



META EVALUATION OF A TEACHERS' EVALUATION PROGRAMME USING CIPP MODEL

Dr. Muhammad Abdul Wahid Usmani,

Director, Quality Enhancement Cell,

Dow University of Health Sciences, Baba-e-Urdu Road, Karachi – Pakistan



Dr. Muhammad Abdul Wahid Usmani is the Director of Quality Enhancement Cell at Dow University of Health Sciences and serves as a consultant of Quality in Higher education for different universities. He has completed his Doctoral Research in Psychometric Testing and also holds masters in English Linguistics and Literature. He has been actively involved in Teacher Education and ELT projects both in the public and private sector and has conducted number of worktops on Assessment, Evaluation, Communication Skills and Educational Research. He was nominated as a resource person for a provincial level teachers training programme of Middle School project, Education Department, Govt. of Sindh. He has supervised more than ten MA TEFL Thesis programme and has also taught different MA language and literature courses at National University of Modern Languages Karachi Campus. He has presented several research papers in national and international conferences in Pakistan and abroad. In addition, he is the assistant editor of the research journal of Dow University of Health Sciences.



META EVALUATION OF A TEACHERS' EVALUATION PROGRAMME USING CIPP MODEL

Dr. Muhammad Abdul Wahid Usmani,

Director, Quality Enhancement Cell,

Dow University of Health Sciences, Baba-e-Urdu Road, Karachi – Pakistan

ABSTRACT

Teachers' Evaluation Programmes have become a regular feature of many public sector universities in Pakistan. However, the evaluators in each university have different practices to conduct teachers' evaluation and there is no uniformity in teachers' evaluation programmes throughout Pakistan. Furthermore, there is no system in place to evaluate the teachers' evaluation programme itself.

This paper uses CIPP model of evaluation to examine the "Teachers' Evaluation System" of a public sector university in Pakistan. CIPP stands for context, input, process and product and it provides comprehensive framework for evaluation of programmes, products and system. The university under study introduced teachers' evaluation programme in different departments and the results were analyzed and reported to various stake holders of the university.

In this study, the "Teachers Evaluation Programme" of the university has been analyzed on four levels of CIPP model

- Context Evaluation: The context of the evaluation programme has been examined and how it led to modifications has been highlighted.
- Input Evaluation: Input given in this programme, its sources, validity and its efficacy has been examined
- Process Evaluation: The process of teachers evaluation programme, its handling of data and reporting strategies have been evaluated.
- Product Evaluation: Finally, the output of the entire exercise of teachers' evaluation and the impact on stakeholders has been addressed.

The findings of the study clearly indicate that context needs to be examined thoroughly before any input. Secondly, due care is required in the selection of questions for evaluation and the tool must be tailor made. Thirdly, the process must be transparent and objective in nature. The reporting should include the follow up required so that the utility of the programme may be established. Finally post evaluation effect must be observed for improvement in future.

Though the study is based on a specific programme of a university, the structure and findings can be replicated in other context as well.

INTRODUCTION:

Teachers' Evaluation has been a subject of great interest for many educationists and many methods have been suggested for Teachers' Evaluation. Some of the methods include Classroom Observation, Competence Testing, Peer Review, and Students' Achievement and

Students' Rating. All such methods of Teachers' Evaluation have their relative pros and cons; however, the need for Teachers' Evaluation remains there for the provision of quality education. In Pakistan, the concept of Teachers' Evaluation is mostly limited to Students' Rating Classroom Observation, and Students' Achievement in the criterion referenced exams. Even these methods are applicable to private sector institutions. In the state owned institutions, there was no concept of Teachers' Evaluation; however, a gradual shift was observed when institutions of Higher Education in the public sector were directed to introduce Students' Rating of teachers. Since this was new to many institutions, a general pro forma was circulated for all the public sector institutions. However, there is no or little uniformity in the process of teachers evaluation programme. Furthermore, there is no system in place to evaluate teachers evaluation programme itself.

The researchers work for a quality assurance centre of a public sector medical university where they implemented a teachers' evaluation programme through students rating in one of the constituent colleges of the university.

The objective of this paper is to do meta-evaluation of this "Teachers' Evaluation Programme" using CIPP model. The acronyms of the model stand for Context, Input, process and Product. The rationale of the study is that evaluators themselves should conduct formative and summative meta-evaluation of their programmes. Former to examine the potential of the programme and later to see whether it has been done the way it was planned and to bring necessary changes for future (Daniel L. 2003).

