Salvaging Nigeria Tertiary Education through Public-Private Partnerships: Issues and Constraints

Christopher Chuks Ugwuogo, Federal College of Education, Nigeria

The Asian Conference on Education & International Development 2015
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Education world wide is an instrument for national development. Funding remains a critical factor for quality education and poor funding has remained the lot of tertiary education in Nigeria. Tertiary education in Nigeria is offered at post secondary levels namely: the universities, polytechnics and colleges of education. Enormous fund is needed for the provision of infrastructures, settlement of overhead and recurrent expenditures, equipping of libraries, and purchase of consumables, staff development and training among others. With over 330 public tertiary institutions and other equally important areas like health and agriculture competing for the dwindling government revenues, it is apparent that government alone cannot adequately fund tertiary education. This paper takes a look at tertiary education in Nigeria, the funding problem, past programs and reforms aimed at ameliorating funding problem and the emergence of public-private partnerships (PPPs) as an alternative source. Issues and constraints to PPPs were equally discussed. Finally, some suggestions on how to take full advantage of PPPs in salvaging tertiary education were made.

Keywords: Salvaging, Tertiary Education, Public-Private Partnerships, Funding and Challenges.

Introduction

Education has been defined as all efforts, conscious and direct, incidental and indirect, made by a given society to accomplish certain objectives that are considered desirable in terms of the individual's own needs as well as the needs of the society where that education is based (Fafunwa, cited in Kpolovie and Obilor, 2013). The relationship between education and development is well established such that education is a key index of development. Education improves productivity, empowerment and health, but reduces negative features of life, such as child labour, prostitution, crime and other vices (Kpolovie and Obilor, 2013).

The difference between developed and developing nations is in the quality of their education. One of the cardinal points of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) is access to quality and better education to all children of school age (Wikipedia, 2009). Nigeria's quest for becoming one of the twenty leading economies in the world depends largely on the quality of its education. It was in this regard that Oweh (2014) stresses that irrespective of the natural endowment a nation might have, without the requisite educational capacity, the skills necessary to harness them would be lacking and therefore, the structure or system of such a society is bound to have defects. The Federal Government realizes the importance of quality education to economic development when it emphasizes that education in Nigeria is no more a private enterprise, but a huge venture that has witnessed government's complete intervention and active participation (National Policy on Education, 2014). It also goes further to adopt education as an instrument par excellence for national development.

Although quality education is a combination of many factors, adequate funding remains very critical. Kpolovie and Obilor (2013) stress that the quality of education depends on a nation's funding of the sub-sector. Investment in education leads to the formation of human capital that makes a significant contribution to economic growth. Education is supposed to attract considerable portion of public expenditure because of its position as a social service with direct economic significance with generally acclaimed positive spillover effects (Uche, Ihugba and Nwosu, 2013). For education to be seen as successful, it requires huge investment either in terms of policies and implementation, infrastructure, human capacity development and of course funds, including the application of all these to get the desired goal (Oweh, 2014).To underscore the importance of funding to education, some international organizations have advocated some benchmarks for the funding of the sub-sector as follows: Dakar Framework of Action, 20% of national budget or 5% of GDP; Education for All, 20% of national budget; World Education Forum, 7% of GDP within 5 years and 9% within 10 years; UNESCO, 26% (Wale, 2014 and UNESCO 2000). Also United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has recommended 70% of education budget to Capital Expenditure and 30% to Recurrent Expenditure (Wale, 2014).

Education is a shared responsibility of the Nigerian federal, state and local governments. Nigeria is the most populous black nation with almost 168 million people, 30 million of which are students (United State Embassy in Nigeria, 2012). The Nigerian higher education sector is perhaps the largest in sub-Sahara Africa both in the number of educational institutions and the population of students (Chikwem, 2008). With more than 330 public and private tertiary institutions, including Colleges of Agriculture and Monotechnics (NUC, 2015; NBTE, 2015; NCCE, 2015) coupled with the dwindling oil revenue, adequate funding of tertiary education poses a very big challenge. The problem of education funding, especially tertiary education in Nigeria has been in the front burner for decades now. This sub-sector has witnessed serious funding crises that have resulted in several strike actions by various academic and non academic staff unions. Many writers (Chikwem, 2008; Adeyemi, 2011; Ubogu, 2011; Akpanuko, 2012; Kpolovie and Obilor, 2013 and Wale, 2014) have decried the under funding of tertiary education in Nigeria. Statistics presented by Wale 2014) show that Nigerian Government budgeted an average of less than 9% to education between 1999 and 2014.

