

Appraisal of Egyptian Nursing Faculties in Light of Egyptian Accreditation Standards: Perception of Students, Staff Members and Employees

Saadia Abdalla^{1*} Nawal A Fouad² Nagat said² Said S. Salam²
1.M.Sc community health nursing
2.Prof. of Community Health

Abstract

Accreditation has gained worldwide attention as an effective quality evaluation and management tool. Accreditation of educational institutions in Egypt is granted by "The National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education NAQAAE ". To be accredited, the educational institution has to prove that it has the institutional capacity and the educational effectiveness in accordance with the minimum "National Academic Reference Standards", or any other international standards approved by "The National Authority for Quality Assurance and accreditation of education" and that it has advanced systems that assures continuous quality improvement and enhancement. This study aimed to identify perceptions of students, staff members and employees regarding the implementation of the Egyptian accreditation standards in accredited and non accredited nursing faculties. Design a descriptive comparative design was utilized. The sample included 2195 students, 322 post graduate students, 566 staff members, 41 academic leaders and 34 employees. This study was conducted at 5 Egyptian nursing faculties two are accredited (Cairo & Alexandria) and three are not yet accredited (Zagzig, Ismailia & Banha). Data were collected over a period of 10 months started in November 2012 till the end of August 2013. Methods: the researcher used 5 questionnaires as data collection methods; one for undergraduate students, one for graduate students, one for faculty staff, one for academic leaders and one for employees. Each questionnaire consisted of two main parts; the first part assesses the socio demographic data of the respondents, the second part deals with the 16 domains of accreditation according to NAQAAE classification; 8 domains for institutional capacity and 8 domains for educational effectiveness. Results: of the study revealed that there were statistically significant differences between accredited and non accredited nursing faculties regarding total scores of institutional capacity. However there were no statistical differences between nursing faculties regarding total educational effectiveness. On the other hand, there were highly statistically significant relationship between total institutional capacity and total educational effectiveness and their total sub scales for accredited nursing faculty's staff members. There was highly statistically significant relationship between total institutional capacity and total educational effectiveness for non accredited faculties' academic leaders. Finally there was statistically significant relationship between total institutional capacity and total educational effectiveness scores for accredited nursing faculty's employees. Conclusion: accredited nursing faculties showed more effective quality education than non accredited nursing faculties. Recommendation: the most important recommendation is to maintain strengths of the accredited nursing faculties and to encourage the non-accredited to fulfill requirements and seek accreditation.

Keywords: Accreditation Egyptian Nursing, Accreditation Standards, Perception of Students, Staff Members and Employees

1. Introduction

Higher education systems face unprecedented challenges arising from the convergent impacts of globalization; the increasing importance of knowledge; and the information and communication revolution. One of the most effective responses to these challenges, especially in developing countries, is creating and/or evaluating quality assurance (QA) and accreditation mechanisms (EL Mahdy, 2001; El Sebai & Basheer, 2006; Ramadan, Zaaba & Umamoto, 2011).

Accreditation has gained worldwide attention as an effective quality evaluation and management tool. It is defined as a system of external peer review for determining compliance with a set of standards. It is a procedure that evaluates the institutional resources periodically and confidentially, seeking to ensure quality of care on the basis of previously accepted standards. These standards are defined as written value statements from the rules that apply to key processes and the results that can be expected when the processes are performed according to specifications (Chitty, 1997; WHO, 2003; Huber, 2006 & NAQAAE, 2008).

Accreditation is a process of peer evaluation of educational institutions and programs to ensure an acceptable level of quality. It is granted to an educational institution or program that meets stated criteria of educational quality. It is "certification of assessment given by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) which is valid for a stated period of time and the recognition accorded to an institution that meets standards or satisfies criteria laid down by a competent agency (Mishra, 2007; CCNE, 2009 & HEFCE,

2010). Accreditation is a system or process for providing public confidence and a tool for improvement used by educational institutions. It promises a basic level of quality in an educational institution through a process that examines a faculty staff, course content, recruiting practices, admissions procedures, and more (ENQA, 2003).

The main purpose of accreditation is to ensure quality education programs through the use of standards and rigorous evaluation criteria; to stimulate institutions toward higher levels of quality and efficiency; and to provide a system for public trust and accountability. Moreover, accreditation includes establishing and maintaining criteria based on best available evidence, recognizing organizations that have met criteria, holding organizations accountable for consistently adhering to criteria during the period of accreditation, supporting accredited organizations in providing evidence of outcomes, and providing evidence to consumers and to the public that accredited organizations are functioning according to quality standards (NWCCU; ENQA, 2003 & CCNE, 2009).

