Influence of Leadership and Administration on Competence Based Curriculum and Digitalization In Higher Education

Hillary Shikokoti
Professor Ursulla Okoth
Dr. Susan Chepkonga

1(Department of Education Administration and Planning, University of Nairobi, Kenya)
2(Department of Education Administration and Planning, University of Nairobi, Kenya)
3(Department of Education Administration and Planning, University of Nairobi, Kenya)

Abstract

Purpose: The study investigated the influence of leadership and administration on competence based curriculum and digitalization in higher education**.**The paper is based on the following objectives: To determine the influence of lecturers administrative roles on teacher preparedness, to examine the influence of lecturer's leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education. The study was based on Davies Bogozzi and Warshaw intergrated model called Technological Acceptance Model (TAM) theory(Davis, Bogozzi and Warshaw, 1989) to measure the influence of its main latent factors on user acceptance of e-learning system in the University.

Materials and Method: The study targeted 800 students, 80 lecturers and 20 ICT officials. a sample of 20% was used on both lecturers, students and ICT officials and considered a large sample.8 lecturers, 162 students and 4 ICT officers were sampled Questionnaires and were used to collect data.

Findings: The findings show the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between lecturers administrative roles on teacher preparedness on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education would be accepted if $p<0.05$.The null hypothesis was therefore rejected. The findings show the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between lecturer's leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education would be accepted if $p<0.05$.The null hypothesis was therefore rejected.

Conclusions: For Competence Based Curriculum to be successful enough instructional resources need to be provided effectively, Leadership on teachers training through digital platforms is key to ensure Competence Based Curriculum is done effectively, Both face to face training method and phone conference training method take between 1-5 hours and the success of digitalization in higher education on Competence Based Curriculum is majorly determined by the coordination of both the lecturers, students and ICT officials give and the Universities effectiveness on resource allocation.

Key words: Competence Based Curriculum, Higher Education, Leadership, Administration, Digitalization

I.   INTRODUCTION

The concept of competence-based or competency-based education (CBE) and training is interpreted in many ways in education systems all over the world, resulting at one end of a continuum into a tick list of skills and at the other into a set of generic abilities that transcends disciplinary knowledge and skills. Although CBE has secured its place in technical and vocational education, especially at secondary level, only in recent years has the competence-based approach been found as well in higher education. However, this is not without controversy. CBE signifies a different paradigm compared to 'classical education'. One of the fears, expressed by adversaries of CBE in higher education curricula and addressed in this paper, is that CBE is too prescriptive, too much skills-oriented and therefore detrimental to the academic character of higher education.In developing countries many higher education institutions experience a growing gap between their curricula and the demands from society, business and industry for a more flexible workforce with high skills (competencies) in problem solving, team work and project management. In 2013, the European Commission published a Digital

