



MANAGING EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FOR KNOWLEDGE DELIVERY: CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES

Anthony Great Ossai

&

Michael N. Osegi

Faculty of Education
University of Delta, Agbor, Nigeria.
anthony.ossai@unidel.edu.ng

Abstract

In Delta State, Nigeria, the study looked into the problems and solutions for effectively managing educational facilities for knowledge delivery. The survey design used in the study was analytical descriptive. The study's population consisted of all academic and non-academic employees at Delta State's five public universities. By employing the stratified random sampling techniques, the sample size is 450, consisting of 250 academic staff members and 200 non-academic staff members. Two hypotheses and two research questions served as the study's compass. The t-test (statistical package for social sciences, or SPSS) was used to analyze the hypotheses at the 0.05 alpha level, while the mean and standard deviation were used to respond to the research questions. According to the study's findings, among other things, insufficient funding, a lack of a maintenance culture, and the incapacity of school administrators were among the difficulties in facilities management. The results also showed that outsourcing facilities management services, maintaining facilities well, and increasing educational funding were some of the tactics. A number of recommendations were made by the study, including the need for regular facility inspections, sufficient government funding, and proactive university managers who guarantee efficient facilities management.

Keywords: facilities, knowledge delivery, management, challenges, strategies

Introduction

The main element of the educational system's efficient knowledge delivery is the school's infrastructure. According to Madumere (2007), school facilities are the essential teaching tools that affect students' academic performance in the educational system. The Australian Council for Educational Research (2008) views them as a blueprint or arrangement of the building or buildings used for general educational purposes. In a similar spirit, Lawanson and Gede (2011) noted that school facilities are those that allow teachers to conduct their jobs effectively and also aid students in learning. In this case, the school's facilities are actually everything needed for efficient instruction and learning.

An organized, methodical, and successful approach to teaching academic skills is knowledge delivery (Anita & Charlet, 2011). According to Bligh (2000), knowledge delivery is a methodical approach to teaching that emphasizes taking small steps, assessing students' comprehension, and ensuring that every student participates successfully and actively. The learner's performance improves as a result of the teacher's use of all human interactive skills to encourage or facilitate learning in the classroom (Bede-Blaise et al., 2015). This suggests that delivering knowledge effectively involves teachers using a variety of instructional strategies to engage and communicate with students about academic subjects. Omordu (2013) added that since education is knowledge-based, it should be designed to produce educated men in a way that has practical applications. In order to create innovators rather than robots in the end, a broad-based education is therefore required. Students who can think critically, be creative, and apply what they have learnt effectively are what universities need to produce.

According to research, it is impossible to discuss improved student academic achievement without mentioning the kind of facilities that are in place to support such achievement. Facilities improve the delivery of knowledge, and their administration is essential to achieving the aim and purpose of university education, which naturally would enable the nation to engage in the global arena on a qualitative level. Achieving the educational goals and objectives is assumed to be extremely challenging if facilities are offered but improperly managed.

Once more, facilities management is the use of the scientific method to plan, organize, make decisions, coordinate, and control the physical learning environment in order to achieve educational goals and objectives (Asiabaka 2008). Therefore, maintaining records of the facilities, overseeing them, planning them, encouraging teachers and students to help with facility maintenance, and assessing the facilities that are available within the school system are all part of school facilities management.

School facilities management, according to Olagboje (2000), is any work done on any part of the school plant with the goal of maintaining it in excellent operating order. For the university school system to effectively deliver knowledge, it entails the regular evaluation of working conditions. In order to support academic excellence, encourage innovation, and guarantee high-quality knowledge delivery, universities must manage their facilities effectively.

In the face of growing student populations, changing pedagogical approaches, and budgetary constraints, universities around the world are struggling to maintain and improve their facilities. In developing nations like Nigeria, this problem is made worse by a lack of funding, deteriorating infrastructure, and ineffective maintenance procedures (Bukola, 2011). In order to overcome these obstacles, creative approaches to facility management at the university must be implemented, with an emphasis on sustainability, resource efficiency, and stakeholder involvement. One of the most important tactics is the use of technology-driven solutions, like integrated facilities management systems, which allow for effective resource use and real-time monitoring (Atkin and Brooks, 2015). Adopting Public Private Partnerships (PPP) is another essential strategy for raising money for the construction and upkeep of university facilities, as demonstrated by other nations's successful models (World Bank, 2009). Additionally, including students, faculty, and administrative staff in decision-making processes promotes a sense of ownership and guarantees that facility management is in line with the academic objectives of the institution (Akpabio 2015). With an emphasis on their relevance to the Nigerian University System, this paper examines the difficulties and solutions of facility management. Through an analysis of both domestic and international best practices, it identifies ways to improve facility management in order to facilitate the dissemination of knowledge and foster global competitiveness.

