

**An Analysis of Student Evaluation Criteria for Teacher Performance at
King Mongkut's Institute of Technology North Bangkok**

By Assoc. Prof. Dr. Krismant Whattananarong

This study was sponsored by King Mongkut's institute of Technology North Bangkok.

It was presented in the International Conference organized by
the Faculty of Education, Chiang Mai University,
at Pomping Tower Hotel, Chiang Mai.

10- 12 November 2000

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the student criteria used for evaluating teacher performance at King Mongkut's Institute of Technology North Bangkok. The samples were 953 students randomly selected from the population of 12,252 students in the second semester of the academic year 1998. The instrument used in this study was a Likert type five-scale questionnaire developed by the researcher. It had reliability alpha coefficient at .94. Data were analyzed by using mean and percentage. Results revealed that the top five criteria used by the students to evaluate the teacher performance were the ability of teaching, supervising, teachers' degree holding, punctuality, and teaching experience respectively. These criteria would be able to be used for faculty development as well.

Introduction

The evaluation of faculty performance is an important issue in higher education administration. It occurs at regular intervals according to institutional policy or requirement of the government. It can diagnose faculty strengths and weaknesses in order to allow for self-improvement and provide certain criteria for determining what good teaching is. Faculty evaluation is a two-step process (Medley D.M. & Shannon D.M., 1994: 6015). The first step is data gathering from various sources. The second step is the use of data to evaluate the teacher or faculty performance. In Thailand, evaluation of a faculty member's contribution to the goals of an institute focuses on his/her performance in four functions of teaching, research, services, and cultural preservation. It is essential for helping administrators make decisions regarding appointments, tenure, promotions, and salary

increments. Although there is some doubt about the use of data, there is no doubt about the accuracy and relevance of the evaluation based on the reliability and validity of data. There was evidence to indicate that student ratings provide reliable and valid information and could heighten teacher effectiveness and improve the quality of undergraduate education (Seldin, 1980, p. 64). Faculty evaluation was introduced as a part of quality assurance policy in Thailand. Data from students were also used for faculty evaluation. In the past, Thai students had never been taught to evaluate their teachers. Teacher evaluation by students is not in the culture of Thailand. However, Thailand could not resist a new concept of quality that follows that in the West. At King Mongkut's Institute of Technology North Bangkok, teacher evaluation by using data from students was first formally used in the Faculty of Engineering. The other faculties are in the process of using data from student evaluation. The purpose of this study was to investigate the criteria used by the students when they evaluate their teachers. The student evaluation criteria may be different from the criteria used by the administrators and peer group criteria. Good teachers, as perceived by the students, may not be good as perceived by the administrators or peer group. In the evaluation process, faculty evaluation is normally based on data from students, administrators, and other faculty members or peers. Institutions are using evaluation to assist faculty members to grow and develop both personally and professionally. Moreover, evaluation will act as a resource, which can be used to improve instruction, and it can be used for faculty discipline and development as well.

Teachers' Work Performance

In higher education institutes, faculty members or teachers have a variety of duties and responsibilities associated with the mission of the institution, including the essential functions of teaching, research, academic services, and cultural preservation. The most common activities of teachers are instructing undergraduates; instructing and supervising graduates; course and curriculum development; preparation of instructional materials; evaluation and grading of student progress; advising students; research; creativity and scholarly activities of a pure or practical nature; professional service, both internal (for example, advising a faculty member and/or other departments in regard to aspects of one's

specialty) and external (for example, belonging to government and national professional organizations, consulting with community groups and individuals); participation in governance at departmental, faculty, and institutional levels in order to obtain and preserve an environment and moral which are conducive to fulfillment of the obligations of the institute (Dressel, 1976, p.332). Many more faculty members or teachers are engaged in off-campus activities in area such as business administration, engineering, and now computer science as compared with the humanities and social sciences. Their activities are much more a part of the world than they once were (Armour, 1987, p. 20). However, teaching is the primary function of the teacher. Although the evaluation of teacher performance is important for many reasons, the most important is the improvement of instruction. It is required for the recognition and reward of good work. In-service education and organizational development are a must in curing inadequate performance and preparation.

