

Meta Evaluation of a Teachers' Evaluation Programme Using CIPP Model

(Published in conference proceedings in international conference on
Quality held in Lahor, Pakistan. Permission to get it
published has been taken from organizers.)

Dr. Mohammad Abdul Wahid Usmani

*Assistant Professor, Deanship of Quality, King Saud University, Kingdom of Saudi
Arabia Email: awusmani@yahoo.com*

Ms. Suraiya Khatoon

*Assistant Director, Quality Enhancement Cell, Dow University of Health Sciences,
Karachi, Pakistan
Email: suraiya.khatoon@yahoo.com*

Dr. Marwan M. Shammot (Corresponding Author)

*Associate Professor, King Saud University, College of Applied Studies & Community
Services, Faculty of Administrative & Humanities Sciences,
P.O.Box 28095, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Tel: 966 558514191,
Email: drmarwan965@yahoo.com*

Dr. Ahmad.M. Zamil

*Associate Professor, Rectorate of business Development, King Saud University,
P.O.Box 2454, Riyadh 11451, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Tel: 966 543718710,
Email: drahmad764@yahoo.com, azamil@ksu.edu.sa.*

Acknowledgments

This paper was supported by King Saud University, Deanship of Scientific Research. The authors would like to thank Deanship of Scientific Research, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, for funding and supporting this research

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 reported to various stake holders of the university.

In this study, the entire "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 evaluation programme, its handling of data and reporting strategies have been evaluated.
- Product Evaluation: Finally, the output of the whole 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.

Keyword: Meta Evaluation, Teachers' Evaluation Programme, CIPP Model

Introduction:

Teachers' Evaluation has been a great subject of interest for many educationists and many standards have been suggested for Teachers' Evaluation some of which include Classroom Observation; Competence Testing; Peer review; 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 institutes of Higher Education in the public sector were directed to introduce Students' Rating of teachers. Since this was new to many institutions, a general Performa was circulated for all the public sector institutions. However, there is no or little uniformity in the process and reporting of teachers evaluation programme. Furthermore, there is no system in place to evaluate teachers evaluation programme itself. The objective of this paper is to do meta-evaluation of a "Teachers' Evaluation Programme using CIPP model. The acronyms of the model stand for Context, Input, process and Product. This Teachers' Evaluation programme was implemented by first and second authors in one of the constituent colleges of a public sector university. 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 institutes. Considering Teachers' Evaluation as an essential outset to determine the performance of each and every faculty member, many institutes 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 not only very updated knowledge; and learn skills but also they must be aware of the core requirements of the subject they are teaching; 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 that aims to determine the extent to which desired changes take place. (Mirajuddin; Salahuddin; M. Shah; & Shadiullah Khan). 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 who favors Students’ Evaluation and finds it reliable and valid and the other who 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 pointed out that being 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: first 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 to students' ratings as 'meaningless, inappropriate and biased'. (Michael B. Paulsen). 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 institutes, 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 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 beautiful 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 are researches 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”.

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 model began back in 1965 and has been practiced widely for evaluations of programmes, projects, products and systems (Daniel L.2003). The organization of the paper is in three fold. At first the theoretical framework has been given for viewing evaluation in broader scenario. Secondly, context of the programme, the input given, the process followed and the product received of this teacher evaluation programme have been described. Finally, their critical evaluation has been given along with their description. This evaluation is based on the checklist provided by Daniel.

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 and finally it would give the reader critical evaluation at all four levels. That is context, input, process and product. For those who implemented this programme, the study would not prove but will improve the programme in future. (Daniel-2003).

Context Evaluation:

The Programme was designed and implemented in the constituent college of a public sector university. The college was under the management of the Government before establishment of the university. One of the senior faculty members pointed out that there was no documented system of monitoring and evaluation of academic activities. Thus the teachers as well as students enjoyed great liberty. Former had no obligation to take classes on regular basis, nor was there any evaluation by student. Similarly, later had no obligation to attend classes. Thus there was good attendance in the class

of teachers who were well prepared. The interaction between teachers and students was least effective in most cases. After the establishment of the university, the college became one of its constituent colleges. However, 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 university initiated Teachers' Evaluation programme using students rating their teachers.

Discussion:

The context explained leads to a very crucial question: "Were important needs addressed? The context evaluation 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 along with administrative head should have been done well 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 university needs. So there were twenty questions altogether. (**Appendix B**). There were more than seventy teachers dealing with seven courses in the first four years. For logistics reasons, it was not possible to conduct individual Teachers' 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:

The question raised "was the input appropriate and according to the needs"?

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. Similarly, a statement "subject matter presented in the course has increased the knowledge of the subject" does not seem to be teachers oriented but is more towards students self assessment. However, the evaluators realized after the first session of the issues and a tailor made copy was the second input. However, the document finally implemented in all sessions of the evaluation also had some shortcomings. 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" will be redundant in this case. Similarly, the question on "gives assistant and projects" and "provides course outline" which have been given in the tailor made copy were not appropriate in the given context. Since the annual system of exam was there, the assignment had no role. Similarly, the course outlines could not be developed as integrated approach made the course 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 is quite probable that students may choose to be giving sweeping judgments. The rows had twenty columns which may cause a wrong entry by the students for the last few questions.