Competence Framework based on five areas and 21 competences, which include the notion of digital literacy (Ferrari, 2013). At a systemic level policy documents often emphasize the need to invest in digital skills enhancement for economic growth and competitiveness (European Commission, 2010). Furthermore, it has been argued that in our interconnected world "sustainable development and social cohesion depend critically on the competencies of all of our population—with competencies understood to cover knowledge, skills, attitudes and values" (OECD, 2005, p. 4). Digitalization has increasingly introduced a new dimension in teachers' pedagogical skills and competences which we have chosen to call Pedagogical Digital Competence (PDC). The world is going through increasingly chaotic changes of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (World Economic Forum (WEF), 2016). One of the main drivers of this chaos is the technological drive towards e-learning in universities. Disruptive changes are coming very quickly and the impact on institutional leadership and management is not smooth. Many organizations are slow to adapt to all of these changes, and those that do not may fail. The main locus of contradiction that contributes to weak and unclear management and leadership competence for e-learning is the lack of proper knowledge of how e-learning environments work. Leaders and managers need to develop a deep understanding of how students learn online today. Reasons that companies or organization fail in e-learning initiatives are well documented (WEF, 2016). Most of the reasons are human failures, including failure to read the market and customer needs, failure to be competitive, failure to adapt, failure to deal adequately with disruptive technologies and innovation, and failure to manage human failures (WEF, 2016). Universities are not excluded in this great challenge in which new initiatives tend to disarm the existing leadership in institutions. It would be very difficult for universities to allow most of its old leaders and managers of teaching and learning to leave the institution and the only way to solve this problem would be to empower them. Therefore within this era of continuous technological innovation higher education institutions need to take cognizance of the changing nature of the leadership and management of e-learning and therefore be more responsive to their needs. Emerging innovations and in particular e-learning innovations have serious implications for higher education institutions. Since the present century has been calling for online learning, innovations in technology together with the use of the internet have transformed teaching and learning practices within open distance learning (ODL) institutions. Though the reality of change towards e-learning has brought with it elements of discomfort and anxiety, it is more so to the leadership and management of this change. Leaders and managers who existed in the pre-digital teaching and learning era find themselves leading and managing in e- learning environments without the required competences. They continue to push for an e-learning agenda that is not clear to them. Therefore universities end up being led by managers and leader who are not clear about the issues around e-learning environments. Today higher education is globally under pressure to produce knowledge that is relevant to social and economic needs, more representative of the diversity of its knowledge producers and more inclusive of the sites What result from thiswhere knowledge should be produced (Ministry of Higher Education, 2006). One of the greatest contributions higher education has made to sustainable development is by enabling online learning in its curriculum and learning. This implies that pedagogies and teaching online approaches should be consciously chosen to enable authentic learning, re-assessment, reshaping and reforming of the purpose of an e-learning curriculum.During times of change, delivering refresher leadership training to ensure managers are leading their people positively and productively can also be advantageous. It is important for the leaders to go through structured training courses and programs that provide knowledge for their working environments. Leaders and managers must be provided with meaningful e-learning and sound induction training during the change management process while providing appropriate support. Today'slearning managers need smart, personalized leadership training they can be accessed anywhere and, on any device, (Penfold, 2016).

Currently, Kenya is in the process of implementing a new curriculum despite distinctive protestations and challenges. It is notable that the reforms in Kenya have been undertaken through Commissions and led by Professionals from within and outside the country. The reform processes in Kenya have been led by the following commissions: Ominde Commission (The Ominde Report, 1964); Bessey Commission (The Bessey Report, 1972); Gachathi Commission (The Gachathi Report, 1976); Mackay Commission (The Mackay Report, 1981); Kamunge Commission (The Kamunge Report, 1988) and Koech Commission (The Koech Report, 1999) (Eshiwani, 1993; Amutabi, 2003). Despite the sevearal transformational attempts, Muricho and Chang'ach (2013) are of the view that education change in Kenya is duplicitous. Muricho and Chang'ach (2013, p.142) argue that instead of the reforms achieving the intended objectives, they have created more challenges especially with regards to high unemployment rates of graduates exiting the education system.,

Statement of the Problem

Gaps and delays in preparation of learning material with publishing houses has added to the fluidity of the implementation dilemma (Momanyi&Rop, 2019; Ondimu, 2018). In the new dispensation, learners are expected to spend 2 years at an Early Childhood Centre before joining primary school (Kaviti, 2018). ECDE centres are ill prepared for the CBC, there is no framework to guide the implementation of the new curriculum and learning material including a guiding curriculum (Kilile, Mwalw'a&Nduku, 2019). Early research that

lucidly targeted the implementation stages of early grade education and preparedness of the teachers to implement CBC indicate that teachers' knowledge of CBC is vague, they are ill prepared, and hence their inability to teach and evaluate the new curriculum. Further training and more sessions for reskilling are suggested through the Kenya Institute for Curriculum Development (KICD) in order to prepare teachers adequately in pedagogy, assessment, and document preparation (Momanyi&Rop, 2019; Koskei&Chepchumba, 2020). Waweru (2018) notes that lack of teacher preparedness and training in the new curriculum is a big impediment to the successful implementation of the new curriculum. Teachers who participated in Waweru's study complained of lack of knowledge on how to design worksheets which are a prerequisite in the CBC. Preparing lesson plans for all subjects was seen as extra work interfering with the instructional time given the already overburdened working environments teachers find themselves in (Koskei&Chepchumba, 2020). Koskei and Chepchumba (2020) and Njeru and Itegi (2018) opine that teachers are an integral part of implementing any education reform agenda. Having proper training and skills will obliterate the current dilemma facing the country's teachers. Momanyi and Rop (2019) intimate that this could be contributing to teachers not having shifted fully to new pedagogies that are imbued in CBC. Teachers have been accused of not using the discovery method and yet it is obligatory in CBC. Teacher centeredness is preferable in most cases, personalized instruction is not happening in most of the schools, understandably so due to large classes.African Union (2007) argues that the quality delivery depends on the competence of the teacher. The competences are measured in terms of theoretical knowledge, technical and pedagogical skills. It means that for someone to effectively deliver the competences to the learners, the person should be highly qualified. The study seeks to investigate the influence of leadership and administration on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education