Statement of the Problem

The effective management of educational facilities is a cornerstone for quality knowledge delivery at all levels of the education system. Educational facilities, including classrooms, laboratories, libraries, workshops, hostels, and ICT infrastructure, serve as the physical environment in which teaching, learning, and research activities occur. In recent decades, however, the quality, adequacy, and maintenance of these facilities have become a growing concern across many educational institutions, particularly in developing countries. The link between poorly managed facilities and diminished educational outcomes has been well established in literature, yet significant gaps in strategic management practices persist.

In many schools and higher institutions, educational facilities are both grossly inadequate or poorly maintained, leading to overcrowded classrooms, outdated equipment, dilapidated buildings, and limited access to modern learning technologies. These conditions severely hamper effective teaching and learning processes, reduce student engagement, limit innovation, and negatively affect overall academic performance. In rural and underfunded institutions, the situation is often more dire, creating deep inequities in knowledge access and delivery.

Several factors contribute to the poor state of educational facilities, including insufficient funding, lack of strategic planning, poor policy implementation, inadequate maintenance culture, weak

institutional governance, and rapid growth in student enrollment without commensurate infrastructural expansion. Additionally, the lack of trained personnel for facility management and the absence of modern data-driven approaches to infrastructure planning and utilization further exacerbate the problem.

Despite recognition of the critical role of educational facilities in achieving learning objectives, there is limited evidence of sustainable strategies that address both the challenges and opportunities in managing these facilities effectively. Moreover, many institutions lack a comprehensive framework that integrates planning, budgeting, monitoring, and evaluation of infrastructure usage in line with academic goals. This situation raises pressing questions: How can educational institutions develop strategic frameworks for the sustainable management of their facilities? What innovative and cost-effective approaches can be adopted to improve the quality and usability of infrastructure for knowledge delivery? What are the roles of stakeholders—governments, administrators, educators, and communities—in addressing these challenges?

Therefore, this study seeks to investigate the multifaceted challenges hindering the effective management of educational facilities and explore practical and sustainable strategies that can enhance knowledge delivery. By addressing these gaps, the study aims to provide actionable insights for policymakers, education managers, and stakeholders committed to improving the educational environment and outcomes.

The Study's Objectives

The study's primary goal was to investigate the difficulties and solutions associated with effectively managing educational facilities for the delivery of knowledge in Delta State, Nigeria's public universities. In particular, the study aimed to:

1. Learn about the difficulties public universities in Delta State, Nigeria, face in effectively managing their facilities for the delivery of knowledge.
2. Analyze the methods used by Delta State, Nigeria's public universities, to upgrade their facilities for efficient instruction.

Research Issues

The following research questions served as guidance for the investigation:

1. What difficulties do academic and non-academic staff face in maintaining facilities for efficient knowledge delivery in Delta State, Nigeria's public universities?
2. What strategies do academic and non-academic staff members take to effectively manage facilities for the delivery of knowledge in public universities in Delta State, Nigeria?

Hypotheses

We investigated the following hypotheses.

1. Regarding the difficulties in managing facilities for efficient knowledge delivery in public universities in Delta State, Nigeria, there is no discernible significant difference between the mean scores of academic and non-academic staff.
2. According to the strategies used to manage the facilities for knowledge delivery in public universities in Delta State, Nigeria, the mean scores of academic and non-academic staff do not differ significantly.

Review of the Literature

Within the context of tertiary institutions, facilities are those actual buildings and their support networks that work together to create a comfortable environment in which students can receive instruction. The content assets available to staff and students to maximize their learning productivity are school facilities (Asiabaka, 2008). Among other things, these facilities could be housing complexes, apartment buildings, lecture halls, classrooms, sports complexes, office buildings, conference centres,

clinics, dining establishments, power and water supply systems, and road networks. One cannot stress how crucial school facilities are to the dissemination of knowledge.