There are two recognized forms of accreditation; institutional accreditation and professional or specialized accreditation. Institutional accreditation concerns itself with the quality and integrity of the total institution, assessing the achievement of the institution in meeting its own stated mission, goals, and expected outcomes. Also, institutional accreditation affirms that the establishment operates with a high level of quality in all its aspects, explicit or implicit academic standard or professional. Professional or specialized accreditation is concerned with assessing the extent to which programs achieve their stated mission, goals, and expected outcomes in addition to determining the quality of the program and the educational preparation of members of the profession or occupation (Harvey, 2004; NAQAAE; CCNE, 2008 & NAQAAE, 2009).

Accreditation has been associated with quality assurance processes in higher education associated mainly with voluntary self regulation carried out by professional accrediting organizations and regional accrediting associations, independent of government. Accreditation was established in the UK in 1995. This system of accreditation has been developed by the centre for development of nursing policy and practice at the university of Leeds. It was the first system of accreditation for Nursing Development Units (NDUs) and Practice Development Units (PDUs) in the UK. Over the past three decades accreditation systems on the American model have been established in many countries of Asia and Latin America. In the Asian region, accreditation systems play a key role in higher education in Japan, Korea, Taiwan and the Philippine. In Britain and many Commonwealth countries, somewhat similar mechanisms were developed for accreditation of courses by professional associations and government registration boards. In the 1990s the US moved to establish a much more comprehensive national system for quality assurance (QA) beginning with the passage of amendments to the higher education Act of 1992 which involved the Federal Government for the first time in QA (Sale; Harman & Meek, 2000).

Egypt has the largest overall education system in the Middle East and North Africa and it has grown rapidly since the early 1990s. The system of higher education in Egypt faced a number of problems and challenges during the last decades. This situation led to a state of low system efficiency. Besides the typical problems of overcrowding, limited financial resources, lack of a sustainable financial policy, inadequate infrastructure, under-trained faculty members in some areas, poor instructional materials and equipment and lack of a formal evaluation and accreditation mechanism, a number of other problems have emerged in the era of rapid explosion of information and modern communication technology. During the 1990s, the concept of standards against which the performance of health care organizations should be evaluated gained widespread international acceptance. Since 1997, Egypt has engaged in a health sector reform program with quality improvement as a key goal of the reform program strategy (Rafeh&Schwark, 2006; Hamdy, 2007; Abdellah et al., 2008 & Hassan, 2011).

Educational reform is an issue of concern to the Egyptian government, and has been on the top of the government's agenda since the beginning of the 1990s. The Egyptian government recognizes the need for improving the quality of university educational standards. Therefore, recently the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) established a higher education reform strategy that has been translated into twenty five distinct projects addressing the diverse areas of reform. The Quality Assurance and Accreditation Project (QAAP) is one of the six priority projects directed towards the improvement of quality, efficiency and relevance of higher education in Egypt. This project constitutes the cornerstone that is applied across the board to support every project within the higher education reform strategy (NQAAC, 2004 & NQAAC, 2005).

1.2. Significance of the Study

The quality of education is considered one of the most important challenges facing all countries of the world in order to cope with changes made necessary through the onset of globalization accordingly, education is a main priority in both developed and developing countries because the main goal of education is to provide societies with graduates qualified to meet their professional and research needs, contribute effectively in drawing up and implementing development policies and plans. There are policies reformulated in order to upgrade the quality level of higher education to ensure that higher education graduates meet internationally accepted standards

through their knowledge and skills which enable them to complete in local and regional job market.

Accreditation is the vital of the welfare of institution of higher education. Those institutions that fail to attain accreditation may be handicapped in a number of ways. Top rank high school graduates seeking quality nursing education may only join accredited faculties. Also, graduates from unaccredited professional programs may find it difficult to obtain well recognized positions in the field. Accreditation of nursing faculties has recently gained great importance in Egypt. However, although there are 19 Egyptian governmental nursing faculties in 2013, only three faculties are accredited; Alexandria Nursing Faculty, Ain Shams Nursing Faculty and Cairo Nursing Faculty. However, other faculties are in the process of preparing themselves for accreditation. In this regard, Egypt has developed the Egyptian Accreditation Standards which are based on international academic standards and adopted for the Egyptian milieu.

1.3. Aim of the study

The aim of this study was to identify perceptions of students, staff members and employees regarding the implementation of the Egyptian Accreditation Standards in accredited nursing faculties and non accredited yet nursing faculties.

1.4. Research Questions

1. What is the perception of under graduate nursing students regarding appraisal of the Egyptian nursing faculties in light of the Egyptian Accreditation Standards?
2. What is the perception of post graduate nursing students regarding appraisal of the Egyptian nursing faculties in light of the Egyptian Accreditation Standards?
3. What are the perceptions of the staff members' regarding appraisal of the Egyptian nursing faculties in light of the Egyptian Accreditation Standards?
4. What are the perceptions of the academic leaders regarding appraisal of the Egyptian nursing faculties in light of the Egyptian Accreditation Standards?
5. What is the perception of employees regarding appraisal of the Egyptian nursing faculties in light of the Egyptian Accreditation Standards?