Objective of the study
The study was based on the following objective:
1)   To determine the influence of lecturers administrative roles on teacher preparedness on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education
2)   To examine the influence of lecturer's leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education

Research hypothesis
The study was based on the following research hypothesis:
$H0_1$: there is no significant relationship between lecturers administrative roles on teacher preparedness on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education
$H0_2$: There is no significant relationship between lecturer's leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education

Theoretical framework
        Davies Bogozzi and Warshaw created an intergrated model called Technological Acceptance Model (TAM) theory(Davis, Bogozzi and Warshaw, 1989) to measure the influence of its main latent factors on user acceptance of e-learning system in the University. This model design includes four additional constructs i.e. training, self-efficacy, compatibility and facilitating conditions adopted from different research studies and literature.TAM has been applied as the most successful and common theory than any other theories in e-learning acceptance (Sumark, 2011). In figure 1, the proposed research framework supposed to be tested and analyzed that shows the constructs grouped into three categories to investigate the factors influencing students', lecturers' and managerial behavior towards successful implementation of eLearning system. The existing research studies statistics shows that TAM is the most utilized as a part of existing investigation is student group, trailed by teachers, and management (Sumark, 2011).

II.   MATERIALS AND METHODS
        Descriptive survey research design was used as it allows the researcher to describe characteristics of an individual or group as they really are. (Kothari, 2011). Descriptive survey are only concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held and process that are ongoing. The study targeted 800 students, 80 lecturers and 20 ICT officials. a sample of 20% was used on both lecturers, students and ICT officials and considered a large sample (Best & Kahn, 2011) and large enough to detect a significant effect (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Simple random sampling was used and Questionnaires were used to collect data from the lecturers, ICT official and students because of their ability to contend alot of information from respondents over a short period of time. They are also free from biasness of the researcher. They contained close ended questions. Orodho (2009) further explains that questionnaires capture information on people's attitudes, opinions and habits. The questionnaires had two sections; Section A captured the background information which contained the gender,

age, level of education; Section B contained the factors influencing e-learning which on a likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree seeking information on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education. To enhance the content validity of the instruments a pretest of the instruments was carried out. Piloting aimed at testing the clarity of test items, suitability of language used and the feasibility of the study. The reliability of the instruments was determined using test-retest technique. The Pearson's product-moment correlation (r) coefficient formula was used to compute the reliability coefficient (Best & Kahn, 2011). Pearson correlation coefficient was used in this study as being the most appropriate for determining relationship (Kothari 2004). Both correlation and regression analysis fitted a line to describe the said relationship.The hypothesis test was at 5% level of significance The null hypothesis was rejected and accepted if the p-value is greater than 0.05 ($P \geq 0.05$) or 0.01 ($P \geq 0.01$). It was rejected if the p-value is less than or equal to 0.05 ($P \leq 0.05$) and 1% level of significance if the p-value was less than or equal to 0.01($P \leq 0.01$)

III. FINDINGS AND COMMENTS
Lecturers administrative roles on teacher preparedness on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education
Table 1 shows students response on Lecturers provide platforms on Competence Based Curriculum through E-learning

Table 1:Lecturers provide platforms on Competence Based Curriculum through E-learning

Statement	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Std
Strongly Disagree	35	21.6	2.86	1.326
Disagree	31	19.1		
Neutral	35	21.6		
Agree	43	26.5		
Strongly Agree	18	11.1		
Total	162	100.0		

Table 1 shows majority26.5% of the students Agreed that Lecturers provide platforms on Competence Based Curriculum through E-learning while 21.6% were Neutral and Strongly Disagreed respectively with a mean of (Mean 2.86, Std=1.326).
Table 2 shows ICT officials response on Lecturers provide platforms on Competence Based Curriculum through E-learning

Table 2:ICT officials response on Lecturers provide platforms on Competence Based Curriculum through E-learning

Statement	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Std
Disagree	1	25.0	3.25	0.957
Neutral	1	25.0		
Agree	2	50.0		
Total	4	100.0		

Table 2 shows majority 50% of the ICT officials Agreed that that Lecturers provide platforms on Competence Based Curriculum through E-learning while 25.0% were Neutral and Disagreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.25, Std=0.957
Table 3 shows Lecturers response on Lecturers provide platforms on Competence Based Curriculum through E-learning.

