrates effective classroom discussions, questioning, and learning tasks that promote higher order thinking skills, teacher challenges students to think deeply about problems and encourages/ models a variety of approaches to a solution. Teacher integrates variety of learning resources with classroom instruction which increases learning, the teacher integrates the application of inquiry skills into learning experiences and teacher shares with the students learning intentions/targets and criteria for success. The student articulates intentions/targets and criteria for success, he/she reads with understanding reading materials, student applies and refines inquiry.

Hattie (2012) argues that instructional relevance includes teacher's ability to facilitate learning experiences that are meaningful to students and prepare them for their future. The teacher undertakes the following practices; he/she links concepts and key ideas to students' prior experiences and understanding, uses multiple representations, examples and explanations, teacher selects and utilizes variety of technology that support student learning, teacher effectively incorporates 21st Century learning skills that prepare students to meet future challenges- divergent thinking, creative expression, innovation, teacher works with other teachers to make connections between and among disciples, teacher makes lesson connections to community, society and current events (Howard, 2009). The student responds to meaningful questions, students uses appropriate tools and techniques to gather, analyze, and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, he/she develops descriptions, explanations, predictions and models using evidence, student works collaboratively to address complex, authentic problems which requires innovative approaches to solve, communicates knowledge and understanding in variety of real world forms, students exhibits necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes to participates a real world beyond the classroom.

Hattie (2009) further postulates that teachers need to understand and apply theories, principles, concepts and skills in the disciple area, and also are able to maintain ongoing knowledge and awareness of current developments. Additionally according to Marzano (2007) the teacher has to use differentiated instruction to meet specific needs of all the students, a teacher has to make connections to real life application and relevance; the teacher should be able to access rich variety of instructional practices, strategies, and resources and applies them appropriately.

Hattie (2012) suggests that the student should be able to demonstrate growth in process, student is able to seek to expand appropriate skills independently, connects, integrates and applies concepts and ideas across all the subject matter fields and uses ideas in realistic problem solving situations.

2.1. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework illustrated the relationship between effective teaching and learning and production of quality graduates in the universities.

3. Methodology

Descriptive survey design was used to collect perceptions on the extent of application of the best management practices in effective teaching and learning by the sampled universities. Orodho & Kombo (2002) and Mbwesa (2006) agree that surveys are relevant in study when the purpose is to explain relationship between variables. This was applicable in this study. The relationship between management practices in teaching and learning and quality graduates produced in the universities was the main focus of the study. Seven (7) universities formed the sample which included Kenyatta University (A), University of Nairobi (B), African Nazarene University (C) Kenya Methodist University (D), Meru

University of Science and Technology (E), Strathmore University (F) and University of Embu (G). Six universities participated in the study. University G did not participate in the study. A total of 120 faculty staff and 375 finalist students were included in the study. Self-administered questionnaires were used to collect data. The data generated was anlaysed using inferential statistics where analysis of variance was computed and where applicable post hoc test using Dancan Multiple Range Test (DMRT) was conducted to further explain the variability.

4. Results and Discussions

Management practices in teaching and learning in this study were measured by use of indicators that included; creation of positive leaning climate, classroom assessment, vigorous engagement in teaching and learning, relevance of teaching and learning and knowledge of the content. The sample included both the faculty and the students in six universities. The results are presented as follows:

4.1. Creation of Positive Learning Environment

The study sought to determine the extent to which the universities created positive learning environment to facilitate effective teaching and learning. The ANOVA results are presented in table 1.

Parameters	P Value	Interpretation
Faculty creates learning environments where students are active participants in the learning process	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Faculty motivates students and nurtures their desire to learn	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Faculty encourages students to accept responsibility for their own learning	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Faculty provides sufficient time in class for students to actively engage in hands-on experiences, discuss and process content and make meaningful connections	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Faculty creates an environment where student work is valued, appreciated and used in learning	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Student actively participate and authentically engaged in the learning	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Student exhibit sense of accomplishment and confidence	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Students take educational risks in class	P>0.05	There were no significant differences.