2. Material and Methods

2-1. Research Design

A descriptive comparative design was utilized for current study.

2-2. Setting

This study was conducted at 5 Egyptian nursing faculties; of which two are accredited (Cairo, Alexandria) and three are not accredited yet (Zagzig, Ismailia, Benha).

2-3. Sample

The research sample included all under graduate students, post graduate students, all faculty members/assistant bodies, all academic leaders, and all employees at Cairo, Alexandria, Ismailia, Zigzag, and Benha faculty of nursing

2-4. Study subjects:

students whose study nursing baccalaureate, master, and doctorate, faculty members / assistance body, and Employees at Cairo nursing faculty, Alexandria nursing faculty, Ismailia nursing faculty, Zigzag nursing faculty, and Benha nursing faculty agree to participate in this study.

2-5. Tools of data collections:

The researcher used 5 questionnaires sheets to collect the data. It constructed & designed by researcher based on reviewing related national and international literature. This questionnaire consist of two main parts the first part assess the socio demographic data, the second parts represent 16 domains according to (NAQAAE) classification. (8 domains for Institutional Capacity and 8 domains for Educational Effectiveness).

1st Questionnaire for under graduate students:

It includes 90 questions; 44 questions in Institutional Capacity. In addition to 46 questions in Educational Effectiveness

2nd Questionnaire for post graduate students:

It includes 68 questions; 35 questions in Institutional Capacity. In addition to 33 questions in Educational Effectiveness distributed

3rd Questionnaire for Staff members:

It includes 99 questions; 45 questions in institutional capacity. In addition to 54 questions in educational

effectiveness

4th Questionnaire for Academic Leaders:

It includes 55 questions 29 questions in institutional capacity and 26 questions in educational effectiveness

5th Questionnaire for Employees:

It includes 48 questions; 35 questions in institutional capacity and 13 questions in Educational Effectiveness.

2-6. Scoring system:

Three scales for all questionnaires was used as the highly agree=3, fairly agree=2, and weakly agree=1 the summation of each questionnaires the higher agree sum from > 75%, fairly agree 50% to < 75% and weakly agree < 50%

2-7. Tools Validity and reliability:

Validity is the most fundamental consideration in developing and evaluating test. It refers to the appropriateness of the interpretation of the test scores the extent of the evidence that exists the inferences we make based on the result of the test (Mary, 2002). The content and validity were developed by reviewing related literature. It was revised by a panel of experts of 4 professors' two professors in community health nursing, and two professors' experts in the field of quality assurance and accreditation. Based on experts comment and recommendations minors changes had been made. Test reliability is very important to test developers and users. Reliability refers to the degree of consistency with which an instrument measures an attribute for a particular group. Reliable achievement tests provide consistent results that are reproducibility and generalize. Reliability can be quantified by several statistical formulas. These estimates provide a reliability coefficient, or a measure of the amount of a variation in test performance. There are several procedures for obtaining a test reliability estimate based on the internal consistency of the test. These reliability estimates range from zero to one, with zero indicating no reliability and one indicating perfect reliability (Mary, 2002). It was generally accepted that the lower limit of Cronbach's Alpha is 0.70. The estimated reliability was 0.98

2-8. Procedure:

Upon receiving the document approval of the Committee on Ethics of Scientific Research and the approval of supervisors, the researcher submit a request to the Vice Dean of Graduate Studies and Research at the faculty of nursing Cairo university asking the target faculties to address to allow her to start the process of data collection. After that, the Dean of the Faculty of each of the targeted faculties to address the Vice Dean for Graduate Studies and Research, Vice Dean for Education and Student Affairs, heads departments, Quality Assurance Unit, Secretary of the faculty and administrative director of the faculty to coordination, assistance and cooperation with researcher. After obtained a written approval agreed from all participants from their faculties the researcher started data collection through interrupted visit to the 2days/week Alexandria, 1 day Cairo, 1 day Benha, 1 day Zagzig, and 1 day Ismailia.

The academic leaders (Dean, Vice dean and heads departments) were received questionnaires by Secretariat after the researcher introduced herself explains its contents and purposes of the study to them.

Then the researcher collected data from faculty members through the heads of the departments with the help of secretarial departments after the researcher met the head departments and explain the purpose of the study.

The researcher collected data from students during the lectures in coordination and assistance with faculty members/assistant body, after the researcher introduced herself to the students and explain the aims of the study and the voluntary participation and enable with drawl at any time of the study and they were assured that, their information would remain confidential and used for the research purpose only.

Also the researcher collected data from employees by assistance of administrator's directors after the researcher clarified the purpose of the study and its importance and the voluntary participation and enable with drawl at any time of the study and they were assured that, their information would remain confidential and used for the research purpose only

Data were collected over a period of 10 months started from the beginning of November 2012, till the end of August 2013

2-9. Ethical consideration:

The purpose and nature of the study was clearly identified before verbal informed consent was obtained from all participants who would be assured that participation in this study is voluntary, able to refuse or with drawl at any time. Also the researcher assured the confidentiality of the information and used to study only. An official permission was obtained from each Faculty Dean of the selected faculties. Approval of the ethic committee was obtained to carry out the study, and then was started to data collection by researcher through different tools in target faculties.