The nexus between the management of educational facilities and effective knowledge delivery has been the subject of numerous empirical investigations across various educational contexts. A study by Earthman (2002) in the United States established a strong correlation between the condition of school facilities and student achievement. The findings revealed that students who attend schools in well-maintained buildings perform significantly better than those in poorly maintained environments. Earthman concluded that the quality of educational infrastructure directly affects student concentration, morale, and overall academic success.

Similarly, Okeke and Orji (2018) conducted a study in South-Eastern Nigeria to examine the impact of school facilities on students' academic performance in secondary schools. Their findings confirmed that availability and adequacy of classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and sanitation facilities significantly influenced students' academic outcomes. The study emphasized the need for regular maintenance and strategic investment in school infrastructure.

In a broader study on public universities in Nigeria, Owoeye and Yara (2011) identified critical challenges facing facility management, including inadequate funding, lack of maintenance culture, bureaucratic bottlenecks, and poor planning. The researchers found that many institutions operate with outdated master plans that do not align with growing student populations, leading to overcrowding and pressure on existing infrastructure.

Likewise, Olagunju and Adedayo (2012) investigated infrastructural challenges in technical and vocational education institutions. The study found that outdated and insufficient facilities hinder practical knowledge delivery, especially in science and engineering disciplines. The authors highlighted poor government funding, lack of private sector involvement, and inefficient procurement processes as major bottlenecks.

Empirical evidence also points to various strategies that institutions have adopted to improve facility management. A study by Ayeni and Adelabu (2012) in Osun State, Nigeria, found that participatory planning, which involved principals, teachers, and community members, led to better outcomes in infrastructure maintenance and utilization. The study revealed that schools with active School-Based Management Committees (SBMCs) were more effective in sustaining facilities and promoting conducive learning environments.

In a related study, Ogundele and Oparinde (2017) examined the effect of facility management strategies on knowledge delivery in tertiary institutions in South-West Nigeria. The researchers found that institutions that implemented routine maintenance schedules, ICT-based inventory systems, and user-feedback mechanisms experienced improved learning environments and student satisfaction. The study recommended the institutionalization of a facilities management unit in every tertiary institution to ensure sustainability.

A study by Ngware et al. (2015) in Kenya explored the use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Management Information Systems (MIS) in educational planning. The study found that institutions that adopted these tools were more efficient in resource allocation and infrastructure monitoring, leading to improved educational delivery.

Furthermore, Adeyemi (2020) examined the impact of public-private partnerships (PPPs) on infrastructure provision in Nigerian universities. The study found that PPPs significantly enhanced access to modern facilities and ensured timely maintenance due to shared responsibility and mutual accountability. Through the various facility management stages of provision, utilization, maintenance, improvement, and audit of the various educational facilities, school facilities play a crucial role in an institution's ability to accomplish educational goals.

The Necessity of Facility Management in Schools

Since facility management is predicated on the idea that an organization's efficiency is directly related to the physical environment in which it functions and that this environment can be enhanced to boost effectiveness, it follows that the environment designed for a facility's users affects how well the



activities conducted there are performed (Gagendrun, 2000). As a result, businesses need reasonably priced, well-maintained facilities that add value to their operations (Njoku&Oluwuo, 2018). The quality of education students receive is directly linked to the facilities that are available and the general environment in which they learn (Ogunsaju, 2000). This is because facilities are necessary to reach educational goals.

Nonetheless, Asiabaka (2008) argued that flexibility must be a key component of the planning process due to the difficulties caused by the quick rise in school enrolment, the expansion of academic programs, and the scarcity of resources. The facilities should be able to accommodate both short-term demands and long-term uses.

The initial planning, design, and construction costs of the facilities are very time-consuming and labour-intensive, and the effects of operating the facilities are left for others to determine later (Rose et al, 2007). This is another significant issue that Nigerian universities must deal with. Once constructed, these facilities have a life of their own—a permanent life—and maintenance is expensive. Notably, educational facilities are consumable, just like other tangible resources. Over time, they need to be renewed or replaced because they get worn out. In light of this, in order to effectively meet the needs of both teachers and students in the future, those in charge of managing educational facilities in this era of decreased resources and program changes must be knowledgeable about facility management issues.

