Evaluation of Teaching Performance in the University Environment

Dr. Sushma H.B.

Assistant Professor

School of Education

Central University of Karnataka

Sushmahaigar@gmail.com

9980095126

ABSTRACT

The study attempts to unfold the significance of Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) on university academic staff members regarding their professional competence in teaching – learning process. Students rating of teaching is one of the most widely accepted method of measuring the quality of higher education worldwide. The overall experience gained by the students during their teaching-learning process is a key factor to determine the teaching competence of teachers. The success of teaching – learning process between the teacher and student depends upon better understanding and evaluation at regular intervals. The sample consists of 120 post graduate students of Gulbarga University. Hypotheses were tested for significance at 0.05 margins in error and it was found to be positively significant.

Keywords: Evaluation, Professional Competence, Effective Teacher, Teaching Competencies Teaching–Learning Process

INTRODUCTION

India ranks second in the educational system of the world, university in such system are tasked with imparting knowledge to the educational masses whose predominant function is teaching, research activities and lastly the much needed community service (Escrigas, Lobera and Team, 2009), which is mainly carried out and functioned through teaching and obviously learning process, resultantly teaching and learning becomes a key area for human development rendering behavioural change in learners, here in the process of teaching and learning genuinely impacts curricula were varied adopted methods bears fruit as

Journal for Studies in Management and Planning

Available at

http://edupediapublications.org/journals/index.php/JSMaP/

ISSN: 2395-0463

Volume 03 Issue 11
October 2017

motivation is ignited in the minds which is paramount, as present day learners are beyond just passive recipients in the information transfer model of high learning. Since universities are higher centers of learning, refined and specific knowledge is expected to be imparted over a given subject rather than become factories for production of collective uniform minds. It is imperative to produce skilled professionals in a given subject from the universities rather than confining itself to an institution distributing degrees (Alderidge and Rowley, 1998; Haunga and Fisher, 2011), and to achieve the given standards from universities teachers' proficiency and skilled knowledge commensurate to the existing standard is a dire requirement to grade teachers' professional competent.

To evaluate the professional competence of teachers, student's evaluations of teaching (SET) are currently the most commonly used method for evaluating teaching effectiveness. The National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) has already published the best practices in three areas namely (1) Internal Quality Assurance Cell Activities (2) Library and Information Services and (3) Community Engagements. The present volume deals with "the best practices in student's evaluation". In reality students evaluation or their feedback should be given more thrust than any other measures of teaching such as peer evaluation, faculty self-reports or individual teaching portfolio (Comm and Manthaisal, 1998; Seldin, 1993). The use of student's evaluations of teaching also gives students an important opportunity to effectively contribute to the teaching–learning process. Apart from teaching teachers should possess the capacity to diagnose students initial behaviour, develop lesson plans, administration, communicate and develop themselves as well as the students potential (Rusman.2010). This is related to the professional aspects of teacher (Betoret, 2007; Dharaskar, 2004; Sanjaya, 2010).

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Teaching is complex and confines to personal activity. The resultant success of teaching and learning process is based on the well-knit understanding and evaluation at regular intervals. Such an evaluation helps to fill the gap between what is taught and what is learnt, how teacher has planned and developed her content and expected results from students through her teaching. In the Universities setup of evaluating of teachers by students regarding teaching – learning process is one of the important components expected

Journal for Studies in Management and Planning

Available at
http://edupediapublications.org/journals/index.php/JSMaP/

ISSN: 2395-0463

Volume 03 Issue 11
October 2017

by NAAC. Thus the feedback mechanism by students plays important role which has resulted in conducting this study

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

"EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE IN THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT"

DEFINITION OF KEY-TERMS

Evaluation

Paul (1976) defined evaluation as both a judgement on the worth or impact of a programme, procedure or individual and the process whereby judgement is made.
Yoloye (1981) defined evaluation as the assigning of some values to an entity in relation to some criteria values or objectives.

Professional competence

Defined as the teachers' capability to master their subjects in-depth and the way to appropriately deliver it to the students. (BSNP, 2009; Hung, etal, 2007; Rusman, 2010).
The capacity to perform the duties of one's professional generally or to perform a particular professional task with skill of an acceptable quality.

Effective Teacher

Clark (1993, p. 10) wrote that, "Obviously, the definition involves someone who can increase student knowledge, but it goes beyond this in defining an effective teacher."