2-10. Statistical analysis:

Upon completion of data collection, the data were scored, tabulated and analyzed by computer using the “Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences” (SPSS) statistical package version 20 for analysis. Quantitative data were presented by mean (X) and standard deviation (SD). It was analyzed using student t- test for comparison between two means; Qualitative data were presented in the form of frequency distribution tables, number and percentage. For nonparametric data, Chi-square (X²) test was used. Level of significance was set as P value <0.05 for all significant tests.

3. Results

Section (1): Description socio-demographic characteristics and study sample

The study result showed that the sample were consist of; In Cairo University 50% of undergraduate students were 448, all post graduate were 66, all of academic leaders were 11, more than 50%staff members 194, 50% of employees were 62. In Alexandria University 50% of undergraduate students were 509, all post graduate were 82, all of academic leaders were 7, more than 50% staff members 169, 50% of employees were 85. In Benha University 50% of undergraduate students were 387, all post graduate were 55, all of academic leaders were 10 more than 50% staff members 74, 50% of employees were 60. In Zagazig University 50% of undergraduate students were 644, all post graduate were 62, all of academic leaders were 9 more than 50% staff members 85, all of employees were 86. In Ismailia University 50% of undergraduate students were 207, all post graduate were 57, all of academic leaders were 4 more than 50% staff members 44, all of employees were 48.faculties.

Section (2): Undergraduate Students and Postgraduate Students in Accredited and Non-Accredited Nursing Faculties

Table (1) differences between accredited nursing faculties’ students according to total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness scores and their total sub scores. In addition, there was a statistically significant difference between Cairo and Alexandria universities regarding the total scores of institutional capacity (t= -2.353, P=.019).

Table (1) differences between accredited universities students according to total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness scores and their total sub scores (n=957)

Variables	Cairo Nursing Faculty	Alexandria Nursing Faculty	t	P
	M±SD	M±SD		
Institutional capacity	84.23±22.74	87.38±18.65	-2.353	.019*
Strategic planning	9.83±3.20	10.18±3.24	-1.683	.093
Credibility and ethics	11.65±4.47	13.06±3.69	-5.335	.000*
Administrative body	7.48±2.83	8.12±2.23	-3.935	.000*
Financial and human resources	37.55±9.86	37.86±7.74	-.545	.586
Society participation and environmental development	13.83±4.57	14.17±3.84	-1.272	.204
Educational effectiveness	82.08±23.75	82.02±19.58	.036	.971
students and graduates	21.65±6.90	22.92±6.36	-2.956	.003*
academic programs and courses	7.59±2.55	7.62±2.23	-.170	.865
Teaching and learning	31.56±9.81	31.04±6.90	.938	.348
Teaching staff	8.68±2.94	8.31±2.436	2.108	.035*
Scientific research	3.81±1.45	3.90±1.13	-1.067	.286
Continuous evaluation	9.14±3.38	9.04±3.09	.476	.635

*significant<0.05

Table (2) shows that there were statistically significant differences among non-accredited nursing faculties regarding total institutional capacity (F=91.31, p=.000), and total educational effectiveness (F= 61.73, p=.000). In addition, there were statistically significant differences according to total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness sub scores.

Table (2) differences among non-accredited universities students according to total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness scores and their total subscores (n=1238)

Variables	Ismailia Faculty	Banha Faculty	Zagzig Faculty	F	P
	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD		
Institutional capacity	75.28±17.58	81.09±18.14	64.92±13.08	91.31	.000*
Strategic planning	8.08±2.21	9.43±2.58	7.73±1.88	50.161	.000*
Credibility and ethics	11.37±4.79	12.62±2.87	10.97±3.79	16.267	.000*
Administrative body	6.79±2.27	7.89±1.99	6.63±2.05	31.667	.000*
Financial and human resources	32.59±7.91	33.68±8.64	25.9±5.90	107.695	.000*
Society participation and environmental development	13.29±3.62	13.52±4.31	10.32±3.00	78.624	.000*
Educational effectiveness	74.37±17.90	77.21±20.91	62.29±16.33	61.73	.000*
Students and graduates	18.54±5.34	21.11±6.64	17.75±5.02	28.884	.000*
Academic programs and courses	6.71±2.10	7.11±2.14	5.49±1.74	61.492	.000*
Teaching and learning	29.61±7.75	29.95±7.85	24.14±6.84	61.541	.000*
Teaching staff	7.81±2.84	7.53±2.80	6.29±1.96	31.757	.000*
Scientific research	3.42±1.19	3.44±1.24	2.85±1.07	26.570	.000*
Continuous evaluation	8.35±2.75	8.71±2.66	6.32±2.16	88.516	.000*

*significant<0.05

Table (3) shows that there was no statistically significant differences between Cairo and Alexandria nursing faculties regarding total institutional capacity (t=1.597, p=.113) and total educational effectiveness (t=.582, p=.562). Also, there was no statistically significant differences between Cairo and Alexandria faculties regarding total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness sub scores except for credibility and ethics (t=3.733, p=.000), total faculty of sub scores (t= - 2.080, p=.039), and total continuous evaluation sub score (t= - 2.747, p.007).