Evaluation Criteria

The criteria for evaluating teacher performance must relate to the goals of institutes and the teachers' total contribution to their institutions. In some institutions, teaching is deemed the primary function of the teacher, in others, research is given priority. And in some institutes, few seem to know exactly where the emphasis lies. To determine what criteria should be evaluated, a well-known educator Miller (1974) stated that " evaluation of overall faculty performance should consider nine categories: classroom teaching, advising, faculty service and relations, management (administration), performing and visual arts, professional services, publications, public service, and research" (p. 16). According to Miller, effective teaching is the primary responsibility of the teaching faculty. The teachers regularly have their fundamental instruction responsibilities in preparing for and meeting their assignments, conferring with and advising students, evaluating fairly and reporting promptly student achievement, and participating in those group deliberations which related to the development of the instructional program of the instruction and to the growth of students. And quality teaching is a minimum expectation for the granting of tenure in the new system of higher education administration in Thailand.

Student Evaluation

Student evaluation, colleague (peer) evaluation, and self-evaluation are the three major methods of evaluating teaching performance. Students are unique in this area as a basis for evaluation by colleagues and the chairman is essential. Teachers' performance can be evaluated by his/her colleagues who are engaged in similar activities. Self-evaluation is an essential area of evaluation as well. There are some people who disagree that student evaluation is reliable and that students lack the capacity to fill out useful evaluations. There are some teachers and administrators who ignore student evaluation. In many cases, student perceptions are fairly accurate if the primary goal of student ratings is the improvement of classroom performance and students are evaluating the teacher's ability to teach them. The evaluations are unquestionably effective in improving teaching. However, for the use of student ratings, administrators can use student ratings in making decisions about teacher salaries and tenure and teachers can use the information from student ratings in course redesign. Many hundreds of colleges and universities throughout the world have evaluated the effectiveness of their courses and instructors by means of student ratings.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to identify criteria used in evaluating teacher performance by the students at King Mongkut's Institute of Technology North Bangkok.

Purposes of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate student evaluation criteria. The second purpose was to rank the top five criteria used in evaluating teacher performance. A final purpose was to make suggestions for teacher evaluation and teacher development.

Delimitation of the Study

During the course of this investigation, several limiting factors were encountered. These factors include the following:

1. This study was limited to students of King Mongkut's Institute of Technology North Bangkok who registered in the second semester of the academic year 1998.

2. The instrument used in this study was a Likert type five-scale questionnaire developed by the researchers.
3. Data that were not pertinent to indicating the student evaluation criteria were not analyzed.
4. The criteria were limited to those given in the questionnaire. They were synthesized by the researchers based on related studies.

Basic Assumptions

This study was based on the following assumptions.

1. It was assumed that the Thai language instrument used in this study posted an acceptable level of validity and reliability and that translation did not change the meanings.
2. It was assumed that the students provided the most accurate criteria used in evaluating teacher performance.
3. It was assumed that the sample size of this study was adequate to represent the population.
4. It was assumed that the research methodology was appropriate to find the solutions.

Methodology

This survey-type research study was designed to indicate and rank the evaluation criteria of student rating. Survey research seems ideally suited to this study, and a questionnaire is the best instrument to obtain data. It was a Likert type, five-scale Thai language questionnaire, scaled from 5 to 1, very high to very low. The questionnaire items were clustered or grouped into five sections. Section 1 consisted of 4 items, which were grouped as general information of the students. Respondents indicated their general information by marking in an appropriate block. Section 2 consisted of 12 items, which were grouped as the criteria used to evaluate teachers' characteristics. Respondents indicated their extent of each item by marking in an appropriate block, never (1), rarely (2), occasionally (3), frequently (4), and usually (5). Section 3 consisted of 12 items, which were grouped as the criteria used to evaluate teachers' performance. This section was cross-