Table 3:Lecturers response on Lecturers provide platforms on Competence Based Curriculum through E-learning

Statement	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Std
Disagree	1	12.5	3.38	0.744
Neutral	3	37.5		
Agree	4	50.0		
Total	8	100.0		

Table 3 shows majority 50.0% of the Lecturers Agreed that Lecturers provide platforms on Competence Based Curriculum through E-learning while 37.5% were Neutral with a mean of (Mean=3.38, Std=0.744)

Table 4 shows students response on Lecturers ensure instructional resources are efficient on Competence Based Curriculum

Table 4:Students response on Lecturers ensure instructional resources are efficient on Competence Based Curriculum

Statement	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Std
Strongly Disagree	29	17.9	3.28	1.393
Disagree	18	11.1		
Neutral	29	17.9		
Agree	51	31.5		
Strongly Agree	35	21.6		
Total	162	100.0		

Table 4 shows majority 31.5% of the students Agreed that Lecturers ensure instructional resources are efficient on Competence Based Curriculum while 21.6%   Strongly Agreed and 17.9% were Neutral and Strongly Disagreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.28, Std=1.393)
Table 5 shows ICT officials response on Lecturers ensure instructional resources are efficient on Competence Based Curriculum.

Table 5: ICT officials response on Lecturers ensure instructional resources are efficient on Competence Based Curriculum

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Strongly Disagree	1	25.0	3.50	1.915
Neutral	1	25.0		
Strongly Agree	2	50.0		
Total	4	100.0		

Table 5 shows majority 50% of ICT officials Strongly Agreed that Lecturers ensure instructional resources are efficient on Competence Based Curriculum while25.0% were Neutral and Strongly Disagreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.50, Std=1.915)
Table 6 shows Lecturers response on Lecturers ensure instructional resources are efficient on Competence Based Curriculum

Table 6:Lecturers ensure instructional resources are efficient on Competence Based Curriculum

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Strongly Disagree	2	25.0	3.38	1.685
Neutral	2	25.0		
Agree	1	12.5		
Strongly Agree	3	37.5		
Total	8	100.0		

Table 6 shows majority 37.5% of the Lecturers Strongly Agreed that Lecturers ensure instructional resources are efficient on Competence Based Curriculum while 25.0% were Neutral and Strongly Disagreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.38, Std=1.685)
Table 7 shows students response on Lecturers ensure budgetary allocation is efficient on Competence Based Curriculum

Table 7:Students response on Lecturers ensure budgetary allocation is efficient on Competence Based Curriculum

Statement	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Std
Strongly Disagree	29	17.9	3.23	1.412
Disagree	25	15.4		
Neutral	21	13.0		
Agree	53	32.7		
Strongly Agree	34	21.0		
Total	162	100.0		

Table 7 shows majority32.7% of students Agree that Lecturers ensure budgetary allocation is efficient on Competence Based Curriculum while 21.0% Strongly Agree and 17.9% Strongly Disagree respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.23, Std=1.412)

Table 8 shows ICT officials response on Lecturers ensure budgetary allocation is efficient on Competence Based Curriculum

Table 8:ICT officials response on Lecturers ensure budgetary allocation is efficient on Competence Based Curriculum

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Strongly Disagree	1	25.0	3.50	1.732
Agree	2	50.0		
Strongly Agree	1	25.0		
Total	4	100.0		

Table 8 shows majority 50.0% of ICT officials Agree that Lecturers ensure budgetary allocation is efficient on Competence Based Curriculum while 25.0% Strongly Agree and Strongly Disagree respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.50, Std=1.732).