Table 1: Creation of Positive Learning Climate Practices

Analysis of variance results presented in Table 1 allowed the researcher to conclude there were significance differences in the manner universities provided conducive learning environment across the universities. The results indicated that faculty in most of the universities did not promote learning environment where students were active participants in the learning process. Equally it was observed that universities performed poorly in ensuring students engaged in hands-on experiences, discussions and processing content for students to make meaningful connections between theory and practice. Mutema et al (2004) indicated that a teacher must be able to understand and create avenue for students to apply principles of student centred learning. This proposition is also supported by Kember & Leung (2005) who argues that for a learning outcome to be developed there is need for an opportunity to practice its use by the learner. Table 2 DMRT results provide information on the universities that similar and comparable in embracing positive learning climate practices with a view of producing quality graduates.

(I) Students Are Active Participants In Learning					
University	N	Subset			
		1	2	3	4
E	51	3.04			
D	83	3.21	3.21		
B	69	3.41	3.41	3.41	
A	75		3.50	3.50	
C	67			3.70	
F	61				4.11
Sig.		.071	.153	.152	1.000
(ii) Faculty motivate students and nurtures their desire to learn					
University	N	Subset			
		1	2		
E	51	2.88			
D	83	3.00			
A	75	3.05			

(ii) Faculty motivate students and nurtures their desire to learn			
B	69	3.06	
C	67		3.62
F	61		3.73
Sig.		.436	.572

(iii) Students accept responsibility for their learning

University	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
D	83	3.14		
E	51	3.20		
B	69	3.31	3.31	
A	75	3.35	3.35	
C	67		3.62	3.62
F	61			3.89
Sig.		.318	.125	.155

(iv) Faculty provides adequate time in class for students to actively engage in hands on experience for meaningful learning

University	N	Subset	
		1	2
E	51	3.06	
B	69	3.06	
D	83	3.31	
A	75	3.37	
C	67	3.51	
F	61		4.13
Sig.		.066	1.000

(v) Students work is valued and used in learning

University	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
B	69	2.80		
E	51	2.86	2.86	
A	75	2.95	2.95	
D	83	3.07	3.07	
C	67		3.30	
F	61			4.13
Sig.		.261	.075	1.000

(vi) Students actively and honestly participate in learning

University	N	Subset	
		1	2
A	75	3.12	
B	69	3.20	
D	83	3.22	
E	51	3.35	
C	67	3.40	
F	61		4.24
Sig.		.200	1.000

(vii) Students exhibit sense of accomplishment and confidence

University	N	Subset	
		1	2
D	83	2.89	
A	75	3.20	
C	67	3.21	
B	69	3.22	
E	51	3.33	
F	61		3.89
Sig.		.053	1.000

Table 2: DMRT Results on Creation of Positive Learning Climate Practices

Table 2 show various categorizations of universities based on each practice from lowest to highest ranked in relation to creation of positive learning climate practices among student and faculty across the universities.

4.2. Instructional Rigor and Student Engagement in Learning

The researcher sought to determine the level of significance of each practice that supported vigorous engagement in the process of teaching and learning among faculty and students. The results are presented in table 3.

Parameters	P Value	Interpretation
Faculty helps student reason and develop problem solving strategies	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Faculty organizes effective classroom discussions, questioning and learning tasks that promote higher-order thinking skills	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Faculty encourages students to continue learning on their own and develop independence	P>0.05	There was no significant difference.
Faculty challenges students to think deeply about problems and models to provide a variety ways to arrive to solution	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Student articulates and understands learning targets and criteria for success	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Students reads, writes and communicate effectively	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Students designs and conducts problem solving investigations	P<0.05	There were significant differences.

Table 3: Vigorous Engagement in Teaching and Learning Practices

Table 3showed significance differences across the universities in the implementation of practices that promote faculty and student rigorous engagement in the learning process. Specifically, the faculty performed poorly in helping students to reason, develop problem solving strategies and inability to promote higher-order thinking skills through effective classroom practices. The success of the student learning outcomes depends to greater degree to several classroom practices such as effective lectures practices, group discussion triggers, thoughtful questions, reflective responses learner contributions and cooperative group assignments among others(Hattie 2012). The DRMT results presented in table 4 shows where the differences were found across the universities.