What is already known about the subject?

Over the last few years, a great emphasis has been laid upon faculty development programs within and or outside the higher education institutions. Considering Teachers' Evaluation as an essential outset to determine the performance of each and every faculty member, many institutions, whether public or private, have adopted various parameters to be used as performance measures to serve the desired purpose. Paulsen & Feldman (1995) consider "rigorous evaluation of teaching" as one of the most significant characteristics of a healthy and conducive 'teaching environment' that leads to remarkable improvements in teaching practices. Priest (1967) shares the same idea. He regards 'evaluation as an inherent element of any organized effort to achieve the goal.' Teaching and learning are on going processes; teachers have to gain updated knowledge, relevant skills, complete awareness of the core requirements of the subject, the market value and the match between market demand and academia as well as the psychological needs of their target audience/ learners so that they can satisfy them to a larger extent. The changes resulting from such awareness and learning can be measured through Teachers' Evaluation aiming to determine the extent to which desired changes take place. (Mirajuddin et al-2006).

The most commonly used source to collect feedback/data for Teachers' Evaluation is rating done by students. Generally speaking, the scholars/educators who have worked in this particular area fall into two broad groups; one that favors Students' Evaluation and finds it reliable and valid and the other that shows certain level of distrust in Students' Rating. Mc Keache (1969) advocates for evaluation and believes that "students' ratings do have some validity and teachers rated as 'effective' by students tend to be those teachers who they learn most from." Murray (1995) has also called the "first hand observers in classes"; students can evaluate not only the performance of teachers but also their behavior and by doing so they play a

crucial role “in assisting teachers to improve their teaching and behavior”. He suggests that instead of getting offended, teachers should respect students’ feedback and use it for their self improvement. Rifkin (1995) too, holds the same opinion that “students’ evaluation aims primarily, to facilitate faculty growth, development and self improvement.”

On the other hand, James R. Martin (1998) argues that “students’ opinions should not be used to evaluate the efficacy and quality of teaching for a number of reasons. Firstly, they are invalid because they provide no empirical evidence. Secondly, they are invalid because they are incomparable across different courses and different faculty members. Finally, they are invalid because they promote faculty gaming and competition and insure the sub optimization and further decline of the higher education system.” Similarly, despite the fact that the major source of Teachers’ Evaluation is the feedback from students, the faculty, too, has certain reservations and misgivings on the validity and reliability of students’ rating and most of the faculty members look upon students’ ratings as ‘meaningless, inappropriate and biased’. (Michael B.2002). Cashin (1995) in this connection asserts that “bias may be present when instructor, student, course, or administrative variables are correlated with students’ ratings but are “not related to teaching effectiveness.” As student ratings are widely used resource to evaluate teachers’ performance in higher education institutions, this method is considered as inexpensive and therefore is highly reliable yet “questions of validity and bias remain”. (Darling-Hammond and others, 1983)

The arguments or objections that are usually raised by the faculty against students’ ratings to evaluate teachers’ performances include students’ favoritism or biased attitude towards certain teachers as students tend to get easily influenced by the empowering personalities or by those who mesmerize them or entertain them by using evocative language/ communication skills or by those who display a good deal of knowledge of the world whether relevant or irrelevant to the subject being taught. In such cases according to the faculty view, students’ ratings can not be considered to be fair. John C. Ory (2001) in his article ‘Faculty Thoughts and Concerns About Student Ratings’ answers these objections/ concerns quoting significant researchers to support his point. First of all, he quotes a phrase, “Hardness of head and softness of heart” by Goldsmid, Gruber, and Wilson, (1977) to give students’ definition of ‘excellence in teaching.’ He further elaborates the idea saying that students are very conscious in their ratings. They approve ‘neither the stand-up comic with no content expertise, nor the cold- fish expert with only content expertise.’ They want a perfect balance in their instructors having command on their subject along with a very good sense of humor. This is what the research has proven that students get influenced not exactly by what the teachers are but what they do in their teaching. (Erdle, Murray, and Rushton, 1985).