Table 9 shows Lecturers response on Lecturers ensure budgetary allocation is efficient on Competence Based Curriculum

Table 9:Lecturers response on Lecturers ensure budgetary allocation is efficient on Competence Based Curriculum

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Strongly Disagree	2	25.0	3.38	1.598
Neutral	1	12.5		
Agree	3	37.5		
Strongly Agree	2	25.0		
Total	8	100.0		

Table 9 shows majority 37.5% of the Lecturers Agreed that Lecturers ensure budgetary allocation is efficient on Competence Based Curriculum while 25.0% Strongly Agreed and Strongly Disagreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.38, Std=1.598)

Table 10 shows Students response on Lecturers monitor the Competence Based Curriculum digitalization in higher education

Table 10:Students response on Lecturers monitor the Competence Based Curriculum digitalization in higher education

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Strongly Disagree	28	17.3	3.15	1.404
Disagree	30	18.5		
Neutral	27	16.7		
Agree	43	26.5		
Strongly Agree	34	21.0		
Total	162	100.0		

Table 10 shows majority 26.5% of students Agreed that Lecturers monitor the Competence Based Curriculum digitalization in higher education while 21.0% Strongly Agreed and 18.5% Disagreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.15, Std=1.404).

Table 11 shows ICT officials responses on Lecturers monitor the Competence Based Curriculum digitalization in higher education

Table 11: ICT officials responses on Lecturers monitor the Competence Based Curriculum digitalization in higher education

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Neutral	1	25.0	4.00	0.817
Agree	2	50.0		

Strongly Agree	1	25.0		
Total	4	100.0		

Table 11 shows majority 50.0% of ICT officials Agreed that Lecturers monitor the Competence Based Curriculum digitalization in higher education while 25.0% were Neutral and Strongly Agreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=4.00, Std=0.817).

Table 12 shows Lecturers response on Lecturers monitor the Competence Based Curriculum digitalization in higher education

Table 12:Lecturers response on Lecturers monitor the Competence Based Curriculum digitalization in higher education

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Disagree	1	12.5	3.75	1.035
Neutral	2	25.0		
Agree	3	37.5		
Strongly Agree	2	25.0		
Total	8	100.0		

Table 12 shows majority 37.5% of Lecturers Agreed that Lecturers monitor the Competence Based Curriculum digitalization in higher education while 25.0% were Neutral and Strongly Agreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.75, Std=1.035)

$H0_1$: *There is no significant relationship between lecturers administrative roles on teacher preparedness on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education*

In order to test the relationship between lecturers' administrative roles on teacher preparedness on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education Pearson correlation was used to test the hypothesis. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant relationship between lecturers' administrative roles on teacher preparedness on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education

Table 13 shows correlation matrix between lecturers' administrative roles on teacher preparedness on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education

Table 13: Correlation matrix between lecturers' administrative roles on teacher preparedness on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education

		Lecturers' administrative roles on teacher Preparedness	Competence Based Curriculum and Digitalization
Lecturers' administrative roles on teacher Preparedness	Pearson Correlation	1	.895[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.003
	N	162	162
Competence Based Curriculum and Digitalization	Pearson Correlation	.895[*]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	
	N	162	162

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The correlation result in Table 13 shows a positive and strong significant coefficient between Lecturers' administrative roles on teacher Preparedness and Competence Based Curriculum and Digitalization where (r=.895, p-value<0.05) were rejected at p<0.05 significance level of which the null hypothesis was rejected. Hence there is a strong significant relationship between Lecturers' administrative roles Teacher Preparedness and Competence Based Curriculum and Digitalization.

Lecturer's leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education
Table 14 shows students response on Lecturers ensure training of teachers is effectively don on Competence Based Curriculum through digital platforms

Table 14:Students response on Lecturers ensure training of teachers is effectively don on Competence Based Curriculum through digital platforms

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Strongly Disagree	5	3.1	3.70	1.196
Disagree	27	16.7		
Neutral	36	22.2		
Agree	38	23.5		
Strongly Agree	56	34.6		
Total	162	100.0		

Table 14 shows majority 34.6% of the students Strongly Agree that Lecturers ensure training of teachers is effectively don on Competence Based Curriculum through digital platforms while 23.5% Agree and 22.2 were Neutral respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.70, Std=1.196).
Table 15 shows ICT officials response on Lecturers ensure training of teachers is effectively don on Competence Based Curriculum through digital platforms