(I) Faculty Helps Students to Reason and Develops Problem Solving Strategies				
University	N	Subset		
		1	2	
E	51	2.94		
D	83	2.95		
A	75	3.08		
B	69	3.35		3.35
C	67			3.64
F	61			3.69
Sig.		.080		.127
(ii) Classrooms tasks promotes higher order skills				
University	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
E	51	3.08		
B	69	3.16		
D	83	3.17		
A	75	3.32	3.32	
C	67		3.68	3.68
F	61			4.02
Sig.		.296	.077	.097
(iii) Students provide variety ways to arrive to solution				
University	N	Subset		
		1		2
D	83	3.19		
A	75	3.27		
E	51	3.67		
B	69	3.53		
C	67	3.64		3.64
F	61			3.98
Sig.		.054		.103

(iv) Students understands learning targets and criteria for success			
University	N	Subset	
		1	2
A	75	3.03	
B	69	3.14	
D	83	3.16	
E	51	3.20	
C	67	3.23	
F	61		3.80
Sig.		.361	1.000
(v) Students reads, writes and communicate effectively			
University	N	Subset	
		1	2
C	67	3.40	
B	69	3.61	
D	83	3.67	
A	75	3.67	
E	51	3.57	
F	61		4.16
Sig.		.679	1.000
(vi) Students designs and conducts problem solving investigations			
University	N	Subset	
		1	2
D	83	3.02	
E	51	3.08	
C	67	3.11	
A	75	3.12	
B	69	3.29	
F	61		3.76
Sig.		.275	1.000

Table 4: DMRT Results on the Vigorous Engagement in Teaching and Learning Practices

Table 4 show various categorizations of universities based on each practice from lowest to highest ranked in relation to vigorous engagement in teaching and learning practices among student and faculty across the universities.

4.3. Assessment, Formative and Summative

The study sought to establish the extent to which the universities embraced practices that promote effective methods of assessment. Results of the data analysed is presented in Table 5

Parameters	P Value	Interpretation
Faculty uses multiple methods of assessing students e.g. peer assessment, self-assessment, examinations	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Faculty uses student assessment data to improve learning	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Faculty co-develops scoring guide/rubrics with the student and set up expectations for quality performance	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Faculty provide regular and timely feedback to students that motivate learners to move forward	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Student monitors progress toward reaching learning targets	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Student uses teacher and peer feedback to improve learning	P<0.05	There were significant differences.

Table 5: Assessment (Formative and Summative) Practices

Table 5 shows that there exist differences in embracing assessment practices that improve student learning across the universities. The P<0.05 in all the practices across six universities. This pointed high level of significance differences in the way universities identified and implemented assessment strategies that supported quality learning for

production of quality graduates. The researcher further sought to establish the universities that performed well in the embracing assessment practices by conducting DMRT tests on each practice. The results are presented in table 6.

(I) Multiple Methods of Assessing Students Used				
University	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
D	83	3.10		
E	51	3.29	3.29	
B	69	3.43	3.43	
A	75	3.67	3.67	
C	67		3.70	
F	61			4.27
Sig.		.151	.106	1.000
(ii) Students Assessment work or observations used to improve learning				
University	N	Subset		
		1	2	
B	69	2.67		
A	75	2.78		
E	51	2.90		
D	83	2.95		
C	67	3.26		
F	61		4.64	
Sig.		.190	1.000	
(iii) Faculty co-develops scoring rubrics with student and set up expectations for quality performance				
University	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
E	51	2.65		
B	69	2.69		
D	83	2.83	2.83	
A	75	2.90	2.90	
C	67		3.28	3.28
F	61			3.53
Sig.		.300	.053	.243
(iv) Regular and timely feedback to motivate learners				
University	N	Subset		
		1	2	
B	69	2.53		
D	83	2.71		
E	51	2.82		
A	75	2.83		
C	67		3.36	
F	61		3.71	
Sig.		.204	.106	
(v) Students monitors progress towards reaching learning targets				
University	N	Subset		
		1	2	
B	69	2.92		
A	75	3.02		
D	83	3.02		
E	51	3.06		
C	67	3.23		
F	61		3.93	
Sig.		.199	1.000	
(vi) Students uses teacher and peer feedback to improve learning				
University	N	Subset		
		1	2	
D	83	2.95		
B	69	2.98		
A	75	3.23		
E	51	3.29	3.29	
C	67	3.38	3.38	
F	61		3.78	
Sig.		.099	.050	

Table 6: DMRT Results on Assessment (Formative and Summative) Practices

Table 6 show various categorizations of universities based on each practice from lowest to highest ranked in relation to adoption and implementation of formative and summative assessment practices.