According to a study by Odediran et al. (2012) on the assessment of maintenance practices among users of residential buildings in Nigeria, the majority of buildings lack a maintenance manual, and the status of the economy was identified as a key factor influencing users' poor maintenance practices. Another study on the factors influencing the maintenance management of public buildings in Lagos, Nigeria, was also carried out by Asiyu (2012). Insufficient funding for maintenance programs is the main factor limiting facility management practices in Nigeria, according to the findings.

Methods for enhancing educational infrastructure

Effective facility management starts with an educational policy that meets the needs of each individual in a knowledge-based, dynamic economy. School administrators should make sure that everyone works together to manage the facilities, including the planning, organizing, decision-making, leading, coordinating, and controlling processes. As a result, the enlarged educational goals and objectives brought about by social and economic development necessitate that everyone involved in the facility management process participate. Stakeholders' and experts' knowledgeable contributions, along with teamwork, will inspire fresh perspectives on facility management. According to Shaibu and Ishaka (2019), an efficient facility management plan must be a crucial component of the institution's overall master plan, which also includes budget priorities.

Establishing a workable plan and adding the essential components of communication and procurement training come next (Akins and Brooks, 2003). According to Amaratanga and Baldry (2000), facility management performance optimization should make use of the indoor environment to support the institutional goals and objectives in an equitable, efficient, and formal way. Facility performance appraisal should also be a regular and formal operation. Accordingly, Asiabaka (2008) suggested a facility audit that includes a thorough inventory of educational facilities and establishes a standard procedure for determining baseline data on the elements, policies, and procedures of both new and existing facilities. Through this audit, planners, managers, and employees can keep track of the facilities' conditions, service history, maintenance requirements, and vocation. This prevents guesswork and helps an organization create plans for facility maintenance and improvement. It also creates a baseline for tracking facility maintenance progress and permits regular in-depth analyses of product life cycles.

Furthermore, due to its widespread acceptance in tertiary institutions worldwide and its ability to improve overall service delivery, Ikediashi et al. (2012) advised outsourcing facility management services in tertiary institutions. The International Association of Outsourcing Professionals estimates that global outsourcing, as cited in Ikediashi et al. (2012), is valued at US \$1 trillion, with India leading the way.

A planned maintenance schedule should also be in place, which all parties involved should follow and act upon as soon as repairs are necessary. Supervisors and inspectors ought to visit educational institutions on a regular basis. Supervision and inspection are essential components of school management control, which aims to improve the overall performance of the educational system, according to Akinwumiju and Ayabi (2013).

Methodology

The study's research design is an analytical descriptive survey. The design was suitable since it includes both an analysis of respondents' opinions and a description of current and existing phenomena that are unmanipulated. All five public universities in Delta State, Nigeria, including their academic and non-academic staff, made up the study's population. Using the stratified random sampling technique, 450 sample members—250 academic and 200 non-academic staff—were chosen from the population. A questionnaire item titled "Education Facilities Management for Knowledge Delivery Questionnaire (EFMKDQ)" was developed by the researchers and used for the study. The instrument was in two parts – A & B. Part 'A' elicited information on demographic data relating to the school. Part 'B' had 14 items on education facilities management for knowledge delivery. The instrument has a four point rating scale of Strongly Agree (SA = 4 Points), Agree (A = 3 points), Disagree (D = 2 points) and Strongly Disagree (SD = 1 points). The instrument was validated by two University experts. The corrections and modifications in content and language clarity made, were incorporated in the final copies of the instrument used for the study. The reliability of the instrument was determined using 20 academic staff and 20 non-academic staff, outside the original sample for the study. The estimated internal consistency computed using Cronbach Alpha was 0.79, which was considered high enough for the study. The research instrument was administered by the researchers with the help of three research assistants. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions. An item with a mean score of less than 2.50 was rejected. The hypotheses generated were tested using the t-test(Statistical Package for Social Sciences) at 0.05 alpha level.

Result Presentation

The first research question

What difficulties do academic and non-academic staff members face when it comes to effectively managing educational facilities for knowledge delivery in public universities? Table 1 displays the mean and standard deviation scores of academic and non-academic staff on the challenges of managing educational facilities for effective knowledge delivery.