Aside direct budgetary allocation to education, the Nigerian government, had introduced various programmes and reforms geared towards improving the funding of education generally and tertiary education in particular. Such programmes and reforms include, but not limited to Education Tax Fund (1993) now known as Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund), Public Sector Enterprises Privatization and Commercialization (1998) and Public-Private Partnership (PPP) established under Bureau for Public Sector Reforms (2006). Of all these programmes and reforms, PPP remains largely unexplored. This paper discusses the potentials and constraints of using PPP to ameliorate the problem of funding tertiary education in Nigeria.

Nigeria Tertiary Education

The tertiary education in Nigeria is comprised of universities, polytechnics (including institutions of technology, colleges of agriculture and monotechnics) and colleges of education. These institutions are further categorized into federal, state and private. Admission into these institutions is through Unified Tertiary Matriculation Examination (UTME) conducted by Joint Admission and Matriculation Board (JAMB). University education is the highest sort for followed by polytechnics and then colleges of education.

Universities are charged with the responsibilities of producing high level manpower. They offer programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. At the undergraduate level, they award Bachelor's degree while at the postgraduate level, they award Master's and Doctorate degrees. The management of each university is headed by a Vice Chancellor. The National Universities Commission (NUC) is the supervisory agency for the universities. There are 40 federal, 39 state and 50 private universities (NUC, 2015).

The polytechnics were established to train technical, middle-level manpower. They offer two levels of programmes of two years each – National Diploma (ND) and Higher National Diploma (HND). There still exists a dichotomy between degree and HND holders which the government is still battling to resolve. The management of each polytechnic is headed by a Rector. The regulatory agency for the polytechnics is the National Board for Technical Education (NBTE). The number of federal, state and private polytechnics is 21, 38, and 25 respectively. There are also 17 and 19 federal and state colleges of agriculture respectively as well as 23 federal, 2 state and 2 private monotechnics (NBTE, 2015).

The colleges of education were established principally to produce manpower to teach at the basic education level. They offer 3-year programmes leading to the award of Nigeria Certificate in Education (NCE). Many colleges of education offer degree programmes in affiliation to the universities. An attempt by the federal government, under Nigeria Education Sector Reform Bill Draft 2007 to convert federal polytechnics and colleges of education into campuses of contiguous universities failed. The administrative head of each college of education is called a Provost. Programmes of colleges of education are supervised and accredited by the National Commission for Colleges of Education. There are 21 federal, 38 state and 4 private colleges of education (NCCE, 2015).

Tertiary Education Funding: Facts and Commentaries

The importance of adequate funding of tertiary education cannot be over-emphasized. Funds are needed to take care of recurrent and capital expenditures such as workers salaries, water and energy bills, maintenance and fueling of vehicles, provision and maintenance of lecture halls, theatres, hostel facilities, libraries and research material, laboratories and so on.

The period between 1953 and 1980 witnessed a lot of development in the financing of education in Nigeria. It was a period when the federal and regional governments had constitutional roles for educational development (Adeyemi, 2011). Before this period, the funding of education was mainly in the hands of Christian missionaries and Voluntary agencies. By 1981, government had taken over the funding of schools. The financial involvement of government in education had become remarkably visible leading to further educational activities and expansion. Adeyemi (2011) reports that during this period, the government was solely responsible for funding education in Nigeria, although the amount spent on education might be small perhaps due to debt servicing.

The federal government increased its commitment towards funding of education at all levels in the country, emphasizing that education in Nigeria was no more a private enterprise, but a huge venture that must witness government's intervention and active participation (Marcellus, 2009 cited in Kpolovie and Obilor, 2013). The federal government is responsible for funding federal government owned public tertiary institutions while the state government and proprietors take care of state and private institutions respectively. However, the federal government provides financial assistance to state and private institutions especially in capital projects. The emphasis of this paper is on the funding of federal government owned public tertiary institutions.

Tertiary institutions in Nigeria are funded through budgetary allocations. Akpanuko (2012) reports that tertiary institutions derive 85% of their funds from the government, 10% from internally generated revenue and 5% from other sources such as endowment, fees/levies, services, consultancy, and renting facilities. The government funds come through the annual budgetary allocations excluding interventions from other government agencies such as TETFund. Government's budget to the education sector is usually shared among the following agencies/parastatals: Main Ministry of Education, universities, polytechnics, colleges of education, government colleges, technical schools and statutory transfer to Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC).

