

## **Deliverology in Ethiopian Higher Education as a Quality Management Tool: Critical Review and the Insider's Reflection**

Teklu Tafase Olkaba\*, Ewnetu Hailu Tamene

*College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Jimma University, Ethiopia*

**Corresponding author:** Teklu Tafase Olkaba, E-mail: teklu252@yahoo.com

### **ARTICLE INFO**

#### *Article history*

Received: August 03, 2019

Accepted: October 09, 2019

Published: October 31, 2019

Volume: 7 Issue: 4

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

### **ABSTRACT**

The concept of deliverology as a systematic process for driving progress and delivering results in government and the public sector, was endorsed in Ethiopia in 2017 for the purpose of quality management in Ethiopian public universities. The impetus of this reflective review article is to examine the essence of deliverology as a quality management tool in Ethiopian higher learning institutions as a response to graduate unemployment. In Ethiopia, different reform strategies were endorsed in higher learning institutions such as: program diversification, modularization governance reform strategies and currently deliverology as a quality management tool. This paper critically reviewed the Ethiopian higher learning institutions experiences and the essence of deliverology from its inceptions to the current implementation in Ethiopian public universities. The findings portray that deliverology as strategy for quality management is not conceived in Ethiopian higher education community at large and reality on the ground is different from the literature developed on the science of deliverology.

**Key words:** Deliverology, Higher Education Policies, Quality management, Reform Strategies

### **INTRODUCTION**

Literary, deliverology is the new concept endorsed in Ethiopian higher learning institutions in the last three years while in western world particularly in UK, is about two decades old. The purpose of endorsing deliverology in Ethiopian higher learning institutions is to make systematic process of quality management in teaching learning that secures graduates' employability (MOE, 2017). However, the policy scenarios, ambition of the government, realities regarding the economy of the country to deliver quality education and secure jobs for graduates from Ethiopian universities have become a bottle neck for the country.

Since the endorsement of the current education and training policy of 1994, Ethiopia has engaged in a highly ambitious effort to re-align its higher education system more directly to its national strategy for economic growth and poverty reduction (MOE, 2017 & Olkaba, 2015). The number of universities changed drastically from two universities to 49 universities within the last 15 years. Within this expansion an attempt was made to diversify disciplines and human resource requirements in all development sectors (MOE, 2017). The massification of university enrollments in science, engineering and technology is the result of the new strategic approach of the government of Ethiopia (MOE, 2017). In this context, the government of Ethiopia is focusing on helping its tertiary education institutions to become more innovative and

responsive to the requirements of a globally competitive knowledge economy.

The reason behind this fact is that Ethiopian government reacted to the low enrollment of Ethiopian higher education, among sub-Saharan Africa (Kahsay, 2012). As a matter of facts the Ethiopian government was appreciated because of its social demand approaches which would have sustained its political stability (Olkaba, 2015). Besides the expansion policy, the quality of higher education in Ethiopia did not attract attention till the graduate unemployment eroded the country. According to the Ethiopian Ministry of Education report more than 175,000 students graduate from Ethiopian public universities annually (MoE, 2017). Because of graduate mix policy, 70% of graduating students are from science and technology disciplines while 30% are from social sciences and humanities (MoE, 2017). This proportion is the result of the graduate mix policy endorsed in 2009 that allowed entry with 70% students to join science and technology stream and 30% to join social sciences and humanities stream.

Besides the expansion policy and program diversification, there were different strategic tools endorsed for quality management of higher education teaching learning processes. Among others, the modularization process, for alignment of the Ethiopian higher education national qualifications framework with that of the European qualifications framework, graduation mix policy (Kahsay, 2012; Olkaba, 2015; Olkaba & Tamene, 2017) and deliverology are major

reforming tools in Ethiopian higher education institutions. However, there are still many critics because of the poor quality of Ethiopian higher learning institutions, graduates of Ethiopian universities are not getting jobs and creating jobs after graduation (MOE, 2017). However, the expansion and graduate mix policy is negatively perceived by most scholars in Ethiopia (Kahsay, 2012; Olkaba, 2015), as the quality of graduate for both local and global placements became a critical challenge that forces the governments to look into deliverology as alternative tool to improve the quality of Ethiopian higher learning institutions.