Another charge against students’ ratings being biased is that students take certain courses for granted such as compulsory courses or low level courses and so the ratings of the teachers who teach these courses ultimately go low. There is a lot of research conducted to support the view that ‘ratings in elective courses are higher than in required courses.’ (Costin, Greenough, and Menges, 1971; Feldman, 1978; McKeachie, 1979; Marsh, 1984) and ‘ratings in higher-level courses tend to be higher than in lower-level courses’ (Aleamoni and Graham, 1974; Bausell and Bausell, 1979; Feldman, 1978; Kulik and McKeachie, 1975). Then, the class size is another hindrance for certain teachers in getting high scores because the teachers who deal with low number of students can not be expected to gain the same scores as of those dealing with large number of students like 300 or above. But again John C. Ory cites the example from the research conducted by Feldman (1978) who found an average correlation of -.09 between class size and

students rating items collected in classes of different sizes. Cashin (1992) has also supported this view by asserting that “take alone, class size is not a serious source of bias”. Finally, Centra (1993) discovered that “rating differences due to class size have little practical significance”.

The current paper is based on CIPP model. The model began back in 1965 and has been practiced widely for evaluations of programmes, projects, products and systems; the acronyms stand for Context, Input, Process and Product. Stufflebeam L. (2003) summarizes the model for each acronym and provides a checklist as well for evaluators. He asserts that Context Evaluation provides needs, problems and opportunities within the programme which help in making value decisions. Input Evaluation provides the insight into the action plan, tools and their relevance with the identified needs. Process Evaluation highlights the features of process, its strengths and weaknesses and its comparison with similar programmes. Finally, Product Evaluation leads to several conclusions regarding impact, effectiveness and transportability of the programme.

In addition, the reason why this model has been chosen for evaluation is that it also provides framework for conducting retrospective, summative evaluations to serve a broad range of stakeholders. The stakeholders need such report in order to see the quality, cost effectiveness and utility of such programmes (Stufflebeam L, 2003).

Methodology of the Study:

As stated earlier, the current study is a summative meta-evaluation carried on Teachers’ Evaluation Programme using CIPP model of evaluation.

The organization of the paper is in three fold. At first the theoretical framework has been given for viewing evaluation in broader scenario. Secondly, programme context, given input, followed process, and received product of this teacher evaluation programme have been described. Finally, their critical evaluation has been given. This evaluation at each level is based on the checklist provided by Stufflebeam (2003,a)

This three fold strategy would first equip the reader with the framework of the evaluation. Then, it would provide the stages of the Teachers’ Evaluation Programme as they were run at the college. Finally, it would give the reader critical evaluation at all four levels i.e. context, input, process and product. For those who implemented this programme, the study would not prove but will improve the programme in future. (Stufflebeam-2003-a).

Context Evaluation:

The Programme was implemented in a constituent college of a university. It is a medical college having seven departments of basic medical sciences with more than eight teachers teaching around 1200 students. The college was under the management of provincial health department of the Government. Later the university was established and it became its constituent college. There was no documented system of monitoring and evaluation of academic activities. Thus the teachers as well as students enjoyed great liberty. The former had no obligation to take classes on regular basis, nor was there any evaluation by student. Similarly, the latter had no compulsion to attend classes. Thus, there was good attendance in the class of teachers who were well prepared. In most cases, the interaction between teachers and students was least effective. Although, after the establishment of the university, the college became one of its constituent

colleges, the mind sets of teachers and students remained the same. The accountability was verbal and feed back of teaching and learning was disorganized. Under these circumstances the evaluators initiated Teachers' Evaluation programme using students rating.

Discussion:

The context explained leads to a very crucial question: "Were important needs addressed? The context reveals that the programme lacks identification of needs. Since it was a college, the scope of teaching and learning was also limited. Teachers were not familiar with structured students rating system. Thus, the teaching methodology was also less organized. Similarly students who were the ultimate respondent had never experienced such system which might affect the quality of data. Finally the awareness of both the stake holders i.e. teachers and students along with administrative head should have been done well before the implementation of the programme. In short, no insight was gained before the implementation of the programme.

Input Evaluation:

The input for this evaluation programme was three fold. At first, a questionnaire was provided by the Higher Education Commission to the university s' Quality Assurance Cell. It had eighteen questions with a rating scale from 'A to E' .i.e. from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' (Appendix A). This questionnaire was tailored by the cell according to universities' needs as some questions were not applicable to medical college context. After tailoring, there were twenty questions altogether (Appendix B). There were more than eighty teachers dealing with seven courses in the first four years. For logistics reasons, it was not possible to conduct individual teacher's Evaluation as each class had more than 300 students. Thus, the second input tool was prepared. It was a list of teachers for each year. Against each name, twenty question numbers were given (Appendix C). A power point presentation was prepared containing one question on a slide with options.