Vogt (1984) related effective teaching to the ability to provide instruction to different students of different abilities while incorporating instructional objectives and assessing the effective learning mode of the students.

Teaching Competencies

Minimum of knowledge, information, skills and innovative capacity and productivity that must be gained by teacher to carryout his/her work during the service.

Teaching – Learning

Teaching- Is a skill that can be improved and teachers are at different developmental level.

Learning- Is commonly defined as a process that bring together cognitive, emotional and environmental influences and experiences for acquiring, enhancing or making changes in ones knowledge , skills, values and world views. (Illeres, 2000; Ormorod, 1995)

LITERATURE REVIEW

Several rating systems are adopted by the Higher Education Institutions to rank the Quality of teaching and learning process (Rubaish *et al*., 2011; Malaysian Higher

Journal for Studies in Management and Planning
Available at
http://edupediapublications.org/journals/index.php/JSMaP/

ISSN: 2395-0463

Volume 03 Issue 11
October 2017

Education rating system, 2011; NACCC, 2010). Students Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) is considered as an effective method for monitoring the quality of teaching and learning process in the Higher Education Institutions (Greenwald, 1997). The assessment of Educational Quality under an academic program, through students" satisfaction, is one of the important aspects regarding quality management in Higher education (Rubaish, 2010). Also, several studies indicated that the student ratings are the widely accepted measures for evaluating teaching quality (Moore and Kuol, 2005; Franklin, 2001). Students Evaluating Teaching (SET) are often used by many institutions as the sole measure of teacher effectiveness (Washburn and Thornton, 1996; Wilson, 1998). Research has shown that teaching effectiveness is multidimensional (Marsh, 2001; Gage & Berliner, 1992; Huitt, 1995). Some indicators/components (e.g., communication skills, attitude toward the students, knowledge of the subject, organizational skills, enthusiasm, fairness, flexibility, and encouragement of students) are identified to be strongly related to teaching effectiveness (Kim, Damewood, & Hodge, 2000). (Toland & Alyala, 2005) identified three dimensions of teaching effectiveness namely, instructor delivery

of course information, instructor-student interaction, and regulation of students' learning. (Marsh & Roche, 1997) identified nine dimensions: learning/value, enthusiasm, organizing, group interaction, relationship with students, extent of coverage, examination and grading, assignments, and workload/difficulty.(Jackson and et al, 1999) identified the following six factors: relationship with students, course value, organization, grading, difficulty, and workload. Similarly, (Gursoy & Umbreit, 2005) identified four factors: learning, instruction, organization, and workload as effective teaching measures. (Marks, 2000) identified five dimensions: organization, workload, expected grades, teacher's concern, and learning. In the UAE, (Badri, Abdulla, Kamali, & Dodeen, 2006) identified five factors of teaching effectiveness: knowledge and performance in teaching, grading, and overview of the course, requirements/efforts, and course outcomes.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To study how effectively teachers plans the lesson.
2. To understand how effectively teachers develops the knowledge in students.

Journal for Studies in Management and Planning

Available at
http://edupediapublications.org/journals/index.php/JSMaP/

ISSN: 2395-0463

Volume 03 Issue 11
October 2017

3. To study the expectation of the teachers from the students through teaching- learning process.

HYPOTHESES

1. There would be significant effect on lesson planned by teachers in teaching-learning process.

2. There would be significant effect on lesson developed by teachers in teaching-learning process.

3. There would be significant effect on result expected by teachers through his/her teaching-learning process.

METHODOLOGY

A survey method was conducted to collect the data from respondents.

- **Population and Sample**

The population for this investigation consists of 120 post graduate students from various departments of Gulbarga University, Kalaburagi.

- **Tool**

The data was collected from post graduate students by administering questionnaire on "Evaluation of Teaching Performance in the University Environment". The questionnaire consist of three factors (1) Planning- with four items 4, 20, 21, 22. (2)

Development- with sixteen items 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9,10,11,12,13,15,16,17,18,19,23, 26 (3) Result-with seven items 5, 6,14, 24 ,25, 27.The internal consistency of each of the factors resulting from the factor analysis (Cronbach's alpha) presented the following results: 0.70 for **Planning,** 0.91 for **Development** and 0.79 for **Result**. Considering all of the items in a single factor, the consistency obtained was 0.94.developed by Juan Antonio etal (2014).