### SITUATION OF THE PROBLEM

In Ethiopia, higher education research report (Kahsay, 2012; Olkaba, 2015; Teshome, 2007) portrays that for the last 15 years, different reform tools for both higher education administration and quality management were introduced. Some of these tools are as follows: Business Process re-engineering (BPR) implemented for responding bureaucratic administration aspects of higher education, while Business Score Card (BSC) and Kaizen introduced for quality and resource management strategies in Ethiopian higher education (Kahsay, 2012; Olkaba, 2015). The Office of quality assurance at institutional levels and Higher Education Quality and Relevance Agencies were established national level to monitor Ethiopian higher education quality at large (Kahsay, 2012; Olkaba, 2015; Teshome, 2007).

The graduate mix policy states to have 70% school leaving students joining higher education and to have 70% of the students graduating in science and technology (Kahsay, 2012). This policy brought a rapid increase in science and technology enrolments with large numbers of new enrollment in all Ethiopian public universities. This rapid increase in enrolments in the science and technology created a chaotic situation for the country at large (Olkaba, 2015). Because of the fact that graduate unemployment exacerbating the county within short period of time. Hence, Ministry of Education took initiative for assuring quality and relevance in Ethiopian higher education via a science of deliverology. Therefore, the main objective of the study was to examine the essence of deliverology from its inception to the current status and finally to reflect on the challenges in Ethiopian public higher learning institutions as to draw attention of the policy makers to its implementation.

### METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

The study was conducted in reviewing the available literature of deliverology from its inception in the UK to its discourses in different countries; Ethiopian higher education policy documents, articles written by scholars regarding Ethiopian higher education, researchers insider reflections as they have concrete experiences of Ethiopian higher education policy scenarios. Then looking at the experiences of other countries: and how it is going on in Ethiopian higher learning institutions was examined with critical reflective approach. Summary of the reviewed sources are:

- Deliverology books and guidelines of Sir Michael Barber (2007; 2008; 2009; 2011 & 2015)

- Articles written on deliverology: 6 internationally reputable articles (Andersen, 2008; Forster, 2005; Jolson, 2015; Lindquist, 2006; Richards, 2016; Seddon, 2009;) were critically reviewed.
- Ethiopian Ministry of Education policy strategy documents: three policy strategies and one consultative document were reviewed.
- Research articles and PhD dissertations on Ethiopian public higher education: four articles and two PhD dissertations were reviewed.
- Experiences of deliverology implementation in Malaysia, Put land; California state of education sectors, Canada, Ontario; Australia, Queen's land; and from Africa, Tanzanian experiences of deliverology implementation have been critically reviewed. All sources were acknowledged and referenced.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section portrays the essence of deliverology from its conceptual inception to practical implementation discourses, scenarios and its current status in Ethiopian public universities as a guarantee for quality management tool.

#### The Concepts of Deliverology

The concept, meaning and implementation of deliverology introduced by Michael Barber (2009) as:

- *A systematic process for driving progress and delivering results in government and the public sector*
- *A systematic process through which system leaders can drive progress and deliver results and it requires a sharp focus on a very limited set of priorities in order to succeed.* (Barber, 2009, p.4)

Advocators of deliverology (Etheridge & Thomas, 2015; Mullin, 2014; Reevely, 2016; Watkins, 2013 & Poister et al., 2013) remarked the viability of deliverology as a science of prioritization and implementation for delivering government strategic goals and policy promises as a unique tools compared to other reform tools that responds to the key questions under considerations:

- What are our priorities, goals, targets, and expected results?
- How to deliver up on priorities, goals, targets?
- How to implement and monitor effective delivery system within the given time framework to respond the public demanding results?

From the very few definitions of deliverology, it can be drawn that it is a science of prioritization and implementation. From the theoretical principles of deliverology, there is an established delivery unit which looks after key activities prioritized for implementation. The key aspect of deliverology is the establishment of central unit with focus on managing performance against key policy outcomes and the development of processes for performance improvement (Barber, 2015).

Moreover, Joelson (2015), on his thesis, portrayed delivery unit as Centers of Government. It means that the functions of a delivery unit are actually a sub-set of activities

inside the broader functions of centers of governments. A strong center of government is a key aspect to empowering delivery units to drive improvements in performance (Barber, 2007 & 2008). From the premises of the concepts of deliverology as a science and delivery unit as a center of government function, one can understand that deliverology is a technical tool for prioritizing key policy issues in government sectors for driving processes and deriving results to address public demands (Seddon, 2009).