4.4. Relevance of Teaching and Learning

The researcher sought to determine the extent to which teaching and learning was relevant to the student needs. Analysis of variance yielded results presented in table 7.

Relevant Teaching and Learning Practices	P Value	Interpretation
Faculty designs learning opportunities that allow students to participate in learning	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Faculty links concepts and important ideas to students' prior experiences and understanding. Use of examples and explanations	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Faculty effectively incorporates 21st Century learning skills that prepare students to meet future challenges e.g. divergent thinking, analysis, creative expression, innovativeness	P>0.05	There were no significant differences.
Faculty makes lessons connections to community, society and current events	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Students develops descriptions, explanations, predictions and models using evidence	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Students communicate knowledge and understanding of real-world situations	P>0.05	There were no significant differences.
Students exhibits necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes (values) to participate in the classroom and beyond	P<0.05	There were significant differences.

Table 7: Relevant Teaching and Learning Practices

Table 7 indicated high levels of significance differences in embracing practices that support relevant teaching and learning activities across the universities. Universities performed poorly in designing opportunities for students to participate in learning, linkingconcepts to student prior knowledge and connecting lessons to current events in the society. Kember & Leung (2005), Morzano (2007), Joyve, Calhoun &Hopkins (2009), Hattie (2009), and Hattie (2012), all agree that identifying and embracing active learning practices increases the opportunities for student to participant and engage on hands-on learning experiences which are critical for development of necessary skills and competencies among learners. The researcher sought to understand the universities that were comparable in embracing appropriate teaching and learning practices. DMRT results provide the information in table 8.

(i) Faculty designs learning opportunities that allow students to participation				
University	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
E	51	3.02		
D	83	3.09	3.09	
A	75	3.18	3.18	
B	69	3.39	3.39	
C	67		3.67	
F	61			4.20
Sig.		.095	.083	1.000
(ii) Faculty links concepts and ideals to students' prior experience				
University	N	Subset		
		1	2	
D	83	3.16		
E	51	3.16		
C	67	3.30		
A	75	3.33		
B	69	3.53		
F	61		4.04	
Sig.		.123	1.000	

(iii) Faculty makes lesson practical by connecting it to the society needs and current events			
University	N	Subset	
		1	2
E	51	3.00	
D	83	3.05	
A	75	3.07	
C	67	3.28	3.28
B	69	4.12	4.12
F	61		4.27
Sig.		.054	.072
(iv) Students develops descriptions, explanations, predictions			
University	N	Subset	
		1	2
D	83	2.93	
A	75	2.93	
E	51	2.96	
B	69	3.02	
C	67	3.15	
F	61		3.89
Sig.		.381	1.000
(v) Students exhibit knowledge, skills and attitudes to participate in the classroom and beyond			
University	N	Subset	
		1	2
E	51	3.22	
D	83	3.29	
B	69	3.39	
C	67	3.40	
A	75	3.43	
F	61		3.98
Sig.		.350	1.000

Table 8: Relevant Teaching and Learning Practices

Table 8 show various categorizations of universities based on each practice from lowest to highest ranked in relation to adoption and implementation of relevant teaching and learning practices.

4.5. Knowledge of the Content

The studysought to establish the extent to which faculty members had adequate knowledge of the content. The results were computed and presented table 9.

Knowledge of Content practices	**P Value**	**Interpretation**
Faculty demonstrates skills, understanding and in-depth knowledge of discipline and how they interrelate and maintains an ability to convey the content to the students	P<0.05	There were significant differences.
Faculty encourages students to use appropriate discipline-specific vocabulary	P>0.05	There were no significant differences.
Students demonstrate growth in the process of learning by utilizing theories, principles and concepts in real life situations	P<0.05	There were significant differences.

Table 9: Knowledge of Content Practices

Table 9 illustrates high significance levels of the faculty knowledge of the discipline area across the universities. Specifically, differences exist in faculty having in-depth knowledge of the discipline area and ability of students to demonstrate growth in the process of learning, application of theories, principles and concepts in real life situations.The researcher sought to find out comparable universities by conducting DMRT test for each practice. The results are presented in tables 10.