Table 1: Total Budgetary Allocation to Education from 1999 – 2014 (in Naira)

Year	Total Budget	Education Budget	% of Allocation
1999	60,549,835,647	2,700,000,000	4.46
2000	470,009,971,781	40,940,663,330	8.71
2001	894,214,805,186	63,783,776,900	7.13
2002	1,064,801,253,520	73,435,499,300	6.90
2003	976,254,543,375	75,707,827,520	7.75
2004	1,790,848,344,588	93,767,886,839	5.24
2005	1,799,938,243,138	147,835,827,799	8.21
2006	1,876,302,363,351	195,693,672,666	10.43
2007	2,266,394,423,477	221,071,774,929	9.75
2008	2,492,076,718,937	250,144,818,579	10.04
2009	2,870,510,042,679	252,204,813,495	8.79
2010	4,608,616,278,213	339,634,791,000	7.37
2011	4,226,191,559,259	393,810,171,775	9.32
2012	4,749,100,821,170	468,385,490,528	9.86
2013	4,987,220,425,601	509,039,713,761	10.21
2014	4,642,960,000,000	493,458,130,268	10.63
Total	**39,775,989,629,922**	**3,621,614,558,688**	**8.43**

Sources: Wale (2013). Budgetary Allocation to Education Sector.
Wale (2014). Empirical Analysis of 2014 Education Budget.

The total budget from 1999 to 2014 was ₦39.775 trillion with education taking ₦3.621 trillion. On the average, this is 8.43% of the total budget. The lowest was in 1999(4.46%) while the highest was in 2014 (10.63%). Allocation to education ranked highest in 12 of the 16 years (2000, 2003 – 2007, 2009 – 2014). While it ranked 2nd in 2001 and 2008, 3rd in 2002 and 6th in 1999.

It should be noted that 13 new federal universities, 4 polytechnics and 3 colleges of education were established within the period of 2009 – 2014. There are times when wide gaps exist between the amount being budgeted for and the actual amount released (Oseni, 2012 and Wale, 2014).

In the budgetary provision for education from 2006 to 2010, all the appropriations for Recurrent Expenditure were fully released but this was not the case for Capital Expenditure (Oseni, 2012). These budgets are shared between current expenditures (salaries, pensions and overheads) and capital expenditures (infrastructure, educational services and healthcare facilities).

Table 2: Recurrent and Capital Allocation to Education from 1999 – 2014 (in Naira)

Year	Recurrent	%	Capital	%	Total	Total Budget
1999	2,700,000,000	100	-	0.00	2,700,000,000	60,549,835,647
2000	29,514,932,709	72.09	11,425,730,621	27.91	40,940,663,330	470,009,971,781
2001	38,983,776,900	61.12	24,800,000,000	38.88	63,783,776,900	894,214,805,186
2002	51,335,499,300	69.90	22,100,000,000	30.10	73,435,499,300	1,064,801,253,520
2003	61,726,621,039	81.53	13,981,206,481	18.47	75,707,827,520	976,254,543,375
2004	72,217,886,839	77.02	21,550,000,000	22.98	93,767,886,839	1,790,848,344,588
2005	92,594,737,799	62.63	27,440,790,000	18.56	147,835,827,799	1,799,938,243,138
2006	129,421,908,835	66.13	35,791,763,831	18.29	195,693,672,666	1,876,302,363,351
2007	137,478,261,081	62.18	48,293,513,848	21.85	221,071,774,929	2,266,394,423,477
2008	162,694,071,909	65.03	47,750,746,670	19.09	250,144,818,579	2,492,076,718,937
2009	183,014,340,686	72.57	33,625,096,425	13.33	252,204,813,495	2,870,510,042,679
2010	198,084,948,657	58.52	97,208,440,839	28.62	339,634,791,000	4,608,616,278,213
2011	304,392,631,774	72.29	35,088,896,911	8.91	393,810,171,775	4,226,191,559,259
2012	345,091,448,178	73.68	55,056,589,805	11.75	468,385,490,528	4,749,100,821,170
2013	360,822,928,272	70.88	71,937,785,489	14.13	509,039,713,761	4,987,220,425,601
2014	373,452,095,037	75.68	49,536,035,231	23.32	493,458,130,268	4,642,960,000,000
Average	-	**71.33**	-	**19.79**	**-**	-

Source:Wale (2014). Empirical Analysis of 2014 Education Budget

The difference between the amount allocated to recurrent and capital expenditures and the total education budget was the amount allocated to the UBEC. The entire education budget in 1999 was spent on recurrent expenditure. In 16 years, the highest that was spent on capital expenditure was 38.88% in 2001. An average of 19.79% was spent on capital projects during the period under review.