### **Deliverology in Other Countries**

Deliverology endorsed in different countries with different scenarios and approaches to manage the implementation of policies promised by the government for public services. Few literatures have been explored to portray the essence of deliverology in other world in general and that of higher education. After Sr. Michael introduced deliverology as a means of addressing education management in UK, during the Tony Blair government, it has got to scale up to different Countries, among others in Malaysia, Put land, California state of education sectors. Education authors have been criticizing the science of deliverology in different perspectives. For instance, John Seddon dictated deliverology in his book as:

*Deliverology actually made public services in the UK worse from a user's point of view. In fact, even after three years of deliverology and improved government numbers, public satisfaction with services was not improving (Seddon, 2008, p.2).*

John Seddon argued that deliverology in its nutshell failed to respond in the way that the public deserves from the then UK government. He further articulated the reason why deliverology failed in UK as:

*One major problem is its top-down approach to driving change, what Seddon calls its "Mickey Mouse command and control". That basic mindset produces several counter-productive consequences for truly improving public services. It fails to take advantage of the knowledge people who actually deliver the service have and it ultimately destroys the sense of public duty that most effectively inspires those people to provide quality service. (Seddon, 2008, p.2).*

According to John Seddon (2008), as the approach of deliverology in UK is a top down command and with high rigidity on few elements of performance management deliverology was not effective in UK to respond the public services demanded from UK government. It means that deliverology might have lacked basic elements of democratic elements that promotes bottom up approaches. On the other hand, it gives on few, very narrow, rigid targets as the sole measure of improvement in public services and rigid elements of quality performance management. However, public service demands more than that the entities of deliverology (Seddon, 2008). Moreover, Seddon in his critic remarks that, the delivery unit for data management on targeted and prioritized strategies in responding public demand especially on health service in UK was out of the mission and only data cooking for the purposes of rewarding and punishment (Seddon, 2008).

Deliverology was introduced in Canada, Ontario after several years of UK deliverology with the chief Canada Prime Minister Mr. Trudeau. Trudeau promises turning the former holistic result delivery approaches to more specific one called Trudeau's five deliverology targets (Forster, 2005). Trudeau to introduce a new way of delivering policies across the entire government focusing on: Growing the middle class, stronger diversity, improved relationships with indigenous, and outcomes for peoples, and international engagement that makes a difference in the world (Forster, 2005, p.3). However, a critic of Forster (2005) portrays that the attempted improvement is not getting its vital meaning to the public demanding it. These is because of the fact that the actual target set was compromised by the overlooked public demand and its top down delivery approaches denied by most implementers (Andersen, 2008).

According to scholars in areas of system management (Forster, 2005; Joelson, 2015; Lindquist 2006) two known delivery unit established in Australia were notified as Queensland's Implementation Unit and the federal government's Cabinet Implementation Unit (CIU), in 2004 and 2003 respectively. The CIU established in 2003 (Lindquist, 2006, p.7) 'acts as a catalyst to drive the implementation and delivery of the Government's most important agendas as well as reporting on the progress of numerous policy initiatives across government'. The study of Lindquist confirms that both Queensland Implementation Unit and the Cabinet Implementation Unit have been described as less potent, directive, robust and aggressive than the UK's PMDU at overseeing improved delivery of key priorities (Lindquist, 2006).

The other notable world of deliverology is Malaysia in similar vein to UK deliverology approach with established Performance Management and Delivery Unit under the Prime minister office (Lindquist, 2006). Two prioritized area of Performance Management and Delivery Unit (Lindquist, 2006, p.17):

- *Creating 'Delivery Labs' to bring together a range of key stakeholders and experts to work intensively to draw up detailed, practical solutions to delivery issues.*
- *Holding Open Days, attended by over 20,000 participants, to communicate the government's change program and gain citizen buy-in. (Lindquist 2006, p. 17)*

To make the scope of delivery more worldwide the delivery unit established under the prime minister of Malaysia has made promotions and seminars to other countries in Africa and Asian where the Tanzanian government is the first in adopting deliverology from Africa in February 2013, ahead of Ethiopian Government's deliverology endorsement by four years.