Table 15:Lecturers ensure training of teachers is effectively don on Competence Based Curriculum through digital platforms

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Neutral	1	25.0	4.00	0.817
Agree	2	50.0		
Strongly Agree	1	25.0		
Total	4	100.0		

Table 15 shows majority 50.0% of ICT officials Agreed that Lecturers ensure training of teachers is effectively don on Competence Based Curriculum through digital platforms while 25.0% were Neutral and Strongly Agreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=4.00, Std=0.817).
Table 16 shows Lecturers response on Lecturers ensure training of teachers is effectively don on Competence Based Curriculum through digital platforms

Table 16:Lecturers ensure training of teachers is effectively don on Competence Based Curriculum through digital platforms

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Disagree	1	12.5	3.75	1.035
Neutral	2	25.0		
Agree	3	37.5		
Strongly Agree	2	25.0		
Total	8	100.0		

Table 16 shows majority 37.5% of Lecturers Agreed that Lecturers ensure training of teachers is effectively don on Competence Based Curriculum through digital platforms while 25.0% were Neutral and Strongly Agreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.75, Std=1.035)
Table 17 shows students' response on Lecturers conduct assessment and management on Competence Based Curriculum

Table 17:Students' response on Lecturers conduct assessment and management on Competence Based Curriculum

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Strongly Disagree	4	2.5	3.69	1.066
Disagree	15	9.3		
Neutral	56	34.6		

Agree	40	24.7	
Strongly Agree	47	29.0	
Total	162	100.0	

Table 17 shows majority 34.6% of the students were Neutral on Lecturers conduct assessment and management on Competence Based Curriculum while 29.6% Strongly Agreed and 24.7% Agreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.69, Std=1.066)

Table 18 shows ICT officials responses on Lecturers conduct assessment and management on Competence Based Curriculum

Table 18:ICT officials responses on Lecturers conduct assessment and management on Competence Based Curriculum

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Neutral	2	50.0	3.75	0.957
Agree	1	25.0		
Strongly Agree	1	25.0		
Total	4	100.0		

Table 18 shows majority 50.0% of ICT officials were Neutral on Lecturers conduct assessment and management on Competence Based Curriculum while 25.0% Strongly Agreed and Agreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.75, Std=0.957)

Table 19 shows Lecturers response on Lecturers conduct assessment and management on Competence Based Curriculum

Table 19:Lecturers response on Lecturers conduct assessment and management on Competence Based Curriculum

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Disagree	1	12.5	3.75	1.389
Neutral	2	25.0		
Agree	2	25.0		
Strongly Agree	3	37.5		
Total	8	100.0		

Table 19 shows majority 37.5% of Lecturers Strongly Agreed that Lecturers ensure training of teachers is effectively don on Competence Based Curriculum through digital platforms while 25.0% were Neutral and Agreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.75, Std=1.389)

Table 20 shows students response on Faculty ensure participation of training on Competence Based Curriculum is efficient

Table 20:Students' response on Faculty ensure participation of training on Competence Based Curriculum is efficient

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Strongly Disagree	5	3.1	3.62	1.028
Disagree	18	11.1		
Neutral	44	27.2		
Agree	62	38.3		
Strongly Agree	33	20.4		
Total	162	100.0		

Table 20 shows majority 38.3% of students Agree that Faculty ensure participation of training on Competence Based Curriculum is efficient while 27.2% were Neutral and 20.4% Strongly Agreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.62, Std=1.028).

Table 21 shows ICT officials responses on Faculty ensure participation of training on Competence Based Curriculum is efficient

Table 21:Faculty ensure participation of training on Competence Based Curriculum is efficient

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Neutral	1	25.0	4.00	0.817
Agree	2	50.0		
Strongly Agree	1	25.0		
Total	4	100.0		

Table 21 shows majority 50.0% of ICT officials Agreed that Faculty ensure participation of training on Competence Based Curriculum is efficient while 25.0% were Neutral and Strongly Agreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=4.00, Std=0.817).
Table 22 shows Lecturers response on Faculty ensure participation of training on Competence Based Curriculum is efficient

Table 22:Lecturers response on Faculty ensure participation of training on Competence Based Curriculum is efficient