- **Procedure**

For the present study the investigator visited the library which is the hub of the university and distributed the questionnaire for the post graduate students and explained them the purpose and questionnaire were collected back after getting filled. Based on the obtained data one sample "t" test, statistical analysis was tested using SPSS 20 and the significance level for all the analysis was set at 0.05.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 01. Mean scores, Standard deviation, "t" and Significant value of lesson planned by teacher

01. There would be significant effect on lesson planned by teachers in teaching-learning process.

VARIABLE	N	MEAN SCORES	STANDARD DEVIATION	"t" VALUE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
LESSON PLANNED BY TEACHER	120	6.5000	1.06116	-1171.676	0.000*

NOTE*= SIGNIFICANCE AT 0.05 LEVEL

The one sample "t" test table 01 shows the N=120, mean value 6.5000, standard deviation 1.06116 and calculated "t" value -1171.676 and obtained significant value 0.000 is significant at 0.05 level . This shows the lesson planned by teachers is found be effective. Hence the hypothesis can be stated as. There is a significant effect on lesson planned by teachers in teaching-learning process.

Table 02. Mean scores, Standard deviation, "t" and Significant value of lesson developed by teacher

02. There would be significant effect on lesson developed by teachers in teaching-learning process.

VARIABLE	N	MEAN SCORES	STANDARD DEVIATION	"t" VALUE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
LESSON DEVELOPED BY TEACHER	120	27.9000	3.46265	-291.368	0.000*

NOTE*= SIGNIFICANCE AT 0.05 LEVEL

The one sample "t" test table 02 shows the N=120, mean value 27.9000, standard deviation 3.46265 and calculated "t" value -291.368 and obtained significant value 0.000 is significant at 0.05 level . This shows the lesson developed by teachers is found be effective. Hence the hypothesis can be stated as, There is a significant effect on lesson developed by teachers in teaching-learning process.

Table 03. Mean scores, Standard deviation, "t" and Significant value of result expected by teacher

03. There would be significant effect on result expected by teachers through his/her teaching-learning process.

VARIABLE	N	MEAN SCORES	STANDARD DEVIATION	"t" VALUE	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
RESULT EXPECTED BY TEACHER	120	11.7333	1.92172	-6.17.157	0.000*

NOTE*= SIGNIFICANCE AT 0.05 LEVEL

The one sample "t" test table 02 shows the N=120, mean value 11.7333, standard deviation 1.92171 and calculated "t" value -617.157 and obtained significant value 0.000 is significant at 0.05 level . This shows the results expected by teachers through his/her teaching –learning process is found be effective. Hence the hypothesis can be stated as, There is a significant effect on result expected by teachers through his/ her teaching-learning process.

FINDINGS

01. There is a significant effect on lesson planned by teachers in teaching-learning process.

02. There is a significant effect on lesson developed by teachers in teaching-learning process.

03. There is a significant effect on result expected by teachers through his/ her teaching- learning process.

LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

Even though, student's surveys are practiced in most of the countries, a number of limitations of students surveys have been reported (Yorke, 2009).As the present study was limited to Gulbarga University students, though the best attempt were made to obtain the reliable data some lapses cannot be ruled out due to wrong information provided by the respondent and students being bias and showing favoritism with respective teachers and the questionnaire might have missed to cover major aspects.

SUGGESTION AND CONCLUSION

Student Evaluation of Teaching is considered to be one of the most important Criteria for sustaining professional development in teaching. A good quality teaching by teachers produces quality learning that creates quality students. Thus student's evaluation of teacher's competencies in teaching has made a difference, it is more than adequate in terms of reliability and validity. Student's evaluation of teaching has value and is worth keeping. Such evaluation helps the teacher to find out what changes they might make in teaching methods or styles, course organisation or content in order to make themselves more efficient and professionally competent and also to improve student's standard of learning. Information obtained by means of student evaluation can also be used by individual teachers to improve the course in future years, and to identify areas of strength and weakness in their teaching by comparison with those teaching similar courses.

REFERENCES

1.Badri, M. A., Abdulla, M., Kamali, M., & Dodeen, H. (2006). Identifying potential

biasing variables in student evaluation of teaching in a newly accredited business program in the UAE. International Journal of Educational Management, 20 (1), pp. 43-59.

2.Clark, D. (1993, June). Teacher evaluation: A review of the literature with implications for educators. Unpublished Seminar Paper, California State University at Long Beach.