checked for accuracy with Section 2. Respondents indicated their degree of concern for each item by marking in an appropriate block, strongly disagree (1), disagree 2), indifferent (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5). Section 4 consisted of 24 items, which were grouped as the criteria used to evaluate teachers' attributes. This section was divided in to 3 areas, personality, knowledge, and teaching behaviours. Each area consisted of 8 items. Respondents indicated their limits by marking in an appropriate block, least (1), less (2), indifferent (3), much (4), and most (5). And Section 5 consisted of 4 open-end questions asked the students for their ideas and suggestions on teacher evaluation. Validity of the questionnaire and translation were validated by a panel of experts. Internal consistency reliability was computed using the Statistic Package for the Social Sciences for Windows. Chronbach's Alpha was .94. The population of this study was 12,252 students registered in the second semester of the academic year 1998. They were students of the Faculty of Engineering, the Faculty of Technical Education, the Faculty of Applied Sciences, the Faculty of Technology and Industrial Management, the College of Industrial Technology, and the Graduate College. The samples were randomly selected by a proportional sampling method. Names of the students in each faculty and classes were given to the researchers by the registrar office. The sample size of this study was computed by using a Taro Yamane's method. In-class visits were arranged by the research assistants in each class to collect data. There were 953 students who returned the completed questionnaires which was computed at 3.11 percent errors according to Taro Yamane's method. Data were analyzed by descriptive statistics using the Statistic Package for the Social Sciences for Windows. Answers from the open-end questions were analyzed by using a content analysis method. Results of data analysis are in the Tables.

Table 1: Analysis of Each Item in Teachers' Characteristics by Using Means (M), Standard Deviation (SD), and Rank Rated by Students Using a scale of Never (1) to Usually (5).

Teachers' Characteristics Used as Criteria in Evaluating	M	SD	Rank
1. Teacher's qualification (BSc., MSc., Ph.D.)	3.83	.84	3
2. Reputation of the institute that the teacher graduated from	3.47	.86	6
3. Academic title (Asst. Prof., Assoc. Prof., Prof.)	3.02	.97	9
4. Academic works (articles, research, texts)	3.30	.94	8
5. Accuracy of teaching students to understand the contents correctly	1.90	1.02	12
6. Being friendly in advising on academic and social issues	3.90	1.01	2
7. Flexibility of measurement and grading	3.45	.99	7
8. Gender and age of the teacher	2.75	1.06	10
9. Teaching experience of the teacher	3.66	.95	5
10. Personality and dressing of the teacher	2.60	1.00	11
11. Responsibility of teaching time	3.78	.94	4
12. Ability to teach by using clear and understandable speech	4.07	.97	1

Table 2: Analysis of Each Item in Teachers' Performance by Using Means (M), Standard Deviation (SD), and Rank Rated by Students Using Degree of Concern from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5).

Teachers' Performance	M	SD	Rank
1. Teachers who teach a subject that directly relates to their qualifications perform good teaching	3.95	.91	2
2. Teachers who graduated from well-known institutes are more knowledgeable.	3.20	.98	10
3. Teachers who have a academic title perform good teaching	3.04	.89	12
4. Teachers who have undertaken other academic work (articles, research, texts) perform good teaching	3.28	.85	9
5. Teachers with a high level degree perform good teaching	3.49	.97	7
6. Students prefer friendly teachers when they require to be advised in academic matters.	3.84	1.11	4

7. Students prefer a flexible method of measurement and evaluation	3.65	.96	6
8. Respect of students is related to Gender and age	3.11	1.02	11
9. Teaching experience could gain the students' respect			5
10. Personality and dress of teachers could gain the students' respect	3.37	.96	8
11. Responsibility of teachers in work performance gain the students' respect	3.92	.91	3
12. Clear speech and precise presentation help students to learn well	4.03	.95	1

Table 3: Analysis of Each Item in Teachers' Attributes by Using Means (M), Standard Deviation (SD), and Rank Rated by Students Using Their Extents from Least (1) to Most (5).