Indeed, the experiences of Pakistan for education system management since 2011 can be taken as a good example which is similar to that of Tanzanian deliverology approaches. The road map of deliverology in the government of the Punjab, Pakistan was succeeded in transforming education quality in the province led by the delivery associates. Sir Michael took Pakistan as succeeded government in delivering results in addressing quality education system (Barber, 2013). This is why the delivery associated established by Sir Michael

Barber are working as consulting firm in Ethiopian Ministry of education in the first year of deliverology endorsement took the success of deliverology in Pakistan particularly for education system management as an advantage to induce the narration of deliverology in context of Ethiopian higher education.

The researchers recognize that deliverology is diffusing itself from its base, UK to other world, whereas the way it endorsed all country differs from each other as each country has its own policies and programs. So far deliverology endorsed in Pakistan succeeded in keeping the quality of education at its optimum pace whereas Tanzanian government deliverology approach is also getting appreciation for the intended policy to be implemented in effective manner to respond the public demanding the output policy initiatives. It is true that the intension and endorsement of deliverology is to solve the critical problems of each country. In the case of Ethiopia, deliverology is expected to solve the quality and relevance of higher education that ensures graduate employability. This premise in turn leads to political crisis management which was resulted from graduate unemployment turmoil in the case of Ethiopia and as a mechanisms and a prerequisite to win political election in the case of Canada and Australia.

However, most literature, particularly in the worlds of deliverology, the principle of deliverology has got difficulty platforms of applications. According Richards (2016), deliverology from several directions constitutes a '*silo effects*' when certain groups are identified for additional attention, based on pre-established performance targets; while the others can by default, be identified for neglect (Richards, 2016, p. 7).

In Ethiopia the critical problem for which deliverology imposed was because of the fact that quality in education system highly deteriorated at all levels which brought up poor quality graduate resulting graduate employment crisis. The graduate an employment crisis leading the political crisis for the ruling party as unemployed graduates are overwhelming the country in all direction. This is why the authors argued to deliverology as crisis management for sustenance of the government and the ruling party at the same time.

### **Introduction of Deliverology in Ethiopian Public Higher Learning Institutions**

Ethiopia introduced modern higher education in 1950s with the founding of the University College of Addis Ababa. Research evidence shows that modern higher education began its operations with the onset of the 20<sup>th</sup> century that was heralded by the establishment of the University College of Addis Ababa (UCAA) in 1950 with was the Western universities' training models and principles (Kahsay, 2012 & Olkaba, 2015). Ethiopian higher education development from 1974 to 1990 was characterised by the low participation rate in higher education, poor collaboration with local communities, weakness regarding its research output and poorly connections with the international higher education community, leading to the collapse of policy directions (Olkaba, 2015; Teshome, 2003).

However, the 1994 education and training policy changed the landscape of the Ethiopian higher education expansion

and program diversification system to meet the country's human power demands at all levels (MOE, 2017). The policy envisaged a higher education expansion policy that was realised in the last two decades especially from the year 2000 to 2019. This resulted the increase of the number of Ethiopian public higher education institutions from two to forty five universities with different policy reforms, such as the graduate mix and policy and programme diversification in line with the country's development policy (MOE, 2017).

Besides the expansion policy of higher education, the Ethiopian Ministry of Education inaugurated the 'graduate mix policy' (MOE 2009, p.39) in all public universities. The basis for the graduate mix policy was to balance the qualified human power for the growth and transformation plans to revitalize the country's economic from an agriculture-based economy to the export-led economy (MOE, 2017). The intention of the graduate mix policy (MOE, 2017) is to have science and technology graduates with 70% school leaving students join public universities in the fields of science and technology and to have 70% of the students graduating in science and technology. However, the graduate mix policy of Ethiopian higher education resulted in a rapid increase in science and technology enrolments with large numbers of new entrants at all Ethiopian public universities and soon the graduate unemployment crisis eroded the country.

Perhaps one can question why deliverology in Ethiopia, and why it is in higher education? Short answer might be the deterioration of quality in higher education resulted the endorsement of deliverology. During the introduction the philosopher of Deliverology Sr. Michael Barber came to Ethiopia and gave a day lecture on how to use deliverology in education system in general and higher education in particular. In his lecture Michael Barber told us that he worked in various levels of education in the United Kingdom and advisor of the former UK prime minister, Tony Blair and head of Delivery Unit, which supports the government of Blair for prioritizing and improving public high public demands and services.