Discussion:

First of all, the question of the appropriateness and the usefulness of input rose. At first the questionnaire, provided to the evaluators, had some questions which were not according to needs. For example 'fairness in examination' and 'returns the graded script in a reasonable amount of time' are the two statements which did not match the context since they are suitable for a semester system education only. So the evaluators were justified in rephrasing those questions. Similarly, a statement "subject matter presented in the course has increased the knowledge of the subject" does not seem to be teacher-oriented but is more towards students' self assessment. Secondly, the document finally implemented in all sessions of the evaluation also had some short comings. Since the courses offered are too extensive, there are many teachers involved in teaching; and even in a specific course outline, segments or topics are allocated to teachers. Thus, the question of "Instructor has completed the whole course" was redundant in this case.

Similarly, the questions on teacher's giving "assignment and projects" and providing "course outline" which have been given in the HEC tailor made copy were not appropriate in the given context. Since the annual system of exam was in practice in the medical college, the assignment had no role. Similarly, the course outlines could not be developed as integrated

approach made the course just topic based. Finally, the list of teachers prepared was cost effective and time saving; however, it might have led to comparison among teachers. Furthermore, the list was so long that it was quite probable that students might choose to be giving sweeping judgments. The rows had twenty columns may cause a wrong entry by the students for the last few questions.

However, the input tools and strategy were quite focused and cost effective as compared to other universities where the handling of data and implementation have always been a significant issue.

Process Evaluation:

The process of Teachers' Evaluation by students was as follows:

It was assumed that students of a particular year should not evaluate the same year as they might be penalized in their practical examination, so the Final year students evaluated the teachers who taught them in fourth year and the fourth year students evaluated third year teachers. Thus, each class from final to second year evaluated the previous class. The students were asked to stay in class after routine classes of each year and they were given the form containing teachers' names and the subject they studied in the previous year. One of the faculty members volunteered to coordinate this programme. The evaluators asked the coordinator from college to stay for students' management in the first evaluation. Later, the evaluators gave a brief speech highlighting the rationale of evaluation of teachers and stated the role of students. Then, the presentation of the questionnaire started and students read each question, took time to respond for each teacher in the list. The evaluators explained each question for students as well. After the evaluation, the answer sheets were collected and brought to the concerned department. Same process was used for evaluation of teachers for each academic year.

Later, these forms were coded and the options from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' were given marks for preparing evaluation results on marks gained basis. Each 'Strongly agree' was given 4 marks, 'agree' 3 marks, 'somewhat' 2 marks, 'disagree' 1 mark and 'strongly disagree' carried zero. However, it was not explicitly communicated to students about the numbers which each option carried.

The results were prepared in two formats. One format was prepared for individual teacher containing his/her results in each question and total score at the end. It also showed the rank of the teacher in the department and college for each question (Appendix D). The second format was prepared for evaluators and decision makers. It showed the results of all teachers in each question. So it was question wise results showing the ranks in the department and college (Appendix E).

The names of 'Top Three Scorers' were written on each result. Finally, these result sheets were sealed and sent to concerned teachers through the Principal of the college. It was decided to communicate the results to teachers only in the first evaluation as the teacher must know the criteria set in the evaluation programme. The analysis of questions revealed that for some questions, the responses were not consistent. So they were discussed with concerned faculty members and it was learnt that they did not apply to teachers. For example, the question on 'fairness in assessment of instructor' had inconsistent responses.

Discussion:

The third question in the process evaluation that may be raised is “Was the program executed competently and fulfilled the needs identified earlier?” In the first place, the students were asked to evaluate at the end of a routine lecture. This was done without consideration of attendance or willingness. The record shows that most of the students have short of attendance. This aspect was rectified in the second session of the same program by adding a column asking about students’ attendance with each instructor. Secondly, the choice of previous year’s teachers’ evaluation does not have sound justification. There was a gap of more than five months for third year students who evaluated teachers of second year. Such an extensive gap would certainly weaken their memory about individual faculty member. The evaluation should be done in the same class at the end of the session. However, the results may be communicated after the academic year so that students’ fear of being penalized would not be there.

The process analysis of the data on numeric basis may not be justified unless students are explicitly communicated the relation between options of questions and their numeric value. The students were given an opportunity to view Likert Scale from “Strongly Agree as option A” to “Strongly Disagree as option E” with each question. In the analysis, “E” was given ‘Zero’ and “A” was given ‘4’. The evaluators argue that “Strongly Disagree” means ‘never done’, so it must carry ‘Zero’. Similarly, “Disagree” only means ‘seldom practice’ so on and so forth. If this argument is accepted, the other part of reservation remains true that students should have been communicated the fact that what score each letter carries.