Teachers' Attributes Used as Criteria in Evaluating	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Rank
Personality			
1. Responsibility	4.08	.85	2
2. Attitudes toward Students	3.92	.90	6
3. Punctuality	3.82	.87	7
4. Ethics	2.06	.91	8
5. Good Model	3.93	.96	5
6. Reasonableness	4.14	.95	1
7. Human Relation	3.95	.97	4
8. Emotional Control	4.05	.88	3
Knowledge			
1. Qualifications	3.64	.92	7
2. Academic Titles	3.19	.93	8

3. Teaching Techniques	4.04	1.00	4
4. Teaching Preparation	4.08	.96	3
5. Teaching Aids	3.72	1.02	6
6. Content Accuracy	4.11	.95	1
7. Keep Up with the Changing Knowledge	3.89	1.01	5
8. Ability in Answering the Students' Questions	4.10	.95	2
Teaching Behaviors			
1. Friendly with Students	3.98	1.00	3
2. Understand the Students' Nature	3.85	1.05	4
3. Pay Attention to All Students	3.82	1.03	5
4. Listen to the Student's Ideas	3.99	1.02	1
5. Fairness	3.97	1.05	2
6. Energetic	3.52	.90	8
7. Well Behaved and Helpful	3.72	.94	7
8. Politeness	7.34	.93	6

Findings

1. The students rated the teachers' characteristics used as criteria in evaluating teacher performance in Table 1, which were ranked as follows:

1. Ability of teaching by using clear and understandable speech
2. Being friendly in advising on academic issues
3. Teacher's qualifications (BSc., MSc., Ph.D.)
4. Responsibility of teaching time.
5. Teaching experience of the teacher

2. Data from Table 2 were cross-checked with data in Table 1 it was found that the students rated the criteria used in evaluating teacher performance between the teachers' characteristics (Table 1) and teachers' performance (Table 2) were much the same.

3. The students rated the teachers' attributes used as criteria in evaluating teacher performance in the area of personality, knowledge, and teaching behaviors as follows:

1. In the area of personality, the criteria were reasonableness, responsibility, emotional control, human relations, and good role model respectively.

2. In the area of knowledge, the criteria were content accuracy, ability to answer the students' questions, teaching preparation, teaching techniques, and keep up with the changing knowledge respectively.

3. In the area of teaching behaviors, the criteria were; to listen to the students' ideas; fairness; friendliness; understanding of students' nature; and paying attention to all students respectively.

Discussions

Teacher evaluation is an evolving program and that a component, for example student evaluation and student ratings may be fashionable this year and obsolete next year. It is only a means to an end — the improvement of teaching in order to improve student learning. In this study the students did not rate the area of public and institutional service, administrative involvement and others which are frequently considered in evaluation. They were given only the area that related to the students' activities. The ability to teach was the top criteria used for evaluating teacher performance. Regarding criteria, it is critical that institutions make explicit the criteria used for administrative decisions. Styles of governance may differ, but the hallmark of institutional criteria, jointly developed by administration and faculty, is specificity. Many institutions center their attention on methodology rather than on the criteria. It is necessary to keep in mind that which is also important.

Suggestions for Teacher Evaluation

Based on the results of this study, related studies, real situation of teacher evaluation at King Mongkut 's Institute of Technology North Bangkok and other higher education institutions, the following suggestions are made. To evaluate the teacher performance successfully, administrators need to consider these categories: purpose of evaluation, open communication, teacher involvement, administrative backing, source information, importance of criteria, applying evaluation data, and so on.

The primary purpose of a teacher evaluation program is to improve teaching and to improve the rationale for salary, promotion, and tenure decisions for teaching staff. Many institutions have developed separate procedures for these two evaluative purposes. The purpose must be clearly and publicly stated.

Open communication means that every teacher must know what is expected of him or her and exactly how their performance will be judged. It also demands prompt feedback to the teachers of the results of their evaluations.

In teacher involvement, the teachers must be directly involved with developing and running the program (course development). They must never lose the feeling that they are in control of their destiny. If the teachers actively partake in development, they will “part own” the program that ultimately emerges and more readily accept its implementation.

For administrative backing, administrators must not only be committed to the running of program but also see that it operates effectively. They must give the teachers the lead in the program’s development and implementation, provide the necessary resources, avoid handing down the program, and support the program with enough enthusiasm to help it overcome week-by-week obstacles.

Sources of information are from students, colleagues, administrators, and self-assessment. These offer important but limited insights. *No single source is enough for tenure and promotion decisions.* It is necessary to combine these sources to estimate the true value of teachers.