Statement	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std
Strongly Disagree	1	12.5	3.38	1.506
Disagree	2	25.0		
Agree	3	37.5		
Strongly Agree	2	25.0		
Total	8	100.0		

Table 22 shows majority 37.5% of Lecturers Agreed that Faculty ensure participation of training on Competence Based Curriculum is efficient while 25.0% were Disagree and Strongly Agreed respectively with a mean of (Mean=3.38, Std=1.506)
Table 23 shows students response on face to face training method

Table 23:Students response on face to face training method

Statement	Frequency	Percent
1-5hours	93	57.4
6-10hours	56	34.6
11-15hours	4	2.5
16hours and above	9	5.6
Total	162	100.0

Table 23 shows majority 57.4% of students said face to face training method takes 1-5hours while 34.6% said it takes 6-10 hours and 5.6% said it takes 16 hours and above respectively.
Table 24 shows ICT officials response on face to face training method

Table 24:ICT officials response on face to face training method

Statement	Frequency	Percent
1-5hrs	3	75.0
4-10hrs	1	25.0
Total	4	100.0

Table 24 shows majority 75.0% of ICT officials said face to face training takes 1-5hours while 25.0% said it takes 4-10hours respectively.
Table 25 shows Lecturers response on face to face training method

Table 25:Lecturers response on face to face training method

Statement	Frequency	Percent
1-5hrs	4	50.0
4-10hrs	2	25.0
16hrs and above	1	12.5

5.00	1	12.5
Total	8	100.0

Table 25 shows majority 50.0% of Lecturers said face to face training method takes 1-5hours while 25.0% said it takes 4-10 hours respectively.

Table 26 shows students response on phone conference training method

Table 26:Students response on phone conference training method

Statement	Frequency	Percent
1-5hours	83	51.2
5-10hours	24	14.8
11-15hours	28	17.3
16hours and above	27	16.7
Total	162	100.0

Table 26 shows majority 51.2% of students said phone conference training method takes 1-5 hours while 17.3% said it takes 11-15 hours and 16.7% said it take 16 hours and above respectively.

Table 27 shows ICT officials response on phone conference training method

Table 27:ICT officials response on phone conference training method

Statement	Frequency	Percent
1-5hrs	2	50.0
4-10hrs	1	25.0
11-15hrs	1	25.0
Total	4	100.0

Table 27 shows majority 50.0% of ICT officials said phone conference training method takes 1-5 hours while 25.0% said it takes 4-10 hours and 11-15 hours respectively.

Table 28 shows Lecturers response on phone conference training method

Table 28:Lecturers' response on phone conference training method

Statement	Frequency	Percent
1-5hrs	3	37.5
4-10hrs	2	25.0
11-15hrs	1	12.5
16hrs and above	1	12.5
5.00	1	12.5
Total	8	100.0

Table 28 shows majority 37.5% of Lecturers said phone conference takes 1-5 hours while 25.0% said it takes 4-10 hours respectively

$H0_2$: There is no significant relationship between lecturer's leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education

In order to test the relationship between lecturer's leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education. Pearson correlation was used to test the hypothesis. The null hypothesis states There is no significant relationship between lecturer's leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education.

Table 29 shows the Correlation matrix between lecturer's leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education

Table 29:Correlation matrix between lecturer's leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education

		Lecturer's leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum	Competence Based Curriculum and Digitalization
Lecturer's leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum	Pearson Correlation	1	.745[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	162	162
Competence Based Curriculum and Digitalization	Pearson Correlation	.745[*]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	162	162

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The correlation result in Table 29 shows a positive and strong significant coefficient between leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education and Competence Based Curriculum and Digitalization where (r=.745, p-value<0.05) were rejected at p<0.05 significance level of which the null hypothesis was rejected. Hence there is a strong significant relationship between leadership on teachers training on competence-based curriculum and digitalization in higher education and Competence Based Curriculum and Digitalization.

IV.   CONCLUSION
For Competence Based Curriculum to be successful enough instructional resources need to be provided effectively
Leadership on teachers training through digital platforms is key to ensure Competence Based Curriculum is done effectively
Both face to face training method and phone conference training method take between 1-5 hours
The success of digitalization in higher education on Competence Based Curriculum is majorly determined by the coordination of both the lecturers, students and ICT officials give and the Universities effectiveness on resource allocation.