Table (3) accredited universities postgraduate students differences according to total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness scores and their sub scores (n=148)

Variables	Cairo Nursing Faculty	Alexandria Nursing Faculty	t	p
	M±SD	M±SD		
Institutional capacity	68.81±8.77	66.67±7.26	1.597	.113
Strategic planning	8.83±1.33	9.29±1.57	-1.956	.052
Credibility and ethics	15.93±2.81	14.15±3.01	3.733	.000*
Administrative body	5.15±1.02	5.16±1.08	-.088	.930
Financial and human resources	31.39±5.35	30.85±5.19	.617	.538
Society participation and environmental development	3.54±1.12	3.73±1.17	-.999	.319
Educational effectiveness	63.28±9.90	64.30±11.23	.582	.562
Students and graduates	9.60±1.79	9.03±2.04	1.802	.074
Academic programs and courses	11.21±1.98	10.60±2.04	1.841	.068
Teaching and learning	15.28±3.08	16.16±3.13	-1.720	.088
Faculty staff	7.53±1.47	8.04±1.50	-2.080	.039*
Scientific research	8.15±1.52	8.48±2.01	-1.092	.277
Graduates	8.82±1.62	8.65±1.91	.604	.547
Continuous evaluation	3.51±1.14	4.07±1.30	-2.747	.007*

*significant<0.05

Table (4) reveals that there were highly statically differences among non accredited universities regarding total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness and their sub scores.

Table (4) non-accredited universities postgraduate students differences according to total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness scores and their subs cores (n=174)

Variables	Ismailia Nursing Faculty	Benha Nursing Faculty	Zagzig Nursing Faculty	F	p
	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD		
Institutional capacity	75.21±14.58	75.71±10.34	53.69±5.66	54.769	.000*
Strategic planning	9.26±3.21	13.30±2.28	8.56±1.98	40.987	.000*
Credibility and ethics	18.96±3.66	17.69±2.44	13.00±1.61	55.231	.000*
Administrative body	6.10±1.63	7.62±1.11	3.93±.93	88.926	.000*
Financial and human resources	30.66±7.35	29.64±7.08	22.11±2.63	24.468	.000*
Society participation and environmental development	4.71±1.58	4.62±1.05	3.65±.79	9.697	.000*
Educational effectiveness	78.10±21.73	75.50±7.58	53.39±6.19	39.941	.000*
Students and graduates	11.80±3.32	10.66±1.60	8.04±1.28	28.548	.000*
Academic programs and courses	12.80±3.35	11.94±1.91	9.13±1.38	26.929	.000*
Teaching and learning	20.52±5.77	19.00±2.77	13.59±1.82	36.652	.000*
Faculty staff	9.69±2.78	9.00±1.43	5.52±1.40	50.398	.000*
Scientific research	10.62±2.72	10.31±1.50	7.37±1.22	37.237	.000*
Graduates	9.58±2.83	9.91±1.72	6.83±1.25	28.955	.000*
Continuous evaluation	4.45±1.52	5.07±1.04	5.00±1.73	33.784	.000*

*significant<0.05

Table (5) shows that there were statistically significant difference between Cairo and Alexandria faculties regarding & total leadership and governess (t = -2.38, P=.011), total credibility and ethics (t=-3.76, p=.000), total administrative body (t=-4.36, p=.000), total financial and human resources (t=2.42, p= .012). However; there was no statistical difference regarding total institutional capacity (t= -1.426, p=.155).

Table (5) Difference between accredited nursing faculties teaching staff according to total institutional capacity and its total subscales (n=363)

Variables	Cairo Nursing faculty	Alexandria Nursing Faculty	t	p
	M±SD	M±SD		
Institutional capacity	95.21±18.47	97.72±14.33	-1.426	.155
Strategic planning	14.98±4.19	15.72±3.99	-1.69	.09
Organizational structure	7.37±1.58	7.47±1.09	-.70	.47
Leadership and governess	12.20±2.90	12.86±2.22	-2.38	.01*
Credibility and ethics	11.36±2.68	12.33±2.16	-3.76	.000*
Administrative body	3.77±1.10	4.27±1.05	-4.36	.000*
Financial and human resources	19.39±3.23	20.42±2.14	-3.48	.001*
Society participation and environmental development	26.24±6.77	24.63±5.83	2.42	.01*

*significant <0.05

Table (6) indicates that there statistically significant difference between accredited universities teaching staff regarding total educational effectiveness and its total sub scores.