Finally, the score in each question and department and university ranking for each question gives a very clear picture to the teachers evaluated as they would learn about their position within the department and the college. Similarly, the decision makers would get a holistic picture of the work efficiency of the entire faculty as perceived by students.

Product Evaluation:

Both positive and negative criticism was received. For some teachers, it was a challenge for them and they communicated that they started bringing changes in their teaching. However, some senior faculty members sent criticism in writing. Phrases like “Biased” “Planned” and “Insane” were used. The evaluator also received letters from junior faculty members stating their concerns on the impact of such evaluations. Some of the faculty members appreciated the programme and mentioned the change in practices after the feedback from students.

Students were dubious about the impact of such practice as it was a new thing for them and they were not sure of sustainability of such practices in state owned institutions.

Later, the same method was used to evaluate the teachers of other colleges of the university after considering the feed back of the first programme. The same was shared with other evaluators of different universities and their positive feedback and desire to replicate the system in their own context also show the success of the programme.

Discussion:

Product Evaluation may further be divided into impact, effectiveness, sustainability and transportability. Since the programme has completed the first phase, there is a continuing impact and effectiveness till the point of Meta Evaluation. The first impact that was received immediately after communicating the results of the evaluation was the letter which was further discussed with other stakeholders. It was noted that the ultimate reason for the criticism was of not taking stake holders into confidence at preparatory stage. The Faculty should have been well informed about the procedure in advance. Similarly, the presence of a faculty member for classroom management purpose led to conclusion of bias as the said faculty member had good students' rating.

Then, the letter from new faculty members leads to the very fact that the evaluation and its results mattered a lot and positive long term impact may be expected. Furthermore, the other stakeholders' reaction towards this evaluation was quite positive. They mentioned that they started the practice of preparing lectures before hand with updated material.

The effectiveness of the programme in terms of nature, cost and success was quite high as compared to other similar practices elsewhere through out Pakistan. One of the issues of large data was pointed out in regular meetings by other evaluators of the similar programme in terms of the large data and their handling, their cost and their analysis. On the other hand, this programme was designed in such a way that large data were collected on some sheets. Their handling became easier and analysis was such that the other evaluators of similar programme collected a copy of it. Further effects and impact may be evaluated after the 2nd year of evaluation which has been planned.

As far as sustainability is concerned, it was noted although the evaluation was conducted in 4 sessions having sufficient time difference, the programme sustained. It was also noted that tailoring of the questionnaire and improvements continued. In a follow up meeting, the faculty were communicated the feedback. Their reaction showed their concerns. In addition, the managers of the programme (Principal and Coordinators of the college) admitted the effectiveness and chalked out a yearly cycle of the same programme.

The transportability aspect has also been found very significant. The interest of other evaluators of similar programs in using similar methodology shows transportability of the program. Similarly, the same program was conducted in other constituent colleges of the same university and it yielded the same results.

Thus, the product evaluation of the program leads to the conclusion that the overall impact and effectiveness is ongoing. For the purpose of sustainability and transportability, the program context and process should include the participation of the faculty as well.

CONCLUSION:

The current study was Meta Evaluation of a Teachers' Evaluation Program using CIPP Model conducted by the evaluators of the program for preparing a summative report of the program so that results of each level of evaluation would lead to further improvement in the program.

This Meta Evaluation leads to several conclusions. First of all, the program context was not appropriately studied and participants were not taken into confidence. Secondly, though the tool was tailored according to needs, the content validity was not ensured. Therefore, few questions were not relevant in the first session. Thirdly, though the process was transparent, the responses may have been sweeping because of the structure of the response sheet. A separate study may provide some more information in this connection. Finally, the product in terms of impact and effectiveness was quite positive and even negative criticism shows the concerns of stakeholders. The feedback session to the faculty members provides a clearer picture and transportability leads to the conclusion that the program would lead to long term impacts not for its stakeholders only but for other intended stakeholders of similar program too.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Following are some recommendations that can be taken into consideration for the next phase of Teachers' Evaluation Program at the same university or intended elsewhere in order to achieve more fruitful results.

First of all, in the given context of the public sector institutions where job is not at stake from the results of such evaluation, the faculty members must be taken into confidence about the input, process, and intended outcomes. Secondly, due care should be given in the selection of questions to be asked. At first, content validity must be ensured by consulting some of the faculty members of that discipline because certain questions do not apply to a specific academic program. Not only this, but if possible, a pilot study would also show the appropriateness of the process in the given context. Moreover, the evaluation session should be conducted in the presence of some faculty members who are not the subject of evaluation for that session. This would increase the reliability and authenticity of the program.