During the inception of deliverology in Ethiopian, it was believed that the implementation and organization of delivery unit under ministry of education and delivery unit in each university. It seems partial restructuring of the university to respond to the prioritized areas in quality teaching learning processes and assurance for program relevance of undergraduate programs. It means that deliverology in Ethiopia comes for strengthening education system in Ethiopia in general of higher education in particular. This is why university graduates are unable to compete for local and global world of work. Thus, the endorsement of deliverology in Ethiopian higher education expected to solve the critical issues of quality and program relevance. World Bank (2011, p. 41) addresses five top tips to strengthening the education systems ability to deliver results with sound policies and coherent strategies.

- Prioritized action plans and targets,
- Setting standards and benchmarks,
- Measure, monitor and make results public
- Incentivized good performance, and
- Strengthen oversight mechanisms.

It's vital to remark that the premises of deliverology and the World Bank (2011) recommendations on strengthening education system mutually complementary. So, authors look the introduction of deliverology to Ethiopian education system positively which seems imperative as the science of result delivery recognized by World Bank through prioritization, standardization, and deriving results. However, the question is that the way deliverology introduced and the perceptions of Ethiopian higher education stakeholders seem different from realities on ground. Hence, the essence of deliverology in Ethiopia higher education is to ensure 80% graduates secure employments within one year from the date of graduation with their respective discipline.

### Priority Areas in Ethiopian Higher Education

Deliverology in Ethiopian higher education is seen as Centre of governing prioritized areas that directly responding to quality inputs or tools supporting university students in building both soft and hard skills. The soft skills intended are expected with mainstreaming in all structures of higher education units to support the students learning, so as to get employment opportunities within a year or 12 months from the date of graduation.

The delivery associates in Ethiopia came up with the prioritization initiatives in all Ethiopian universities to scale up the graduate employment opportunities within one year of graduation. The delivery associate in Ethiopia defined employability as degree-relevant employment: The graduate is employed in a job that is in line with the knowledge, skills and attitude listed in the graduate profile, and not necessarily in the same field of study (MOE, 2017). In order to realize these hypothesis major quality hindering factors in Ethiopian higher education were identified by the delivery associates recruited as a consultant of the Ethiopian Ministry of Education, with experts from Universities. The priority area identification and strategic decision making process has taken 12 days' workshop at Bishoftu, Ethiopia. The workshop was conducted with delivery associates, ministry of education, and university staffs selected for deliverology initiatives for prioritizing, planning, executing and monitoring all deliverology components in Ethiopian higher education. During the workshop, major quality problems in Ethiopian higher education (Delivery associates, Bishoftu, August, 2017) identified as follows:

- **Teachers' professional competence:** Big driver of employability is the quality of graduates as university products; however the reality is the revers. Our graduates lack practical skill as well as conceptual knowledge of the area of the study they graduated in. Among the various root causes to this challenge, teacher quality was deemed to be the top factor impacting quality of graduates. One of the main problems identified were teachers' lack of the technical and the pedagogical skills which is key to effectively prepare and coach students for the world of work requirements. Although good policies and processes have been put in place quality of classroom teaching and assessment of students' learning remain challenging.

- **Graduates basic competence:** one of the most important root causes of unemployment miss match between graduate's profile and the need of the world of work. While the world of work of the 21<sup>st</sup> century require various skill mainly IT skills like computer and digital skill our graduates from universities are not equipped with practical and conceptual skills that employers are seeking for. To be more specific, the graduates are lacking are not only lacking the practical skills required (e.g. computer use for technology, problem solving and analytical thinking skills), but also the soft skills that are key to securing jobs that much valued in the workplace like communication, teamwork, leadership skills.

Language of instruction for teaching learning is another barrier where poor command of English, limits students' learning leading to poor understanding of the subject matter. This language barrier is further exacerbated by the fact that many teachers are lacking good command of the language of instruction, English.