V.   RECOMMENDATIONS
The University should create awareness on the importance of digitalization in higher education on Competence Based Curriculum.
Leadership on teachers training should be frequently and effectively done to ensure efficiency in digitalization in higher education on Competence Based Curriculum
More training methods should be used to promote Competence Based Curriculum and digitalization in higher education.

REFERENCES
[1].   African Union. (2007). Strategy to revitalise technical and vocational education and training (TVET) in Africa.
[2].   Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V. (2007) Research in education. (7th ed.) New Delhi Prentice Hall
[3].   B.K. Koskei, E. Chepchumba (2020).Teachers 'competency as a cornerstone on the implementation of competency-based curriculum in Kenya. a case of lower primary schools in Nakuru county. International Journal of Educational Research, 8 (2)
[4].   Bonham, B. S., & Boylan, H. R. (2012). Developmental Mathematics: Challenges, Promising Practices, and Recent Initiatives. Journal of Developmental Education, 36(2), 14-21.
[5].   Chikowore, T. (2013). The school head as an instructional leader. Harare: University of Zimbabwe.
[6].   Chalmers, D., & Gardiner, D. (2015). The measurement and impact of university teacher development programs. Educar, 51(a), 53–80. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/educar.655

[7]. Choudaha, R. (2008) Competency-based Curriculum for a Master's Program in Service Science, Management And Engineering (SSME): An Online Delphi Study. Executive summary: Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, USA. Available on www.linkedin.com/in/rahulc

[8]. Dasmani, A. (2011). Challenges facing technical institute graduates in practical skills acquisition in the Upper East Region of Ghana. Asia Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education, 12(2), 67-77.

[9]. European Commission. (2010). A Digital Agenda for Europe. Brussels, 26.8.2010. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/digital-agenda/index_en.html

[10]. Ferrari, A. (2013). DIGCOMP: A framework for developing and understanding digital competence in Europe (Report EUR 26035 EN). JRC Technical Reports. Seville: Institute for Prospective Technological Studies, European Union

[11]. I.M. Mulenga, Y.M. Kabombwe (2019) Understanding a competency-based curriculum and education: The Zambian perspective. Journal of Lexicography and Terminology, 3 (1)

[12]. J.M. Momanyi, P.K. Rop (2019).Teacher preparedness for the implementation of competency based curriculum in Kenya: A survey of early grade primary school teachers' in bomet east sub-county. The Cradle of knowledge. African Journal of Educational and Social Science Research, 7

[13]. J.M. Kilile, S.N. Mwalw'a, E. Nduku (2019) Challenges facing early childhood development education centres in the implementation of the competency based curriculum in mwingi west sub-county, kitui county. International Journal of Energy Technology and Policy, 2 (3), pp. 36-37

[14]. J.W. Waweru (2018) Influence of teacher preparedness on the implementation of competency Based curriculum in public primary schools in Nyandarua North Sub County Unpublished master's thesis. University of Nairobi.

[15]. Kerlinger, F. N. & Lee, H.B. (2000). Foundations of behavioural research (4[th]ed.)Fort worth:Harcourt college publishers

[16]. L. Kaviti (2018)The new curriculum of education in Kenya: A linguistic and education paradigm shiftUniversity of Nairobi.

[17]. Ministry of Higher Education (MoHE) (2009). Higher Education Leadership Academy: Shaping Minds, Building Leadership. Putrajaya: Ministry of Higher Education

[18]. OECD (2005) Definition and Selection of Key Competencies. Executive Summary (online resource) OECD Publishing

[19]. P.W. Muricho, J.K. Chang'ach (2013). Education reforms in Kenya for innovation. International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 3 (9)

[20]. Porter, S. R. (2014). Competency based education and students' aid. San Diego: San Diego Press.

[21]. S.M. Ondimu(2018)Teachers' preparedness for implementation of the competency based curriculum in private pre-schools in dagoretti North sub-county, Nairobi city county Unpublished Masters project, university of Nairobi.

[22]. UNESCO (2008). ICT competency standards for teachers. Policy Framework (156210). Paris, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

[23]. World Economic Forum (WEF) (2016). The Future of Jobs: Employment, skills, and workforce strategy for the Fourth Industrial Revolution.