For the importance of criteria, if the criteria are not explicit, the teacher evaluation will lead to unfairness. Understanding the perceptions of students, colleagues, and administrators toward the criteria used in evaluating teacher performance will yield the true value of teachers. The administrative team may be changed timely. The criteria may be changed according to the styles of governance. However, there are no perfect criteria of teacher evaluation. It is an art involving value judgments. Teacher evaluation may always remain beyond human reach. But with enough time, effort and goodwill, reasonable approximations are attainable.

In applying the evaluation data, when the purpose of ratings is to improve performance, it is advantageous to issue rating forms to students, teacher colleagues, and a to-be-evaluated teacher early in the term, not at the end of term. With the criteria in hand, the teacher performance can be monitored and corrected. And when ratings are used for personnel decisions, the forms should be completed within the last two weeks of the semester. Moreover, the teacher’s entire performance must be assessed several times over

several semesters by several evaluators before being accepted as reliable data by the program.

In addition, good teaching should be weighted as heavily as research in tenure and promotion decisions. This is one of the urgent problems confronting higher education. What is most needed are two different tests that can separately and reliably measure excellence in research and in teaching.

Suggestions for Teacher Development

Excellence in all areas of teaching, research, academic services, and cultural preservations is an unattainable goal unless the institute is able to develop teacher performance. In order to satisfy with data that is collected from students or other sources, it will be limited to the criteria used in evaluating teacher performance. The results of this study showed the criteria used by the students to evaluate their teachers. However, those criteria would be able to be used as the issues for teacher development. Suggestions for teacher development are made as follows:

Issues for Teacher Development	Methods of Teacher Development
1. Ability of teaching	Teachers should be trained (in teaching) in using words and oral behavior to communicate effectively. Micro teaching lessons are needed for those teachers who have no teaching practice before entering to teaching career.
2. Ability of supervision	Every teacher should be assigned to be a homeroom teacher. A training program in supervising and consulting is quickly needed for teachers.
3. Qualifications	For career development, teachers should be allowed to study in areas directly related to their teaching subjects. Recruitment should considered the subject area of teaching and

	the qualifications the teachers.
4. Punctuality	Monitoring teacher performance is needed for making corrections.
5. Teaching experience	Senior teachers should assist new teachers in teaching preparation and learning activities. The new teachers should be allowed to attend in classrooms with senior teachers.

Conclusions

Results of an analysis of student evaluation criteria for teacher performance found that the criteria used by students were based only on the perceptions of the students. They were: ability of teaching, supervising, teachers' qualifications, punctuality, and teaching experience respectively. Data from the students are not enough to point out what a good teacher is or what good teaching is. It is necessary to combine other sources, e.g. exam results, to produce the true value of good teaching or good teachers. For the importance of criteria, the most carefully conceived system of evaluation will still largely depend upon a collection of subjective judgments. The subjective criteria always play an important role in teacher evaluation. The criteria must be stated clearly and publicly and jointly developed by qualified administrators and teachers. Knowing the student criteria is necessary to keep in mind what is important to the students. The criteria could be able to be used for teacher development appropriate to need of students.

Acknowledgements

In conducting this study, we wish to acknowledge full cooperation of the teachers and students of King Mongkut's Institute of Technology North Bangkok. Further acknowledge goes to the staff of registrar's office that provided us with necessary data. Most particularly, we wish to thank King Mongkut's Institute of Technology North Bangkok that sponsored this study. The study team comprises the following persons:

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr.Krismant Whattananrong, head of the study team
2. Ms. Supaporn Aussawavirote

Bibliography

Armour, Bob. (1987). Assessing the Professoriate: An Interview with Chester E. Finn jr. (Interview). National Forum: Phi Kappa Phi Journal, 67 (1), 20-21.

Dressel, Paul L. (1976). Handbook of Academic Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Medley, D.M., Shannon, D.M. (1984). "Teacher Evaluation," The International Encyclopedia of Education, Second Edition, Vol 10, p. 6015.

Miller, Richard I. (1974). Developing Program for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Seldin, Peter. (1980). Successful Faculty Evaluation Program. Coventry Press: New York.