- **University-industry linkages:** The challenges in employment of graduates are often attributed to the mismatch between the supply and demand by the labor market. There seems little consideration/understanding/ on the needs of the labor market, leading to a glut of graduates in similar even in one area and a dearth of industry in another. Currently, universities place students on internship, apprenticeship and externship programs. However, due to problem in planning and communication the implementation is affected that the values gained from these programs are limited. These challenges can be stated as the university doesn't structure the program with the program objectives, expected skills to be gained; whilst the companies receiving students do not plan the programs and do not provide supervisory or mentorship support to students. (Delivery associates, Ministry of Education, Bishoftu, Ethiopia, August, 2017)

During the workshop, so many factors hindering quality of graduates discussed and experiences of other countries higher education quality management and graduate employability policies benchmarked by the delivery associates. Among the various factors affecting quality of teaching learning that directly influence the quality of graduate's employability were selected to overcome the unemployment crisis in Ethiopia. Based on the science of prioritization seven strategies set as a model improving employment opportunity by science of deliverology in all Ethiopian universities:

- *Improving teacher performance and motivation*
- *Improving student learning competence*
- *Improving teacher pedagogical and language competencies*
- *Improving student language skills*
- *Improving linkage with industry and support to students (Career Services)*
- *Improving student skills through value adding internship experiences and*
- *Tracer study*

It is true that these strategies were designed for realizing Ethiopian education sector development programme V (ESDP-V) 2015/16-2020 with the initiative, called ensuring

≥ 80% the employability of graduates by improving quality and relevance of undergraduate programmes. However, the progress and delivering results of these strategies are fragmented and not meeting the science of deliverology.

### Practices in Ethiopia Higher Learning Institutions

It is better to portray what the realities on the ground and what deliverology attempts to respond in the current realities in Ethiopia. In the last two decades in Ethiopian, higher education is characterized with unexpected expansion and enrollment growth of students of which the ratio 70: 30; the graduate mix policy impacting student admission is overwhelming the country. Even though deliverology emphasizes on few qualities of input and process management, the reality on the ground is twofold: Program relevance and quality of the program itself. As the preliminary documents of deliverology in Ethiopian higher education indicates, is to ensure job security of graduates to the coming 2020 by 80%, realities on ground should clearly be articulated in terms of program quality and relevance.

**Program relevance:** in Ethiopia ratio 70: 30 admission policies was not readable with the industry requiring manpower and end up with the market mismatch with graduates: One of the focus group discussion shows this reality as:

*There was an orientation when we took our first entry to our university how and why to assign the proportion of student as 70:30 ratios. During the orientation, some academic group understood that the country's manpower demand dictated the movement to develop the policy. Today it is referred as 70:30 higher education admission policies. But within short time, we are observing that there will be a mismatch between manpower demands in the intended ratio of graduate. For instance, for this year accounting department of our university wanted to recruit lecturers who graduated with MA degree in accounting discipline and advertised in Addis Zemen two times, and eventually the department didn't get any candidate. However, in the same university, in an electrical department vacancy advertised for recruitment of lecturers; 27 MSC graduate and more than 200 BSC graduate CVs were collected by human resources of our university. For further scrutiny, if we visit job seekers among others at least 50% are graduates of engineering and technology. We cannot deny these realities; it is an implication of the 70:30 admission outcomes. On the other hand, even though not supported with statistical data, there are hearings of here and there on lack of social science teachers for secondary education. This is also one indication of the 70:30 outcomes.*

In support of this comment, another participant recommended that revising "the curriculum of Ethiopian higher education in line with local and global market demand". These arguments confirm that there is a gap between the intention of endorsing expansion and program diversification process and the practice, on one hand; on the other hand there is a lot to do to realize clear guide line and policy to make sure that there will be local and global market demands for the graduates. On the other hand, program quality is

another challenge. Of course, deliverology document gives emphasis on quality management at input and process level. As the total quality management of higher education constitute the whole entities of the program not only on few quality inputs such as teacher assessment, student assessment, continuous professional development, English language improvement, internship, career services and tracer studies.

In Ethiopia these elements are constituents of deliverology to manage quality of higher education to secure job security for graduates. However, program quality constitutes more broad elements than the one embarrassed in deliverology of Ethiopian higher education. Program qualities likely equilibrate with the quality that the industry demand, not the quality that the training institute for cast for the usual report. As a result, that the operation of deliverology in Ethiopian higher education is an effortless program exercised, and the outcome of deliverology is not this much expected in bringing quality and relevance of Ethiopian universities. The following are the missing link of deliverology in Ethiopian higher education quality management

## DISCUSSION

### Ethiopian Higher Education and its Relevance to Local Realities

For instance, the country's development policy is led with the development policy as agricultural led industrialization. This policy is true because of the fact that country is poor due to unused resources-fertile land and manpower, which are reliable to agricultural led industrialization, and 83% of the country lives in rural areas highly engaging in traditional farming system. However, when we see the contribution of our higher education in general and universities in particular the role played by these institutions in transforming our local reality, traditional farming system, to modern system, is none existent at all in perspectives of the level challenge and opportunity we have.