(I) Students Demonstrates Growth By Utilizing Theories, Principles And Concepts

University	N	Subset	
		1	2
D	83	3.19	
E	51	3.31	
A	75	3.32	
B	69	3.33	
C	67	3.40	
F	61		3.98
Sig.		.344	1.000

(ii) Faculty demonstrates understanding of discipline area

University	N	Subset			
		1	2	3	4
E	51	2.86			
D	83	3.09	3.09		
A	75		3.35	3.35	
C	67			3.53	3.53
B	69			3.55	3.55
F	61				3.93
Sig.		.266	.190	.369	.059

Table 10: DMRT Results on Knowledge of Content Practices

Table 10 show that universities could be classified into four categories from lowest to highest ranked in relation to faculty demonstrating adequate knowledge in the discipline area.

5. Conclusion

The findings on teaching and learning based on ANOVA results showed that universities were not similar in promoting management practices in effective teaching and learning. Sporadic variations were observed in creation of positive learning environment where students in some universities remained inactive in learning process due teaching and learning approaches adopted by the faculty that were largely teacher centered. This led to low motivation to learn and lack of acceptance to learning among the students. This consequently affected students' sense of accomplishment and confidence in the learning process. It was further observed that most of the universities lacked elaborate and comprehensive methods of assessment. Most of the universities used one sit-in continuous assessment test and one take away assignment. This did not take into account the skills that are developed by use of other forms of assessment such as group work, project and independent studies. It was also revealed that faculty did not provide regular and timely feedback to the students to help them reflect on areas that required improvement. The study also showed that universities were not keen to create avenues where student could apply theoretical knowledge in real situation. Therefore knowledge remained an abstraction in the mind of the student lacking any practical value.

6. Recommendations

From the empirical evidence and conclusions drawn, best management practices in teaching and learning are critical in the process of preparing quality graduates. The results of the study point out the need for the universities to identify and entrench management practices in teaching and learning. The university management needs to endeavor to establish teaching and learning practices that work best for her and ensure continuous implementation and support. This will give graduates produced in the universities a competitive edge in the global market.

7. References

i. Anstey, M., & Bull, G. (2006). Teaching and Learning Multiliteracies: Changing Times, Changing Literacies. International Reading Association. 800 Barksdale Road, PO Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714-8139.

ii. Christopher, D., Gavin T.L.B, Trevor G. B., & Ronnie, S. (2013) Understanding outcome-based education changes in teacher education: evaluation of a new instrument with preliminary findings. Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 41(4), 441-456, DOI: 10.1080/1359866X.2013.787392

iii. Evans, W.R. and Davis, W.D. (2005) High-Performance Work Systems and Organizational Performance: The Mediating Role of Internal Social Structure. Journal of Management,31,758-775. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279370

iv. Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. London: Routledge.

v. Hattie, J. (2012). Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning. London: Routledge.
vi. Howells, K., Fitzallen, N., & Adams, C. (2016). Using Assessment to Develop Social Responsibility as a Graduate Attribute in Teacher Education. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41(6).56-67.retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n6 .4
vii. Joyce, B. R., Calhoun, E., & Hopkins, D. (2009). Models of learning: Tools for teaching (3rd ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.
viii. Kember, D., & Leung, D. Y. (2005). The influence of active learning experiences on the development of graduate capabilities. Studies in Higher Education,30(2), 155-170. doi:10.1080/03075070500043127
ix. Marzano, R. J. (2007). The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction.
x. Mbwesa, J.K. (2006). Introduction to Management Research, A student's handbook,; Basic Modern management Consultants , Printed by Jomo Kenyatta Foundation
xi. Mutema A. M., Ngatia, P. M., & Kangethe, S. (2006). A systematic Approach to Curriculum Development and Implementation in Health Professions. Nairobi: Acts press.
xii. Orodho, A.J. & Kombo, D.K. (2002). Research Methods - Kenyatta University, institute of open learning, Nairobi,
xiii. Phillips, V., & Bond, C. (2004). Undergraduates' experiences of critical thinking. Higher Education Research & Development,23(3), 277-294. Doi:10.1080/0729436042000235409
xiv. Wells, G., & Mejia Arauz, R. (2006). Dialogue in the Classroom. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 15.3779.28. Doi 10.1207/s15327809jls1503_3
xv. Wiliam, D. (2007). Content then process: Teacher learning communities in the service of formative assessment. Ahead of the curve: The power of assessment to transform teaching and learning, 183-204.