3.Comm, C. L., & Manthaisel, D. F. (1998). Evaluating teaching effectiveness in America's business schools: Implications for service marketers. Journal of Professional Service Marketing, 16(2), pp. 163-170.

4.Escrigas, C; Lobra, J; et.al (2009). Higher Education at a time of transformation: New dynamics for social responsibility. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

5.Franklin, J. (2001). Interpreting the numbers using a narrative to help others read student evaluations of your teaching accurately. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, pp. 87:85–100.

6.Gage, N. L., & Berliner, D. C. (1992). Educational psychology, Boston, MA: Houghton, Mifflin Company.

7.Gary, M., & Bergmann, B. R. (2003). Student teaching evaluation: Inaccurate, demeaning, misused. Academe, 89 (5), pp. 44-46.

8.Greenwald, A. G. (1997). Validity concerns and usefulness of student ratings of instruction. American Psychologist, 52(11), pp. 1182-1186.

9.Gursoy, D., & Umbreit, W. T. (2005). Exploring students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness: What factors are important? Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, 29(1), pp. 91-109.

10.Huitt, W. (1995). A system model of teaching/learning process. Educational Psychology Interactive. Valdosta, GA: College of Education, Valdosta State University.

11.Jackson, D. L., Teal, C. R., Raines, S. J., Nansel, T. R., Force, R. C., & Burdsal, C. A. (1999). The dimensions of students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59 (4), pp. 580-596.

12. Juan, A., Yolanda,S.,Noelia,B. (2014). Questionnaire Evaluating Teaching Competencies in the University Environment .Evaluation of teaching competencies in the University.New Approaches in Education Research, 4(1), pp. 54-61

13.Malaysian Higher Education Institution Rating System (SETARA-2011). Malaysia Research Assessment Instrument 2011, Retrieved from: http://www.studymalaysia.com/education/art_usefultips.php?id=setara.

Marks, R. B. (2000). Determinants of student evaluations of global measures of instructor and course value. Journal of Marketing Education, 22 (2),pp. 108-119.

14.Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1993). The use of students' evaluation and an individually structured intervention to enhance university teaching effectiveness. American Educational Research Journal, 30, pp. 217-251.

15.Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1997). Making students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective. American Psychologist, 52, pp. 1187-1197.

16.Marsh, H. W. (2001). Distinguishing between good (useful) and bad workloads on students' evaluations of teaching. American Educational Research Journal, 38(1), pp. 183-212.

17.Moore, S. & Kuol, N. (2005). Students evaluating teachers: exploring the importance of faculty reaction to feedback on teaching. Teaching in Higher Education, 10(1), pp. 57–73.

18.National Commission for Higher Education Institutions (NACCC): Self Evaluation scales for Higher Education Institutions, February 2010. Retrieved from: www.ncaaa.org.sa

19.Rifkin, T. (1995). The status and scope of faculty evaluation. (ERIC Reproduction Services No. ED 385315).

20.Rubaish, A. (2010). On the Contribution of Student Experience Survey Regarding Quality Management in Higher Education: An Institutional Study in Saudi Arabia. Journal of Service Science and Management, 3(4), pp. 464-469.

21.Rubaish, A., Wosornu, L., & Dwivedi, S. (2011). Using Deductions from Assessment Studies towards Furtherance of the Academic Program: An Empirical Appraisal of Institutional Student Course Evaluation. iBusiness, 3(2), pp. 220-228.

22.Rusman. Model-Model Pembelajaran Mengembangkan Profesionalisme Guru. Bandung: Rajawali Pres. 2010.

23.Seldin, P. (1993). The use and abuse of student ratings of instruction. The Chronicle of Higher Education, A-40.

24.Toland, M. D., & Ayala, R. J. (2005). A multilevel factor analysis of students' evaluation of teaching. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 65(2), pp. 272-296.

25.Washburn, K., & Thornton, J. F. (1996). Dumbing down: Essays on the strip mining of American culture. New York: Norton.

26.Wilson, R. (1998). New research casts doubt on value of student evaluations of

professors. Chronicle of Higher Education, 44(19), A1Vogt, W. (1984). Developing a teacher evaluation system. Spectrum, 2(1), pp. 41-46.

27.Yorke, M. (2009). Students Experience surveys: Some methodological considerations and an empirical investigation, 34(6), pp. 721-739.