REFERENCES:

- 1) Aleamoni, L. M., and Graham, N. H. "The Relationship Between CEQ Ratings and Instructor's Rank, Class Size, and Course Level." *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 1974, 11, 189–201.
- 2) Bausell, R. B., and Bausell, C. R. "Student Ratings and Various Instructional Variables from a Within-Instructor Perspective." *Research in Higher Education*, 1979, 11, 167–177.
- 3) Cashin, W. E. *Student Ratings of Teaching: The Research Revisited*. Idea Paper, no. 32. Manhattan, Kans.: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Faculty Development, Kansas State University, 1995.
- 4) Centra, J. A. *Reflective Faculty Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993b.
- 5) Costin, F., Greenough, W. T., and Menges, R. J. "Student Ratings of College Teaching: Reliability, Validity, and Usefulness." *Review of Educational Research*, 1971, 41, 511–535.
- 6) Darling-Hammond, L., and others. "Teacher Evaluation in the Organizational Context: A Review of the Literature." *REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH* 53, 3 (Fall 1983): 285-328.
- 7) Erdle, S., Murray, H. G., and Rushton, J. P. "Personality, classroom, behavior, and College teaching effectiveness: A path analysis." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1985, 77, 394–407.

- 8) Feldman, K. A. "Course Characteristics and College Students' Ratings of Their Teachers and Courses: What We Know and What We Don't." *Research in Higher Education*, 1978, 9, 199–242.
- 9) Goldsmid, C. A., Gruber, M. E., and Wilson, E. K. "Perceived Attributes of Superior Teachers (PAST): An Inquiry into the Giving of Teaching Awards." *American Educational Research Journal*, 1977, 14, 423–440.
- 10) James R. Martin, J 1998. Evaluating faculty based on student opinions: Problems, implications and recommendations from Deming's theory of management perspective. *Issues in Accounting Education* (November): 1079-1094.
- 11) John C. Ory: Faculty Thoughts and Concern about Student Ratings. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no, 87, Fall 2001.
- 12) Kulik, J. A., and McKeachie, W. J. "The Evaluation of Teachers in Higher Education." In F. N. Kerlinger (ed.), *Review of Research in Education*. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock, 1975.
- 13) Marsh, H. W. "Students' Evaluation of University Teaching: Dimensionality, Reliability, Validity, Potential Biases, and Utility." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1984, 76, 707–754.
- 14) Mc Keachie, W.J. (1969) "Student Ratings of Faculty." *AAUP Bulletin*, 55, pp. 439- 444.
- 15) McKeachie, W. J. "Student Ratings of Faculty: A Reprise." *Academe*, 1979, 65, 384–397.
- 16) Michael B. Paulsen: Evaluating Teaching Performance. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no.114, Summer 2002
- 17) Mirajuddin, Salahuddin, Shah, M. & Khan, S. (2006) Evaluation of Academic Performance of University Teachers As Perceived By Their Students (A case study of Gomal University Teachers), *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 22:117-121
- 18) Murray (1995) "Task Force on Assessing and Improving Teaching and Learning" at Indiana State University, on line <http://www.cedanet.com/indiana.htm> accessed in March 2005.
- 19) Paulsen, M. B., & Feldman, K. A. (1995). Taking teaching seriously: Meeting the challenge of instructional improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED396615)
- 20) Preist, B.J. (1950) "Classrooms: Castles or Learning Laboratories." In. C.B.T.Lec(Ed), *Improving College Teaching*, Washington, D.C. American Council on Education, 1967. Publication of Tyler's Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction syllabus for Education 305 Chicago University of Chicago Press.
- 21) Rifkin, T. (1995). The status and scope of faculty evaluation. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED385315)
- 22) Stufflebeam, D. L (2003-a) The CIPP Model for Evaluation. In T.Kellaghan & D.L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *The Internatinal handbook of educational evaluation* (Chpater-34). Boston: Kluwer.