This was against the recommended 70% (Wale, 2014). There is a huge gap between amount for capital and recurrent expenditures. Large percentage of education budget is voted for recurrent expenditure to the detriment of capital expenditure for infrastructure in the sector. This distribution poses challenges of slow pace in infrastructural development in the agencies and institutions (Chukwumerije, cited in Oseni, 2012).

A comparison of federal government budgetary allocation to education with the recommended global benchmark for developing countries and other countries' budgetary allocation (Wale, 2014; Kpolovie and Obilor, 2013; and UNESCO, 2000) shows that education, especially tertiary education is under funded in Nigeria. This presents a contrast to what obtains in many industrialized nations where some individual universities' budget exceed the entire national budgets for higher education in many African countries (Tererra and Altbabach, 2004)

Table 3: Annual Budgetary Allocations of 20 World Bank Sampled Countries to Education

S/No	Country	% Budget Allocation Education	Position
1	Ghana	31.0	1st
2	Cote d'Ivoire	30.0	2nd
3	Uganda	27.0	3rd
4	Morocco	26.4	4th
5	South Africa	25.8	5th
6	Swazilan	24.6	6th
7	Mexico	24.3	7th
8	Kenya	23.0	8th
9	United Arab Emirate	22.5	9th
10	Boswana	19.0	10th
11	Iran	17.7	11th
12	USA	17.1	12th
13	Tunisia	17.0	13th
14	Lesotho	17.0	14th
15	Burkina Faso	16.8	15th
16	Norway	16.2	6th
17	Colombia	15.6	17th
18	Nicaragua	15.0	18th
19	India	12.7	19th
20	Nigeria	8.4	20th

Source: World Bank (2012). World Bank selected 20 countries annual budgetary allocation to education.

Nigeria with 8.4% occupies the last position while Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire with 31.0% occupy the 1st and 2nd position respectively. A well developed nation like USA budgets as much as 17.0% to education. The poor funding of education has led to serious infrastructural deficit in Nigerian tertiary institutions. The institutions are bedeviled by myriad of problems, which keep worsening by the day. These include poor funding; shortage of quality staff; dearth of infrastructure; inadequate classrooms and offices; inadequate laboratories for teaching and research; shortage of books and journal; inconsistent and ill-conceived policies; low staff-student ratios; fraud and self-deception with regard to accreditation; failure to send staff regularly on short courses to improve and enhance their competencies; and the fact that government often reneges on the mutual agreements between it and the staff unions (Ayooso, 2011 and Oseni, 2012).

Statistics recently released by the UN Human Development Index (HDI) ranks Nigeria 26th out of 54 African countries and 13th out of the 16 West African countries on education (Oweh, 2014). This sorry state of affairs has occasioned incessant strike actions by various staff unions notably the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU), Polytechnic Academic Staff Union (PASU) and Colleges of Education Academic Staff Union (COEASU). In 2013 ASUU was on strike for about 6 months. The PASU strike that started in 2013 lasted for almost an academic session while

COEASU was on strike for about 7 months in 2014. All these disruptions on academic activities have serious negative impact on the quality of education.

To stem this ugly tide, the Committee of Vice Chancellors (2013) recommended policy interventions to address the challenges of universities and other tertiary institutions in the country. The government on its part is doing everything possible within the limit of its financial resources to improve the funding of tertiary education. To this end, and in response to the findings of the Needs Assessment Committee, the Federal Government has decided to inject ₦1.3 trillion into public universities in the next 5 years starting from 2014. The polytechnics and colleges of education are still awaiting government's response to the findings of the Needs Assessment Committees set up for polytechnics and colleges of education. In the interim, the government has approved ₦220 billion to be disbursed to tertiary institutions as follows: federal universities, ₦910 million; polytechnics, ₦650 million and colleges of education, ₦550 million.

Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund)

The Education Tax Fund (ETF) as it was originally called was an alternative source of funding education being explored by the government. It was established under the Education Tax Act 1993. The Act stipulates that every company registered in Nigeria with more than 100 employees contributes 2% of their yearly pre-tax profit to the fund through Federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS). Other sources of its fund include:

(a) 2% bloc grant received from federal government from its Consolidated Revenue Fund established under section 167 of the 1999 constitution which was before the commencement of this Act received by the UBEC under repealed Compulsory Free Universal Basic Education Act 2004
(b) any money or contribution in form of federal government guaranteed credits
(c) any money received from local and international donors, gifts and endowment
(d) monies received as profit and interest from investments from the Fund made by the Board of Trustees.