Table (6) Difference between accredited universities teaching staff according to total educational effectiveness and its total subscales (n=363)

Variables	Cairo Nursing Faculty	Alexandria Nursing Faculty	t	P
	M±SD	M±SD		
Educational effectiveness	114.17±22.38	123.51±12.63	-4.782	.000*
Students and graduates	15.87±3.52	17.92±2.49	-6.27	.000*
Academic programs and courses	16.41±4.20	17.73±2.43	-3.54	.000*
Teaching and learning	24.89±5.83	26.33±3.34	-2.83	.005*
Faculty staff	9.98±2.68	11.07±2.21	-4.20	.000*
Scientific research	14.49±3.05	15.60±2.34	-3.78	.000*
post-Graduates studies	16.93±3.52	18.33±2.29	-4.39	.000*
Continuous evaluation	18.25±3.92	19.20±2.70	-2.62	.009*

*significant<0.05

Table (7) indicates that there were statistically significant differences among non-accredited universities teaching staff regarding total institutional capacity ($F= 64.957, p=. 000$); and its sub scores.
 Table (7) Difference between non-accredited universities teaching staff according to total institutional capacity and its total subscales (n=303)

Variables	Ismailia Nursing Faculty	Banha Nursing Faculty	Zagzig Nursing Faculty	F	p
	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD		
Institutional capacity	93.18±12.40	117.13±13.84	75.42±16.49	64.957	.000*
Strategic planning	18.58±2.23	19.19±2.36	12.97±4.52	75.069	.000*
Organizational structure	7.23±1.34	8.79±.68	7.34±1.70	88.127	.000*
Leadership and governess	12.86±2.64	16.04±2.42	9.96±2.48	116.264	.000*
Credibility and ethics	12.04±3.08	13.61±2.60	9.10±2.03	66.026	.000*
Administrative body	3.41±.98	4.79±.86	3.22±.877	66.221	.000*
Financial and human resources	15.41±2.55	21.72±3.09	13.21±3.89	129.973	.000*
Society participation and environmental development	23.62±6.81	32.97±6.59	21.19±6.59	64.957	.000*

*significant<0.05

Table (8) shows that, there were no statistically differences between accredited universities academic leaders total institutional capacity ($t= .170, p= .867$) and total educational effectiveness ($t = -.4067, p = .690$).
 Table (8) Difference between accredited faculties academic leaders according to total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness scores (n=17)

Variables	Cairo Nursing Faculty	Alexandria Nursing Faculty	t	p
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD		
Institutional capacity	78.36 ± 5.88	77.71 ± 10.38	.170	.867
Educational effectiveness	67± 9.97	68.71± 6.1	-.406	.690

*significant<0.05

Table (9) shows there were no statistically significant differences among non-accredited faculties academic leaders regarding total institutional capacity ($F =2.760, p=.087$) and total educational effectiveness ($F = .480, p = .626$).

Table (9) Difference among non-accredited faculties academic leaders according to total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness scores (n=23)

Variables	Ismailia faculty	Benha Faculty	Zagzig Faculty	F	p
	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD		
Institutional Capacity	79±5.94	81.20±5.18	75.66±4.74	2.760	.087
Educational Effectiveness	64±13.73	67.80±5.30	64.88±7.25	.480	.626

*significant <0.05

Table (10) indicates that there was statistically significant differences between Cairo University and Alexandria University employees regarding total educational effectiveness ($t= 2.53, p = .01$), however there was no statistically significant concerning total institutional capacity ($t = 1.09, p = .27$)

Table (10) Differences between accredited universities employees according to total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness scores (n=147)

Variables	Cairo Faculty	Alexandria Faculty	t	p
	M±SD	M±SD		
Institutional capacity	61.44±10.45	59.74±8.57	1.09	.27
Educational effectiveness	25.50±5.99	23.37±4.29	2.53	.01*

*significant<0.05

Table (11) shows that there were statistically significant differences among non-accredited universities employee regarding total institutional capacity ($F= 15.442, p = .000$), and total educational effectiveness ($F=9.560, p=.000$)

Table (11) Differences among non-accredited universities employees according to total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness scores (n=194)

Variables	Ismailia Faculty	Benha Faculty	Zagzig Faculty	F	P
	M±SD	M±SD	M±SD		
Institutional capacity	65.76±26.81	55.23±10.24	50.30±8.04	15.442	.000*
Educational effectiveness	25.61±9.75	23.88±5.62	20.80±4.25	9.560	.000*