Teacher Evaluation Form

(To be filled by the student)

Course Title and Number: _____

Name of Instructor: _____ **Semester** _____

Department: _____ **Degree** _____

Use the scale to answer the following questions below and make comments

A: Strongly Agree B: Agree C: Uncertain D: Disagree E: Strongly Disagree

Instructor:					
1. The Instructor is prepared for each class	A	B	C	D	E
2. The Instructor demonstrates knowledge of the subject	A	B	C	D	E
3. The Instructor has completed the whole course	A	B	C	D	E
4. The Instructor provides additional material apart from the textbook	A	B	C	D	E
5. The Instructor gives citations regarding current situations with reference to Pakistani context.	A	B	C	D	E
6. The Instructor communicates the subject matter effectively	A	B	C	D	E
7. The Instructor shows respect towards students and encourages class participation	A	B	C	D	E
8. The Instructor maintains an environment that is conducive to learning	A	B	C	D	E
9. The Instructor arrives on time	A	B	C	D	E
10. The Instructor leaves on time	A	B	C	D	E
11. The Instructor is fair in examination	A	B	C	D	E
12. The Instructor returns the graded scripts etc. in a reasonable amount of time	A	B	C	D	E
13. The Instructor was available during the specified office hours and for after class consultations	A	B	C	D	E
14. The Subject matter presented in the course has increased your knowledge of the subject	A	B	C	D	E
15. The syllabus clearly states course objectives requirements, procedures and grading criteria	A	B	C	D	E
16. The course integrates theoretical course concepts with real-world applications	A	B	C	D	E
17. The assignments and exams covered the materials presented in the course	A	B	C	D	E
18. The course material is modern and updated	A	B	C	D	E

Comments:

Instructor: _____

Course: _____

Teachers' Evaluation Form

Course Title/Number: _____

Department _____

Name of Instructor: _____

Semester/Year _____

Q-No.	Title of Question	A	B	C	D	E
	Classes I attended of this instructor					
Q-1	Instructor is prepared for each class					
Q-2	Demonstrates knowledge of the subject					
Q-3	Completes the whole course assigned					
Q-4	Provides additional material apart from the textbook					
Q-5	Gives real life EXAMPLES or applications relating to the topic of lecture					
Q-6	Communication skills of the Instructor are very effective and appealing					
Q-7	Instructor shows respect towards students					
Q-8	Instructor encourages class participation during his teaching					
Q-9	Instructor maintains an environment that is helpful for learning					
Q-10	Instructor arrives on time					
Q-11	Instructor leaves on time					
Q-12	The Instructor has good class control					
Q-13	The Instructor gives assignments and projects on important topics					
Q-14	Available after class for consultation or any academic query					
Q-15	Subject matter presented in the course has increased knowledge of the subject					
Q-16	Provided you the course outline of his/her syllabus					
Q-17	Clearly states course/lecture objectives before teaching					
Q-18	Prepared us according to pattern of exam as well					
Q-19	The length of material prepared was appropriate for the allocated time					
Q-20	Used audio visual aids e.g. multimedia/ OHP during his teaching					

Comments:

Course: _____

Instructor: _____

_____ Medical College
 Teachers' Evaluation for the Year 2006-2007
 Students' Feedback Form

S. No	Name of Teachers	Attn.	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20
1	A																					
2	B																					
3	C																					
4	D																					
5	F																					
6	G																					
7	H																					
8	I																					
9	J																					
10	K																					
11	L																					