The fund was disbursed according to the ratio of 50:40:10 to tertiary, primary and secondary education respectively. The share of tertiary education is further allocated to the universities, polytechnics and colleges of education in the ratio of 2:1:1 respectively (Ajayi and Alani, 1996 cited in Oseni, 2012). In 2009 ETF was transformed to TETFund whose sole focus is on funding capital projects, library, research, and capacity building in tertiary institutions (Naiya, 2014). The Federal Government allocated ₦336 billion to federal tertiary institutions in 2013 through TETFund. The institutions funded by TETFund in 2013 increased from 16 to 179 just as allocations to universities, polytechnics and colleges of education equally increased (Wike, 2014).

The breakdown shows that TETFund grant to each university in 2011 was ₦395m which was increased to ₦646 million in 2013, with total grant to all public universities increasing from ₦22.9 billion in 2011 to ₦45.2 billion in 2013, an increase of 97.38%. Support for each polytechnic increased from ₦240 million in 2011 to ₦443 million in 2013, bringing an increase from ₦12 billion for all polytechnics in 2011 to ₦23 billion in 2013, an increase of 97.67%. Similarly, the support for the colleges of education increased from ₦190 million each in 2011 to ₦390 million in 2013, with total grants to the colleges also rising from ₦10.2 billion in 2011 to ₦21.4 billion in 2013, an increase of 109.80% (Wike, 2014).

There is also high impact intervention on infrastructure development with monies received by all institutions running to several billions of naira and Research Fund for which over ₦260 million had recently been released to 13 beneficiaries. TETFund has also sponsored many academic staff of tertiary institutions to various training and development programmes such as higher degrees, conferences and workshops both locally and internationally.

However, the tertiary institutions are having the challenge of accessing this fund. Babayo (2014) disclosed that ₦300 billion meant for tertiary institutions was lying idle in the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN). Similarly, Wike (2014) expressed dismay that many state and federal government-owned tertiary institutions did not access the fund for their development.

Privatization and Commercialization of Education

The Public Sector Enterprises Privatization and Commercialization Act of 1999 gave the legal framework for private sector participation in tertiary education and has occasioned the increase in school fees in order to boost internally generated revenue of the institutions.

Chikwem (2008) recounts that the private universities have evolved during two historical periods: the first period, during the Nigeria's second democratic experience (1979/1983). During this period, private universities emerged without any defined educational planning for their development and were later abolished in 1984. The second period, from 1999 to-date, occurred as part of planned development project. Since 1999, 50 private universities, 25 private polytechnics and 4 private colleges of education have been established. Beyond mere increase in private funding, privatization appears to be an answer to increasing demand for higher education and may therefore mean that parents pay the cost of schooling rather than the government (Chikwem, 2008). Chikwem contends that the issue is not so much of money but rather the freedom of choice, flexibility, regulation, quality and accountability. According to him, in developed countries, privately managed and regulated schools are generally supposed to be more effective, efficient and produce better results than schools managed by the government.

Under the privatization and commercialization policy, the government withdrew some of its services to workers, sold out furniture in government quarters and reviewed rent in government houses based on prevailing commercial rates. All these were geared towards reducing the cost of running the institutions and mobilizing more funds for the core academic activities.

Public-Private Partnership (PPP) in Education

A public-private partnership is a legally binding contract between government and business for the provision of assets and the delivery of services that allocates responsibilities and business risks among the various partners (Wali-Uwais & Co, 2006-2014). Ifediora (2013) conceptualizes PPP as a model of public procurement based on long term relationships between government or other public bodies and the private sector for the delivery of services. In a similar account, Uzodinma (2013) reiterates that PPP relates to perceptions and practices affecting public-private sector relationships in ensuring national/global health, development and wellbeing, and the conceptual aspects of such relationships, including the role of the key players to make these partnerships successful or otherwise. All these concepts point to the fact that PPP involves a contract between public-sector authority and a private party, in which the private party provides a public service or project and assumes substantial financial, technical and operational risk in the project.

Globally, the shift towards PPP has been necessitated by increasing dilapidation of public infrastructure, fiscal constraints as government seeks alternative sources of investment funding, need to eliminate bureaucratic inefficiencies in government projects, search for a viable alternative in the face of rising public debt and the rising demand for public services in the face of increasing population and strong economic growth (Ikpefan, 2013). Most countries have adopted the PPP policy about two or three decades ago as a way of fixing their infrastructure gap and at the same time, delivering good welfare services for their citizens.