*significant<0.05

4. Discussion

In relation to differences between accredited universities students according to total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness scores and their total sub scores (table 1), there was a statistically significant difference between Cairo and Alexandria nursing faculties regarding the total scores of institutional capacity ($t = -2.353$, $P = .019$). Concerning differences among non-accredited nursing faculties regarding total institutional capacity (table 2), there were statistically significant differences ($F = 91.31$, $p = .000$), and total educational effectiveness ($F = 61.73$, $p = .000$). In addition, there were statistically significant differences according to total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness sub scores. Table (3) shows that there was no statistically significant differences between Cairo and Alexandria nursing faculties regarding total institutional capacity ($t = 1.597$, $p = .113$) and total educational effectiveness ($t = .582$, $p = .562$). Also, there was no statistically significant differences between Cairo and Alexandria faculties regarding total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness sub scores except for credibility and ethics ($t = 3.733$, $p = .000$), total faculty of sub scores ($t = -2.080$, $p = .039$), and total continuous evaluation sub score ($t = -2.747$, $p = .007$). Also table (4) reveals that there were highly statically differences among non accredited universities regarding total institutional capacity and educational effectiveness and their sub scores.

It was clear in table (5) that there were statistically significant difference between Cairo and Alexandria faculties regarding to total leadership and governess ($t = -2.38$, $P = .011$), total credibility and ethics ($t = -3.76$, $p = .000$), total administrative body ($t = -4.36$, $p = .000$), total financial and human resources ($t = 2.42$, $p = .012$). However; there was no statistical difference regarding total institutional capacity ($t = -1.426$, $p = .155$). The current study result indicates that there statistically significant difference between accredited faculties teaching staff regarding total educational effectiveness and its total sub scores (table 6).

Either (table 7) indicated in that there were statistically significant differences among non –accredited universities teaching staff regarding total institutional capacity ($F = 64.957$, $p = .000$); and its sub scores. Concerning table (8) it showed that, there were no statistically differences between accredited faculties academic leaders total institutional capacity ($t = .170$, $p = .867$) and total educational effectiveness ($t = -.4067$, $p = .690$). Also study result showed in table (9) that there were no statistically significant differences among non- accredited faculties academic leaders regarding total institutional capacity ($F = 2.760$, $p = .087$) and total educational effectiveness ($F = .480$, $p = .626$).

Table (10) indicated that there was statistically significant differences between Cairo University and Alexandria faculties employees regarding total educational effectiveness ($t = 2.53$, $p = .01$), however there was no statistically significant concerning total institutional capacity ($t = 1.09$, $p = .27$). Either table (11) showed that there were statistically significant differences among non-accredited faculties employee regarding total institutional capacity ($F = 15.442$, $p = .000$), and total educational effectiveness ($F = 9.560$, $p = .000$)

In regards to undergraduate students and postgraduate students in accredited and non-accredited faculties, finding concerning institutional capacity to accreditation standards majority of accredited nursing faculties students weakly are involved in putting strategy plan and strategic aims of the faculty. However more than half of Cairo and Alexandria nursing faculties' students aware about the available authorized and disclosed vision and mission. Also, in non accredited nursing faculties more than half of Benha Nursing Faculty compared to one third for Ismailia Nursing Faculty and slightly one third for Zagzig Nursing Faculty highly agrees that the faculty has an authorized and disclosed vision and mission. Lerner (1999) and NLN (2011) Stated that the strategy plans of the institution require making environmental analysis, based on strategy aims. When conducting environmental analysis inclusiveness, effective participation of all relevant parties. These results reflect that disclosed vision and mission item achieved high indicators in accredited universities in strategic planning standards in spite of that both accredited faculties need to support the involvement of students in environmental analysis.

Also, finding regarding leadership and governess more than one third in Cairo nursing faculty compared to more than half in Alexandria nursing faculty students perceive that academic leaders are democratic, co operative and dealing with transparency, this finding due to adoption of open door policy with students. These result on the same line with Agha(2010) who found that high percentage with achievement for leader ship and governance

availability of reporting complaints and suggestion.

In regards to faculty teaching Staff of accredited and non-accredited faculties finding regarding credibility and ethics domain, more than half of accredited nursing faculties highly agree that there are approved and disclosed procedures to preserve the rights of intellectual property and publishing. One half of accredited faculties fairly agree that there is corrective action to deal with any unfair practice. Majority of accredited nursing faculties highly agree that there is authorized and disclosed mechanism to deal with complaints. This result with the same line of ANA (2001) emphasized that faculty committed to the credibility and integrity in its policies and decisions related to complaint.

Majority of Alexandria nursing faculty compared to more than half of Cairo nursing faculty fairly agree that academic programs updated **according** to labor market. Also, more than half of Alexandria nursing faculty compared slight half of Cairo faculty highly agree that academic courses evaluated by faculty members, assistant bodies and students. This result reflect moderate achieved it according to standards of NAQAAE (2009) consider evaluation, an integral part of an educational program, is the process of judging the effectiveness of educational experiences through careful appraisal.

5. Conclusion: Accreditation is the vital of the welfare of institution of higher education. Those institutions that fail to attain accreditation or removal from the list of accrediting agency may be handicapped in a number of ways. An institution of higher learning that is not accredited may find the difficulty in getting grants from the foundation in government sector. Thus accredited nursing faculties showed more effective quality education than non accredited nursing faculties.