Deliverology in Ethiopian higher education didn't address the local relevance of universities for transforming higher education mission to policy responsive, agricultural led industrialization, that absorb a lot of graduates, to ensure employability of ≥80% within a year of graduation. Since agriculture is a huge industry of Ethiopian and also most of Ethiopian universities based and build up on colleges of agriculture, the local relevance of Ethiopian universities should respond to agricultural transformation that leads to agricultural led industrialization, and deliverology should responds to these realities.

### Admission Policy of Ethiopia Higher Learning Institutions

The current admission policy is against the country's manpower demand and its social demand approaches of university aggressive expansion could not be entertained with deliverology science. As deliverology works with respect to quality and relevance on one side and the 30/70 admission policy (30% social and humanity discipline and 70%

engineering-technology and science) works on the other side, the reality on the ground is completely different from these two dimensions. Where there is no industry heavy or light industry, how it can be sure that 70% students graduated from engineering-technology and science discipline get employed within a year of graduation. On top of this the consent of deliverology in Ethiopia is to ensure  $\geq 80\%$  employability by 2020, which is unthinkable to realize the deteriorated quality of Ethiopian university to rehabilitate within two or three years from 2017.

In short no local market demanding the graduates; poor quality of graduates to be attracted by global market and job seeking rather than job creation exacerbating the country will be continued, and the current deliverology may not be guarantee of quality and relevance of Ethiopian higher education.

### **Deliverology Approach**

The delivery is initiated by the government and mandated by the Ethiopian ministry of education to implement all components of seven strategies for ensuring ensure  $\geq 80\%$  employability by 2020. The approach is solely top down, as the former Prime Minister of Ethiopia, Hailemariam Desalegn and Sir Michael Barber, the owner of deliverology project and the former delivery unit advisor of the former UK Prime Minister, Tony Blair, officially endorsed deliverology in Ethiopia within two days meeting in Ethiopia. During the introduction of deliverology Ethiopian ministry of education took the initiatives from the prime ministry office and directly imposed on Ethiopian universities without much preparation and structural adjustments. As the approach of deliverology was structurally different from the experiences of Ethiopian universities, it complicated the monitoring system to measure the outcome of each strategy. For instance, data trucking through traffic lightening system is not clear for the delivery unit at university levels and the officials are confused whether the intended plan is on the right truck or not. The delivery unit at the ministry of education is loaded with weekly traffic light report from 36 six universities implementing deliverology in the country. Furthermore, there is no structural viability of deliverology at university level. The attempt is to work as small government arm of the top leader within the existing structure, however, the governing structure highly resisting its top down approach and the attempts so far made seems fruitless.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

The endorsement of deliverology is highly linked with country's policy scenarios to manage the implementation of policies promised by the government for public services. Deliverology from its inception dictates a top down management approach as a government army to manage routine activities of prioritized strategies to ensure sector policies that responds to the public demanding results. Literatures confirms that deliverology is diffusing itself from its base, UK to other world, whereas the way it endorsed in all countries differs from each other as each country has its own policies and programs.

However, among countries with experiences of deliverology only few countries like Pakistan, Punjab region succeeded in keeping the quality of education at its optimum pace and Tanzanian government deliverology approach is also getting appreciation for the intended policy to be implemented in effective manner to respond the public demanding the output of policy initiatives. Whereas the deliverology approach in its birth place, UK, because of its top down command and rigidity on few elements of performance management responded in very limited public services demanded from UK government.

Deliverology in Ethiopian higher education is at frantic status, and its nexus to higher education quality and relevance management seems an intricate for application. It lacks local reality; its approach is top down. The outcome is expected in 2020, which contradicts the usual quality and relevance, difficulty to maintain quality of higher education within two years. Furthermore, even if quality is maintained to some extent the admission policy of the Ethiopian higher education contradicts the market demand of graduate employability. From the researchers' point of view, deliverology is a tool endorsed in Ethiopian higher education without dealing with the current Ethiopian higher education local relevance, admission policy, governance structure or approaches and market demand analysis.