S/N	Items	Academic Staff (N=250)				Non-Academic Staff (N=200)			
X	SD	Decision	x	SD	Decision				
1.	There is no policy guideline for facility management	3.50	0.67	Agree	3.25	0.83	Agree		
2.	There is lack of maintenance culture among administrators of universities.	3.34	0.76	Agree	3.14	0.86	Agree		
3.	There is inadequate provision of fund for Facilities maintenance.	3.34	0.70	Agree	3.23	0.86	Agree		
4.	Periodic review on facilities is not carried out to avoid breakdown of facilities.	3.32	0.69	Agree	3.33	0.69	Agree		
5.	Increase in the enrolment of students in the of students in the university system.	3.33	0.79	Agree	3.20	0.25	Agree		
6.	There is lack of routine check on the available facilities.	3.33	0.77	Agree	3.27	0.74	Agree		
7.	There are management incompetency in managing the facilities.	3.22	0.84	Agree	3.17	0.85	Agree		
Grand Mean & SD		23.40	5.065		22.59	5.468			

Table 1 shows that both academic and non-academic staff agreed on all items, with mean scores higher than the criterion mean of 2.50. Based on the indications, the grand mean of 23.40 and 22.59 for academic and non-academic staff, respectively, and the standard deviation of 5.065 and 5.468 for academic and non-academic staff, respectively, suggested that all respondents agreed that the following are among the challenges in facilities management: a lack of guidelines for facility management; a lack of maintenance culture among university administrators; insufficient funding for facilities management; a lack of regular facility reviews; an increase in the number of students enrolled in the university system; a lack of routine checks on the facilities that are available; and managerial incompetence in facility management.

The second research question

What strategies do academic and non-academic staff members adopt when managing educational facilities to ensure efficient knowledge delivery in Delta State, Nigeria's public universities? Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviation of the academic and non-academic staff's scores on the knowledge delivery facilities management strategies.

S/N	Items	Academic Staff (N=250)			Non-Academic Staff (N=200)		
X	SD	Decision	x	SD	Decision		
1.		There should be outsourcing of facility management services	3.24	0.813	Agree	3.25	0.776 Agree
2.		There should be auditing of facilities to ensure they are in good shape.	3.27	0.745	Agree	3.25	0.883 Agree
3.		Inspectors visit school to ascertain the condition school facilities .	3.24	0.764	Agree	3.17	0.897 Agree
4.		Establishing implantable policy for facilities management.	3.28	0.802	Agree	3.19	0.893 Agree
5.		Management should always define priorities for expenditure on facilities management.	3.28	0.824	Agree	3.24	0.846 Agree
6.		Emergency issues should be handled as they arise.	3.26	0.799	Agree	3.14	0.862 Agree
7.		Engaging stakeholders in decision making process.	3.30	0.807	Agree	3.18	0.878 Agree
Grand Mean & SD			22.87	5.517		22.425	5.927

Table 2 revealed that the academic and non-academic staff agreed on all the items, with a mean score higher than the criterion mean of 2.50. From all indications, the Grand mean of 22.87 and 22.42 (for academic and non-academic staff, respectively) and standard deviation of 5.517 and 5.927 (for academic and non-academic staff, respectively) revealed that the strategies for facilities management for knowledge delivery include: outsourcing of facility management facilities, auditing of facilities to ensure that they are in good condition, inspectors visiting schools to ascertain the conditions of school facilities, establishing implantable plan and policy for facility management, management defining priorities for expenditure on facilities management, emergency issues should be handled as they arise and engaging stakeholders in decision making process.

First hypothesis

Regarding the difficulties in managing educational facilities for efficient knowledge delivery in public universities in Delta State, Nigeria, there is no discernible significant difference between the mean evaluations of academic and non-academic staff.

Table 3: uses a t-test to show the mean difference between academic and non-academic staff about how hard it is to manage facilities for knowledge delivery.