A: Strongly Agree

B: Agree

C: Uncertain

D: Disagree

E: Strongly Disagree

Teachers' Evaluation Result 2006-2007
Department of , _____ Medical College

Teacher's Name: _____

Top Scorers through THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

1st _____ 77.73%
2nd _____ 73.14%
3rd _____ 70.95%

Q-No.	Title of Question	A	Score	B	Score	C	Score	D	E	No. Resp	Mar. Obt	Tot Marks	%age	Dept. Rank	Colg. Rank
	Classes I attended of this instructor	61		21		12		4	0	98				1st	4 th
Q-1	Instructor is prepared for each class	72	288	17	51	6	12	0	0	95	351	380	92.37	1st	2 nd
Q-2	Demonstrates knowledge of the subject	52	208	30	90	3	6	0	1	86	304	344	88.37	1st	3 rd
Q-3	Completes the whole course assigned	60	240	34	102	4	8	0	0	98	350	392	89.29	1st	2 nd
Q-4	Provides additional material apart from the textbook	15	60	15	45	15	30	29	19	93	164	372	44.09	1st	7 th
Q-5	Gives real life EXAMPLES or applications relating to the topic of lecture	26	104	27	81	15	30	18	10	96	233	384	60.68	1st	5 th
Q-6	Communication skills of the Instructor are very effective and appealing	31	124	41	123	16	32	11	1	100	290	400	72.50	1st	6 th
Q-7	Instructor shows respect towards students	50	200	40	120	6	12	1	1	98	333	392	84.95	1st	1 st
Q-8	Instructor encourages class participation during his teaching	39	156	21	63	16	32	5	9	90	256	360	71.11	1st	7 th
Q-9	Instructor maintains an environment that is helpful for learning	35	140	33	99	12	24	6	6	92	269	368	73.10	1st	4 th
Q-10	Instructor arrives on time	37	148	30	90	15	30	10	1	93	278	372	74.73	1st	12 th
Q-11	Instructor leaves on time	46	184	38	114	10	20	2	1	97	320	388	82.47	1st	4 th
Q-12	The Instructor has good class control	21	84	38	114	26	52	4	6	95	254	380	66.84	1st	8 th
Q-13	The Instructor gives assignments and projects on important topics	6	24	8	24	19	38	25	37	95	111	380	29.21	1st	7 th
Q-14	Available after class for consultation or any academic query	29	116	35	105	12	24	11	11	98	256	392	65.31	1st	8 th
Q-15	Subject matter presented in the course has increased knowledge of the subject	27	108	40	120	7	14	11	6	91	253	364	69.51	1st	5 th
Q-16	Provided you the course outline of his/her syllabus	22	88	17	51	11	22	14	28	92	175	368	47.55	1st	9 th
Q-17	Clearly states course/lecture objectives before teaching	11	44	15	45	15	30	21	35	97	140	388	36.08	1st	8 th

2nd International Conference on Assessing Quality in Higher Education, 1st – 3rd December, 2008, Lahore - Pakistan

Q-No.	Title of Question	A	Score	B	Score	C	Score	D	E	No. Resp	Mar. Obt	Tot Marks	%age	Dept. Rank	Colg. Rank
Q-18	Prepared us according to pattern of exam as well	28	112	21	63	5	10	10	29	93	195	372	52.42	1st	9 th
Q-19	The length of material prepared was appropriate for the allocated time	28	112	37	111	18	36	9	3	95	268	380	70.53	1st	3 rd
Q-20	Used audio visual aids e.g. multimedia/ OHP during his teaching	25	100	33	99	13	26	6	10	87	231	348	66.38	1 st	10 th
											5031	7524	66.87		

Students' Ranking For The Best Teachers 1st _____ 2nd _____ 3rd _____

A: Strongly Agree B: Agree C: Uncertain D: Disagree E: Strongly Disagree

Teachers' Evaluation Result
Department- Wise Ranking 2006-2007
Department of _____ Medical College

Top Scorers through THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

1st	_____	77.73%
2nd	_____	73.14%
3rd	_____	70.95%

Question-1: Teacher is well Prepared.

Name of teachers	A	Score	B	Score	C	Score	D	E	Score	No. Resp	Mar. Obt	Tot Marks	%age	Dept. Rank	Uni. Rank
A	72	288	17	51	6	12	0	0	0	95	351	380	92.37	1st	2nd
B	30	120	37	111	15	30	0	0	0	82	261	328	79.57	2nd	13th
C	8	32	13	39	16	32	4	4	0	45	107	180	59.44	3rd	21st
D	4	16	9	27	13	26	4	1	0	31	73	124	58.87	4th	26th
E	3	12	8	24	7	14	9	2	0	29	59	116	50.86	5th	28th
F	11	44	18	54	31	62	16	11	0	87	176	348	50.57	6th	30th
G	1	4	11	33	25	50	14	3	0	54	101	216	46.76	7th	31st

Quesetion-2 Teacher is always on time

Name of teachers	A	Score	B	Score	C	Score	D	E	Score	No. Resp	Mar. Obt	Tot Marks	%age	Dept. Rank	Uni. Rank
A	52	208	30	90	3	6	0	1	0	86	304	344	88.37	1st	3rd
B	20	80	33	99	24	48	4	2	0	83	231	332	69.58	2nd	12th
C	10	40	13	39	11	22	6	4	0	44	107	176	60.80	3rd	15th
D	2	8	1	3	7	14	5	0	0	15	30	60	50.00	4th	20th
E	4	16	6	18	8	16	4	6	0	28	54	112	48.21	5th	21st
F	1	4	17	51	30	60	21	16	0	85	136	340	40.00	6th	26th
G	1	4	1	3	7	14	3	3	0	15	24	60	40.00	7th	27th