Aside from developed countries including the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and the USA, emerging economies such as India, United Arab Emirate, Qatar, Singapore and Malaysia have adopted the PPP not only to develop but also to grow their economies (Adepetun, 2008 cited in Ikpefan, 2013). He goes further to cite a World Bank report which reveals that since 1984, 86 industrialized and developing countries have privatized 547 infrastructures as well as a shift away from public sector financing.

In 2009, Abu Dhabi government-owned Mubadala Development Company secured a $1 billion financing for the Zayed University project through a PPP. The project involved the construction of a new university campus for 6,000 students in Abu Dhabi (Ifediora, 2013). The governments of Qatar and the USA have contracted with private partners to manage public schools to cater for the differentiated demand for education, in some cases using a franchising model to take advantage of good practices and economies of scale. Also in Denmark, New Zealand, Norway and the United Kingdom, more than 20% of public expenditure is transferred to private organizations (World Bank, 2009)

Many years of underinvestment and poor maintenance have left Nigeria with a significant infrastructure deficit which is holding back the country's development and economic growth. Nigeria needs to make massive investments beyond the means available to government in order to close its yawning infrastructure gap. Sanusi (2011) cited in Ifediora (2013) reports that Nigeria needs to invest over $100 billion in the next 10 years in just four infrastructure areas namely power ($18 – 20 billion), rail tracks ($8 – 17 billion), roads ($14 billion), and oil and gas ($60 billion). Ifediora

(2013) estimates that between $15 – 17 billion would be required over the next 10 years on the education infrastructure alone, with 65% of that estimate dedicated exclusively to the development of university infrastructure. Given the huge amount and expertise needed to address the infrastructure problem in Nigeria in general and the tertiary education sector in particular, the federal government believes that the private sector can play an important role in providing some of these new investments through PPP.

The National Policy on PPP (N4P) was formulated to give the modus operandi of PPP in Nigeria. The Policy covers key areas like legal framework, scope and application, parties/stakeholders and their roles, characteristics of PPP, principles of PPP, the PPP process, project funding among others. Under the legal framework, the Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (ICRC) Act was established in 2005. The ICRC board is charged with the mandate to develop and issue guidelines on PPP policies, processes and procedures (including those for concessions), and to act as a national centre of expertise on PPP. It will work closely with relevant Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) to identify PPP projects and will act as the interface with the private sector to promote communication on national policies and programmes.

The PPP scope covers power generation, roads and bridges, ports, airports, railways, gas and petroleum, water supply, transport system, housing, healthcare facilities and education facilities among others. In education, and the tertiary institutions in particular, PPP arrangement can come in various areas such as construction (from building classroom blocks, lecture theatres, student hostels, and staff quarters to designing whole new campuses), health, transport, environmental sanitation, security and so on. The huge infrastructure deficit in tertiary institutions in Nigeria can best be addressed through PPP. Student hostels are inadequate and poorly maintained. Government placed embargo on construction of staff quarters and many of the institutions do not have staff quarters. These are some of the areas PPP arrangement can be very useful.

The PPP has the following options: Joint ownership, Contracted forms and Private financing (Bureau of Public Service Reforms (BPSR), 2006, p.27 cited in Ijaiya and Jekayinfa, 2009). Joint ownership is an arrangement whereby "a legal entity is formed for a new Greenfield investment or in order to pull out useful assets from a moribund or 'misused' indebted government business" (p.27). Contracted forms of PPP come in the form of "concessions, leases and contracted agreements, which are just simply procurement such as maintenance contracts where a particular aspect of a government's operation is contracted out" (p.28). The contracted forms comprise "Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT), Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT), Rehabilitate-Operate-Transfer (ROT), and Build-Own-Operate (BOO)" (p.28).

The lease version is a case in which "a contract to assume control and use of a government asset for commercial purposed" is entered into with an appropriate organization (p.29). It is not privatization since an investor does not buy the whole business and all assets. A concession is "a right to serve a set of customers for a given service in a specific geographical area, or a set of customers already served by the network or set of products" (p.29). Private financing involves capital investment by a private company to help government in building infrastructure e.g. hostels, staff quarters etc, while it pays the investor for the use of the facilities. PPP can also be used for staff training and development.

There are many variants of PPP models. Outsourcing has become another popular option. The Security, Cleaner and Messenger cadres have been outsourced to the private sector in the federal civil service in Nigeria. Many private investors have constructed hostels around institutions' campuses at agreed terms of operations with the institutions' authorities. The way in which the private sector engages and participates in education projects will reflect the strategy chosen by the relevant public sector body to best achieve its overall objectives (Ifediora, 2013). In all this, the principles of value for money and maintaining public interest must be kept in focus.