Category	N	X	SD	df	t-cal	P-value	Decision
Academic Staff	250	23.40	5.065	448	1.643	0.101	Not significant
Non-Academic Staff	200	22.59	5.468				

Table 3 revealed that academic staff have mean and standard deviation scores of 23.40 and 5.065, while the non-academic staff have mean and standard deviation scores of 22.54 and 5.468. When these values were subjected to independent t-test analysis, it was discovered that, with a degree of freedom of 448, the calculated t-test value which is 1.643 is not statistically significant at 0.05 alpha level. Since the probability value (P-value) of 0.101 is greater than the significant level of 0.05, there is no significant difference between the mean scores of academic and non-academic staff on the challenges encountered in the management of educational facilities for effective knowledge delivery in public universities in Delta state, Nigeria.

The Second Hypothesis

According to the strategies used to manage the facilities for knowledge delivery in public universities in Delta State, Nigeria's, the mean scores of academic and non-academic do not differ significantly.

Table 4 shows a t-test analysis of the mean difference in facility management strategies for knowledge delivery between academic and non-academic staff.

Category	N	X	SD	df	t-cal	P-value	Decision
Academic Staff	250	22.896	5.517	448	0.871	0.384	Not significant
Non-Academic Staff	200	22.425	5.927				

Table 4 indicated that academic staff has mean and standard deviation scores of 22.896 and 5.517 while the non-academic staff have mean and standard deviation of 22.425 and 5.927. When these values were subjected to independent sample t-test analysis, it was revealed that, with a degree of freedom of 448, the calculated 't' which is 0.871 is not statistically significant at 0.05 alpha level. Since the probability value (P-value) of 0.384, is greater than the significant level of 0.05, the null hypothesis is therefore accepted. This implies that, there is no significant difference between academic and non-academic staff on the strategies adopted in the management of educational facilities for knowledge delivery in public universities in Delta state, Nigeria.

Discussion of the Results

In discussing the findings of this study, the researchers followed the arrangement of data and also used relevant literature from the work to back it up. All of the people who answered agreed that some of the problems with facility management are that there aren't any clear rules for it, university administrators don't have a culture of maintenance, there aren't enough funds for maintenance, facilities aren't reviewed on a regular basis, the number of students in the university system is growing, and administrators aren't doing their jobs well. Also, the test of hypothesis one showed that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of academic and non-academic staff on the difficulties encountered in the management of educational facilities for effective knowledge delivery in public universities in Delta State, Nigeria. The implication is that facilities management cannot be effective if administrators are not proactive, funds are insufficient, maintenance is not done, there is no policy guideline, school enrolment is rising rapidly, etc. This finding is in line with the findings of Odediran et al. (2012), that most buildings do not have a maintenance manual, and the state of the economy was cited as a major factor affecting the poor maintenance. Also, Asiyai (2012) posited that insufficiency of funds for maintenance programs is the most significant factor limiting facility management practice in Nigeria. Asiabaka (2008) asserted that the major problems of facility management are the lack of policy guidelines for infrastructural development for educational facilities, the rapid increase in school enrolment, and the increasing number of academic programs. Also, the study is in line with the findings of Olagunju and Adebayo (2012) that poor government funding and inefficient procurement processes are bottlenecks in managing educational facilities. With this in mind, it is necessary that those responsible for handling educational facilities in the era of declining resources and changes in

educational programs understand the facility management issues in order to effectively meet the needs of future generations of students and teachers.

Again, the study found that the respondents agreed that the strategies for management of facilities for knowledge delivery includes: outsourcing of facility management services, auditing of resources to ensure that they are in good condition, inspectors as supervisors visiting schools to ascertain the condition of school facilities, establishing implementable policy for facility management, define priority for expenditures on facilities management ensuring that emergency issues are handled as a right, and engaging stakeholders. Also, hypothesis 2 reviewed that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of academic and non-academic staff on the strategies adopted in the management of educational facilities for knowledge delivery in public universities in Delta State, Nigeria. This finding is in line with the assertion of Amanchukwu and Ololube (2015), that management of school facilities entails good leadership, effective monitoring of both the facilities and the users cannot and applying sound maintenance culture of those facilities and other things required for the school to give maximum services. In the same vein, Akpabio (2018) posited that engaging stakeholders including students faculty and administrative staff in decision-making processes will foster a sense of belonging and ensures that facility management aligns with the institutions academic goals. The study is line with Ayeni and Adelabu (2012) who asserted that there should be participatory planning and involvement of stakeholders in decision making. Also, the finding is in line with the recommendation of Ikediashi et al (2002) that, there should be outsourcing of facilities management services in university because of their capacity to boost overall service delivery. In all supervision and inspection are vital features of management control of schools. In fact, both passive factors such as buildings, document and all instructional facilities and active factors such as learners, teachers and administrative staff are all inspected and the idea is to ensure compliance with policy decision as well as existence of healthy functional school environment (Akinwumiju&Agabi, 2013).