6. Recommendation: the most important recommendation is to maintain strengths of the accredited nursing faculties and to encourage the non-accredited to full fill requirements and seek accreditation.

7. References

- Abdellah, G. & Hosny, S. (2008). Review of the utilization of HEEPF, competitive projects for educational enhancement in the Egyptian medical sector, available at: <http://www.human-resources-health.com/content/6/7>.
- Chitty, K. (1997) Professional Nursing Concept and Challenges, 2nd United States of America, p.46
- Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) (2008) Standards for Accreditation of Post Baccalaureate Nurse Residency Programs..
- Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) (2009) Achieving Excellence in Accreditation the First 10 years, Washington, available at: www.aacn.nche.edu/accreditation.
- El Baradei, M. & El Baradei, L. (2004) Needs assessment of the education sector in Egypt. Retrieved from http://www.zef.de/fileadmin/webfiles/downloads/projects/el-ikawy/egypt_final_en.pdf
- EL Mahdy (2001).Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) in Egypt. Available at <http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/tempus/countries/higher/egypt.pdf>
- El Sebai, (2006). The Egyptian Higher Education System: Towards Better Quality in the Future. Journal of Futures Studies 11:75–92.
- European Network of Quality Agencies (ENQA) (2003) The Bologna Process, Glossary, Accreditation, http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/en/glossary/glossar_eng.htm, accessed, 3 August, 2008, page changed to <http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/en/glossary/> accessed 29 January 2011
- Hamdy, A (2007) "ICT in Education in Egypt" Survey for ICT and Education in Africa Egypt country report, available at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education_in_Egypt#cite_note-
- Harman, G & Meek, V (2000) Repositioning Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Australian Higher Education, University of New England. P.14-15-16
- Harvey, L. (2004) The power of accreditation: views of academics in Di NautaP Schade A and Scheele JP. Accreditation Models in Higher Education: Experiences and Perspectives, ENQA Workshop Reports 3. Helsinki, ENQA, pp 5–19, available at <http://www.enqa.eu/files/ENQAmodels.pdf> accessed 17 January 2012.
- Hassan, F. (2011) 'Science Education in Egypt and other Arab Countries in Africa and West Asia'; Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal (LICEJ), Volume 2, Issue 1, Infonomics Society 348, available at:
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) (2010) About us: Glossary, available at <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/aboutus/glossary/glossary.htm>, updated 8 November 2010, accessed 27 January 2011.
- http://www.accreditation.ca/uploadedFiles/Value%20of%20Accreditation_EN.pdf
- http://www.frontiersjournal.com/issues/vol3/vol3-11_Hassan.htm
- Huber, D. (2006). Leadership and nursing care management, 3rd ed. Saunders Elsevier comp, USA, p. 829.

- Mary, E. McDonald (2002) Systematic Assessment of Learning Outcomes: Developing Multiple Choice Exams. Jones & Bartlett publishers, p.19
- Mishra, S. (2007) Quality Assurance in Higher Education an Introduction. India & Canada. P.87
- National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education (2009) National Academic Reference Standards (NARS) Basic Sciences, Egypt, p 3-4.
- Nicklin, W. (2013). The Value and Impact of Health Care Accreditation. Accreditation, Canada available at: North West Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) (2003) Accreditation hand book, available at: www.nwccu.org
- Rafeh, N.& Schwark, T. (2006) Developing and Implementing an Accreditation Program in Egypt, USAID (U.S. Agency for International Development)
- Ramadan, F., Zaaba, Z, & Umemoto, K. (2011). Quality Assurance of Egyptian Higher Education: A Policy Transfer Perspective. Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal (LICEJ), Volume 2, Issue 1.
- Richard, A. (1992) Higher education in Egypt; population and human resources department, the World Bank
- Sale, D. (2000) Quality Assurance a Pathway to Excellence, Malaysia, pp.279- 282
- The National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education (NAQAAE) (2008) Guide book for evaluation and Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions & Al Azhar University Egypt, P. 9
- The National Quality Assurance and Accreditation Committee (NQAAC) in Collaboration with British consultants in Higher education (CHE) (2005) Quality Assurance and Accreditation, Egypt.p.16 Accessed at: <http://www.qaap.net>
- The National Quality Assurance and Accreditation Committee (NQAAC) in Collaboration with British Consultants in Higher Education (BCHE) (2004) Quality Assurance and Accreditation, Egypt. Accessed at: <http://www.qaap.net>
- WHO Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean Cairo (2006) Report on the Regional consultation on the accreditation of health professions education in the Eastern Mediterranean Region, Manama, Bahrain 20–22 December 2003.P.10
- World Health Organization (WHO) (2003) Report on expert group hospital accreditation, Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean, Cairo, pp.1-2, 22-23.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library , NewJour, Google Scholar