Issues and Constraints

Some of the issues and constraints that will prevent the government, private sector and other stakeholders from maximizing the potentials of PPP include:

1. How to provide investors in the partnership with acceptable return on their investment while keeping with the principles of value for money and public interest?
2. How to achieve transparency where corruption is endemic? How to ensure public and private sector integrity and accountability and establish appropriate procedures to deter, detect and penalize corruption?
3. Which forms of PPP can help expand the volume of resources available for education?
4. Which forms of PPP can help improve quality and relevance of education?
5. There is general lack of awareness and apathy on PPP.
6. There is a weak regulatory and enforcement power of ICRC.
7. There exist technical capacity gaps that will help institutions take full advantage of PPP.
8. Government policy inconsistency makes investors to be circumspect about PPP arrangement.
9. Government is underfunding education

Recommendations

1. The anti graft agencies like Independent Corrupt Practices and other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) and the Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC) should be strengthened to check corruption in the country.

2. The ICRC should embark on aggressive enlightenment campaigns to make its existence and activities known to tertiary institutions' administrators and the general public

3. Each tertiary institution should establish PPP Technical Committee whose main duty would be to develop and advice management on PPP projects.

4. Every tertiary institution should have PPP Desk Officer whose duty would be to interface with the institution's PPP Technical Committee.

5. Any PP project should be well-researched and packaged by credible, experienced players in order to attract the needed finance.

6. Government should gradually increase funding of education with the target of meeting the minimum budget allocation of 26% by 2025.

Conclusion

The main focus of this paper is how to salvage tertiary institutions in Nigeria through PPP. Government alone cannot adequately fund tertiary education in the face of increasing students' enrolment, shortage of infrastructure and other educational services, competition from other sectors and more importantly dwindling resources occasioned by sharp drop in oil price and global economic meltdown. Budgetary allocations to the education sector have remained below 9% in the last 16 years and recurrent expenditures have taken a great chunk of the budget, leaving capital expenditures below 20%. Other measures taken in the past did little to bridge the funding gap. PPP holds the greatest prospect of addressing the funding challenges in Nigerian tertiary institutions. This can only be achieved if some of the issues raised and constraints identified are addressed.

References

Adepetun, A. (2008). *Poor infrastructure as a cog in the nation's economic progress.* Money Watch*,* Wednesday, 9th March.

Adeyemi, T. O. (2011). Financing education in Nigeria: An Analytical review. *American Journal of Social and Management Sciences 2(3)*, 295-303. Retrieved on 11th November 2014 from www.scihub.org/AJMS/PDF

Ajayi, T. and Alani, R. A. (1996). A study on cost recovery in Nigerian university education: Issues of quality, access and equity. Final Report: Association of African Universities.

Akpanuko, E. E. (2012). Tertiary education development and sustainability in Nigeria: Beyond financial accountability. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development 3(8)*, 90-98.

Ayooso, W. (2011). *Nigeria and the education sector reforms*. The Tide Newspaper, 6th May. Retrieved on 9th Novermber 2014 from www.thetidenewsonline.com/2011/05/06/nigeria-and-the-education-sector-reforms.

Babayo, M (2014). *₦300bn for tertiary institutions lying idle in CBN.* Vanguard, February 6. Retrieved on 27th January 2015 from www.vanguardngr.com/2014/02/₦300bn-tertiary-institutions-lying-idle-cbn-tetfund-chairman.

Chikwem, R. (2008). *The privatization and commercialization of higher education in Nigeria.* Retrieved on 7th January 2015 from www.nas.int.org/articles/116-the -privatization-and-commercialization-of-higher-education-in-Nigeria-by-roy-chikwend.html

Fafunwa, A. B. (2003). Nigeria education: Yesteryears, now and the future. In F. Abayomi, D. Atilade and M. Matswamgbe(Eds.), *What hope for the future*. Lagos: Ajasin Foundation.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004 Revised). *National Policy of Education*. Lagos:NERDC Press.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2005). *National policy on public-private partnership and its supplemental notes*. Retrieved on 11th November 2014 from www.icrc.gov/National -PPP-Policy.pdf

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2006). Bureau of public service reforms, 27-29.

Ifediora, C. A. (2013). *Public-private partnership as a model for infrastructural development in Nigerian universities*. Paper presented as the Guest Lecturer at the maiden lecture of the Annual Lecture series of the department of Economics, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. 25th April. Pp 1-10.