Therefore, the researchers recommend that there should be new model of manpower approaches that balance the local needs and realities with the quality and relevance of programs in Ethiopian universities which directly responds to graduate employability.

### **REFERENCES**

- Andersen, S. C. (2008). The impact of public management reforms on student performance in Danish schools. *Public Administration*, 86(2), 541-558.
- Barber, M. (2015). *How to Run a Government So that Citizens Benefit and Taxpayers Don't Go Crazy*. UK, Penguin Random House,
- Barber, M. (2011). *Deliverology from Idea to implementation*, McKinsey Company. UK
- Barber, M. (2009). *Deliverology: A Field Guide for Education Leaders: Who Want to Ensure Significant Results*. U.S. Education Delivery Institute.
- Barber, M. (2008). *Instruction to Deliver: Tony Blair, the Public Services and the Challenge of Delivery*, London, Politicos.
- Barber, M. (2007). *Instruction to Deliver: Fighting to Transform Britain's Public Services*. Methuen Publishing Ltd, London.
- Etheridge, Z., Thomas, P. (2015). Adapting the PMDU Model. The creation of a delivery unit by Haringey Council, London: A case study. *Institute for Government*, London, U.K.
- Forster, P. 2005, *Queensland Health Systems Review Final Report*, Queensl and Government, September 2005.
- Joelson, V. (2015). *The role of Delivery Units in the implementation of public policies and services*. The George Washington University, Washington, DC.

- John, S. (2008). *Systems Thinking in the Public Sector: The Failure of the Reform Regime and a Manifesto for a Better Way*. Triarchy Press Ltd.
- Kahsay, M. (2012). *Quality and quality assurance in Ethiopian higher education: critical issues and practical Implications* (PhD Dissertation). Enschede: CHEPS.
- Lindquist, E. (2006) Organizing for Policy Implementation: The Emergence and Role of Implementation Units in Policy Design and Oversight, *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 8(4), 311-324.
- Ministry of Education (MOE) (2017). Ethiopian Education Roadmap Development Process, 2017-2030: *Higher Education, Empirical Survey*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Ministry of Education (MOE) (2017). Introduction to deliverology in Ethiopia: Deliverology to ensure graduate employability 80% by 2020. Delivery associates consultative document. Bishoftu, Ethiopia.
- Ministry of Education (MOE). (2010). *Education Sector Development IV*. Addis Ababa: MOE Ethiopia.
- Mullin, C. (2014). Making things happen at the Implementation Unit. Cabinet Office. Disponible en <https://quarterly.blog.gov.uk/2014/04/16/making-things-happen-at-the-implementation-unit/>(consulta: 4 de mayo de 2015).
- Olkaba, T. (2015). *Globalisation and Its Impact on Higher Education in Ethiopia* (Doctoral Thesis). University of South Africa, Pretoria.
- Olkaba, T. T., & Edosa, K. C. (2017). A Glimpse at Ethiopian Universities from Globalisation Perspectives: Institutional Policy Responsiveness for Local and Global Realities. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 4(13).
- Olkaba, T. & Tamene, E. (2017). Bologna Process and Reality on the Ground in Ethiopian Higher Education. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 5(4).
- Poister, T. H., Pasha, O. Q., & Edwards, L. H. (2013). Does performance management lead to better outcomes? Evidence from the US public transit industry. *Public Administration Review*, 73(4), 625-636
- Reeveley, D. (2016). Ontario's experience shows serious flaws in 'deliverology' governance. <http://news.nationalpost.com/flaws-in-deliverology-governance>
- Richards, G. (2016). *Does 'Deliverology' Deliver?* Telfer School of Management, University of Ottawa Institute on Governance.
- Seddon, J. (2009). In Defense of Higher Education: Barber's Deliverology. Retrieved August 20, 2016, from <http://defendthecsu.blogspot.ca/2009/12/barbers-deliverology.html>
- Teshome, Y. (2007). *The Ethiopian Higher Education: Creating Space for Reform*. Addis Ababa: St Mary's University College Printing Press.
- Watkins, K. (2013). Jim Kim's 'science of delivery': what role for politics? | Overseas Development Institute (ODI). <http://www.odi.org/comment/7703-jim-kims-science-delivery-role-politics>
- World Bank (2011). *A New Instrument to Advance Development Effectiveness: Program-for Results Financing*. Operations Policy and Country Services.