Conclusion

A multifaceted approach involving increased investments, stakeholder participation, constant supervision and inspection, and other measures is necessary to address the issues that hinder the optimal use and maintenance of school facilities in Nigerian universities, which are essential to the delivery of high-quality knowledge. By putting these strategies into practice, Nigerian universities can foster an environment that is conducive to learning, research, and innovation, ultimately increasing the global competitiveness of the country higher education.

Suggestions

Considering the results, the following suggestions are offered.

1. Regular inspections of school facilities should always be conducted by qualified technical personnel for facility inspection and supervision. This will help fully identify any major deficiencies that could interfere with the regular operations of the school.
2. University works department employees should make sure that the existing school facilities are kept up to date in order to increase their longevity and usefulness.
3. The government should prioritize making sure university managers have enough money to run their institutions efficiently.
4. To ensure that facilities for knowledge delivery are managed effectively, university managers should be proactive and strategically creative in their approach to facilities management and revenue diversification.

References

- Adeyemi, K. (2020). Public-private partnerships and infrastructure development in Nigerian universities. *International Journal of Educational Planning & Administration*, 10(2), 45–54.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). *The theory of planned behavior*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)



- Akinwumiju, J.A & Agabi, C.O (2013). *Foundations of School Management*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.
- Akpabio, I.U. (2015). Managing School Facilities for Quality Education in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects. *Journal of Qualitative Education*, 11(1) 1 – 6.
- Alejo, A.O. (2018). The Maintenance of Tertiary Institution Buildings in Ondo State, Nigeria: Practice, Problem and Prospect. *Civil and Environmental Research* 10 (5)90 – 95.
- Amanchukwu, N.R. & Ololube, P.N. (2015). Managing School Plant for Effective Service Delivery in Public Secondary Schools in Rivers State of Nigeria. *Human Resource Management Research* 594) 95 – 102.
- Armstrong, M. (2012). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource practice*, New Delhi: Kogan.
- Asiyai, R. (2012). Assessing School Facilities in Public Secondary Schools in Delta state, Nigeria. *African Research Review* 6(2) 192 – 205.
- Atkin, B & Brooks .A. (2009). *Total facilities management* 3rd edition, New York: Wiley – Blackwell Publishers.
- Australian Council for Educational Research (2008). *Educational Facility Design*.
- Ayeni, A. J., & Adelabu, M. A. (2012). Improving learning infrastructure and environment for sustainable quality assurance practice in secondary schools in Osun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 1(1), 61–68. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2012.v1i1.28>
- Bebe – Blaise, C.O., Termit, K R S & Fong S.F. (2015). Need for ICT integration for effective instructional delivery of Education practice 6 (3) 51 – 56.
- Bligh, D.A (2000). *What is the use of lectures?* San Francisco: Jessey – Bass.
- Bukola, A.B. (2011). Problems of Facilities in South West, Nigeria Universities and the way forward. *European Journal of Educational Studies* 3(1) 132 – 143.
- Earthman, G. I. (2002). School facility conditions and student academic achievement. *Los Angeles: UCLA's Institute for Democracy, Education, and Access*. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5sw56439>
- Gagendran, T. (2000). *An Integrated Approach to Access facilities Performance*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, National University of Singapore.
- Godfrey, O.U. & Anih, P.C. (2010). Effect of Design Layout and Management of Primary School on Performance of Public Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS) 2 (3) 111 – 124.
- Hornsby, D.J. & Osman, R (2014). Massification in higher education: Large Classes and Student Learning. *H.E.* 7(6), 711 – 719.
- Igbinedion, D.A (2014). *Facilities Management in Schools*. In F.N. Obasi & J.D. Asodike (Eds). *Educational resource management*. Port Harcourt: Pearl Publishers.
- Ikediashi, D.I., Ogunluno, S.O., Boules, G and Mbamali, I. (2012). Outsourcing of Facilities Management Services in Nigeria's Public Universities, In Igea .S., Agyepong, S.A, Leiringer, R. and Hughes, W (Eds), *proceeding 4th West Africa Built Environment Research (WABER) conference*, 24-26 July 2012, Abuja 725 – 735.
- Johnson, A.O. (2007). *School Facility Management*. Port Harcourt: Smart Publishing.
- Lavy, C. (2008). Facility management practices in higher education buildings: A case study. *Journal of Facilities Management*. 6 (4) 192 -205.
- Lawanson, Q.A & Gede, N.T. (2011). Provision and Management of School facilities for the Implementation of UBE programme. *Journal of Education and Social Research* 1(4) 40 – 51.
- Lind, H. and Muyingo, H. (2012). Building maintenance strategies: Planning under uncertainty. *Property Management*, 30(1) 14 28.
- Liu, Z. & Motindu, G (2016). On Progress of Mass Tertiary Education: Case of Lebanon, Kenya and Omar. *Higher Education Studies* 6(4) 1 – 11.
- Machika, P. Troskie – de Bruin C, Albertyn R.M (2014). The student's experience of attending large classes in a South Africa Higher Education context. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5(16) 375 – 380.