Ijaiya, N. Y. S. and Jekayinfa, A. A. (2009). *Public-private partnership initiative and the management of unity schools in Nigeria: To be or not to be?* Retrieved on 27th November fro www.unilorin.edu.ng/publications/jekayinoluwa/31.Public-private Partnership Initiative...

Ikpefan, O. A. (2013). *Challenges of public-private partnership in infrastructural financing in Nigeria.* Retrieved on 9th November, 2014 from www.iaen.org/pronet/index.php?view=detail&id=15113

Kpolovie, P. J. and Obilor, I. E. (2013). Adequacy-inadequacy:Educaaion funding in Nigeria. *Universal Journal of Education and General Studies 2(8)*, August, 239-254.

Marcellus, I. O. (2009). Development planning in Nigeria: Reflections on the national economic empowerment and development strategy (NEDS) 2003-2007. *Kamla-raj Journal of Social Science,* 20(3), 197-210.

Naiya, M. A. (2014). *FG spends ₦110bn on tertiary education in 3 years.* Leadership, March 11. Retrieved on 9th November 2014 from www.leadership.ng/news/.../fg-spends-₦110bn-tertiary-education-3-years-minister...

National Board for Technical Education (2015). *List of institutions with contact addresses under the purview of NBTE.* Retrieved on 7th January 2015 from www.nbte.gov.ng/institutions.html

National Commission for Colleges of Education (2015). *List of colleges of education in Nigeria.* Retrieved 7th January 2015 from www.ncceonline.edu.ng/

National Universities Commission (2015). *List of approved universities in Nigeria*. NUC Bulletin, 10(4), 26th January. 9.12

Oseni, M. (2012). Adequacy of budgetary allocation to educational institutions in Nigeria. *Pakistan Journal of Business and Economic Review 3(1)*, 143-157.

Oweh, I. (2014). *A case for better educational funding in Nigeria*. Daily Independence, Sunday November 9. Retrieved on 11th November 2014 from www.dailyindependentnig.com/2013/01/a-case-for-better-educational-funding-in-nigeria/

Sanusi, L. S. (2011). Infrastructure, industrialization and the Nigerian economy. Published as Nigeria's insfrastructure yet to meet requirements for economic development. *Business day, 2nd March.*

Teferra, D. and Altbach, P. G. (2004). African higher education: Challenges for the 21st century. *Kluwer Academic Publishers, Higher Education 47*, 21-50

Ubogu, R. E. (2011). Financing higher education in Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Education and Society, 2(1)* April, 36-45.

Uche, Ihugbe, O. A. and Nwosu, C. (2013). Casual relationship between Nigerian government budget allocation to education sector and economic growth. *Discourse Journal of Education Research, 1(8)*, August, 54-64.

UNESCO (2000). *The Dakar Framework for Action.* Dakar, Senegal, 26-8 April

United States Embassy in Nigeria (2012). *Nigeria education fact sheet.* Retrieved 7th January 2015 from www.photos.state.gov/libraries/nigeria/487468/.../January Education Fact Sheet...

Uzodinma, A. A. (2013). *Public-private partnership and Nigeria's development*. Retrieved on 31st October 2014 from www.unilorin.edu.ng/.../31

Wale, M. (2013). *Budgetary allocation to education sector*. Retrieved on 18th January 2015 from www.slideshare.net/statisense.

Wale, M. (2014). *Empirical analysis of 2014 education budget*. Retrieved on 18th January 2015 from www.slideshare.ne/statisense/empirical-analysis-of-2014-education-budget.

Wali-Uwais & Co (2004-2006). Developing pubic private partnerships for infrastructure development in Nigeria – fundamental of the contract agreement, contract management and dispute resolution. Retrieved on 4th November 2014 from www.wali-uwais.com/?page_id=780.

Wike, N. (2014a). *Four years after, stakeholders assess TETFund*. Nigerian Tribune, 20th March. Retrieved on 27th January 2015 from www.tribune.com.ng/eduation/item/1617/four-years-after-stakeholders-assess-tetfund1617.

Wike, N. (2014b). *FG spends ₦110bn on tertiary education in 3 years.* Leadership, March 11. Retrieved on 9th November 2014 from www.leadership.ng/news/.../fg-spends-₦110bn-tertiary-education-3-years-minister...

Wikipedia (2009). *Millennium development goals*. Retrieved on 2rd November 2014 from en.wikipedia.org/wiki/meillenium_Development_Goals

World Bank (2009). *The role and impact of public-private partnership in education*. The World Bank e-library.

World Bank (2012). *World Bank selected 20 countries annual budgetary allocation to education*. Washington D.C. The World Bank.

Contact email: ogocee2006@yahoo.com