- Madumere, S.C. (2007). School Plant Planning, Facilities Management and education law. Lagos: Okoye Honeybees Enterprises.
- Margnson S. (2010). Higher Education in the Global Knowledge Economy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences* 2(5) 6962 – 6980.
- Mohamedbhai, G. (2008). The Effects of Massification on Higher Education in Africa. *International Journal of African Higher Education*. 1 (1) 1 – 79.
- Ngware, M. W., Oketch, M., &Ezeh, A. C. (2015). Quality of learning environment in low-cost private schools in Nairobi, Kenya. *Education and Urban Society*, 47(4), 555–574. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124513508583>
- Njoku, N.N &Oluwuo, S.O. (2018). Challenges and Strategies of Facilities Management for Knowledge Delivery in Universities in Rivers and Bayelsa States. *African Journal of Educational Research and Development (AJERD)* 11(1) 82 – 94.
- Odediran, S.J., Opatunyi, O.A and Eghenure, O.F (2012). Maintenance of Residential Buildings: Users Practices in Nigeria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences* 3 (3) 261 – 265.
- Ogundele, M. O., &Oparinde, O. A. (2017). Facilities management strategies and knowledge delivery in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(6), 162–170.
- Ogunsaju, S. (2000), Nature and Purpose of Educational Management. Ilorin: Haytee Books.
- Okeke, C. I. O., & Orji, E. I. (2018). Educational facilities as correlates of academic performance in secondary schools in Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 5(5), 89–97. <https://doi.org/10.15739/IJEPRR.18.011>
- Olagboye .C. (2000). An assessment of school plant maintenance among secondary schools in Lagos state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Nigeria* 3(2) 108 – 120.
- Olagunju, O. E., &Adedayo, J. O. (2012). Infrastructural challenges to technical and vocational education in Nigeria. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 2(9), 17–24.
- Omordu, C. (2013). Knowledge and learning management. In J.D. Asodike, J.M., Etiong, S.O. Oluwuo& N.M. Abraham (Eds). Contemporary administrative and teaching issues in Nigerian Schools. Owerri: Alphabet, Nigeria publishers.
- Owoeye, J. S., &Yara, P. O. (2011). School facilities and academic achievement of secondary school agricultural science in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Asian Social Science*, 7(7), 64–74. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v7n7p64>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational behavior* (15th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education
- Rose, R., Cain, D.A, Dempsey, J.J, and Schneider, R (2007). Buildings The gift that keep on taking a framework for integrated decision making, APPA and the centres for facilities research.
- Shaibu, L.E.C &Ishaka, M.L. (2019). Problems and strategies for the management of school facilities for effective instructional delivery in Federal and state Colleges of Education in North Central States of Nigeria. *Ewemen Journal of Education Research and Review*, 2(1) 11 – 19.
- Trow, M. (1973). Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education. Catnegic commission on Higher Education, 1947 center street, Berkeley, California 94 – 704.
- Uko, E.S. (2015). Principalsip and Effective Management of Facilities in Secondary Schools in Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection* 3 (1) 64 – 69.