Process Evaluation:

The process of Teachers' Evaluation by student 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. Later, these forms were coded and the options of questions were given scores. 'Strongly agree' carried 4 marks and 'strongly disagree' carried zero as the frequency from 100 to zero percent was explained to students during the evaluation. 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 as students stay two years in one class of that college which is divided into part I and II of the same class. 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 displayed Likert Scale from “Strongly Agreed” to “Strongly Disagree” with each question. The letters “A” to “E”, and not the numbers, denoted each option. 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. Later, the same method was used to evaluate the teachers of other college of the university after considering the feed back of the first programme.

Discussion:

Product Evaluation may be further 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, its handling, its cost and its analysis was pointed out in regular meetings by other evaluators of the similar programme. On the other hand, this programme was designed in such a way that large data was collected on some sheets. Its 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 that 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 was communicated the feedback. Their impact showed their concerns. In addition, the managers of the programme admitted the effectiveness and comprised 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 the conclusion that the program context was not appropriately studied and participants were not taken into confidence. Furthermore, though the tool was tailored according to needs, the content validity was not ensured. Therefore, few questions were not relevant in the first session. 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. 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 provided 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 institute 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 in the current evaluation program. Not only this, but if possible, a pilot would also show the appropriateness of the process in the given context. Besides, 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, Muhammad Shah & Shadiullah Khan, Evaluation of Academic Performance of University Teachers As Percieved By Their Students (A case study of Gomal University Teachers), Din et al. Gomal University Journal of Research, 22:117-121 (2006)
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)

Appendices:

Appendix A

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: _____

Appendix B

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 on:

Course: _____

Instructor: _____

_____ Medical College
 Teachers' Evaluation for the Year 2006-2007
 Students' Feedback Form
 Department of Anatomy (3rd Year)

S. No	Name of Teachers	Attn.	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15
1	A																
2	B																
3	C																
4	D																
5	F																
6	G																
7	H																
8	I																
9	J																
10	K																
11	L																
12	M																
13	N																
14	O																
15	P																

A: Strongly Agree

B: Agree

C: Uncertain

D: Disagree

E: Strongly Disagree

XY University of Health Sciences Teachers' Evaluation Result 2006-2007

Department of Anatomy, _____ Medical College

Teacher 's Name _____

1st _____

Top Scorers through **THIS QUESTIONNAIRE** 2nd _____

3rd _____

4th _____

Q-No.	Title of the Question	A	Score	B	Score	C	Score	D	E
	Classes I attended of this instructor	61		21		12		4	0
Q-1	Instructor is prepared for each class	72	288	17	51	6	12	0	0
Q-2	Demonstrates knowledge of the subject	52	208	30	90	3	6	0	1
Q-3	Completes the whole course assigned	60	240	34	102	4	8	0	0
Q-4	Provides additional material apart from the textbook	15	60	15	45	15	30	29	19
Q-5	Gives real life EXAMPLES or applications relating to the topic of lecture	26	104	27	81	15	30	18	10
Q-6	Communication skills of the Instructor are very effective and appealing	31	124	41	123	16	32	11	1
Q-7	Instructor shows respect towards students	50	200	40	120	6	12	1	1
Q-8	Instructor encourages class participation during his teaching	39	156	21	63	16	32	5	9
Q-9	Instructor maintains an environment that is helpful for learning	35	140	33	99	12	24	6	6
Q-10	Instructor arrives on time	37	148	30	90	15	30	10	1
Q-11	Instructor leaves on time	46	184	38	114	10	20	2	1
Q-12	The Instructor has good class control	21	84	38	114	26	52	4	6
Q-13	The Instructor gives assignments and projects on important topics	6	24	8	24	19	38	25	37
Q-14	Available after class for consultation or any academic query	29	116	35	105	12	24	11	11
Q-15	Subject matter presented in the course has increased knowledge of the subject	27	108	40	120	7	14	11	6
Q-16	Provided you the course outline of his/her syllabus	22	88	17	51	11	22	14	28
Q-17	Clearly states course/lecture objectives before teaching	11	44	15	45	15	30	21	35
Q-18	Prepared us according to pattern of exam as well	28	112	21	63	5	10	10	29
Q-19	The length of material prepared was appropriate for the allocated time	28	112	37	111	18	36	9	3
Q-20	Used audio visual aids e.g. multimedia/ OHP during his teaching	25	100	33	99	13	26	6	10

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

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

XY University of Health Sciences Teachers' Evaluation Result 2006-2007

Department of Anatomy, _____ Medical College

Teacher's Name _____

Top Scorers through **THIS QUESTIONNAIRE**

1st _____

2nd _____

3rd _____

4th _____

Q-No.	Title of Question	A	Score	B	Score	C	Score	D	E
	Classes I attended of this instructor	61		21		12		4	0
Q-1	Instructor is prepared for each class	72	288	17	51	6	12	0	0
Q-2	Demonstrates knowledge of the subject	52	208	30	90	3	6	0	1
Q-3	Completes the whole course assigned	60	240	34	102	4	8	0	0
Q-4	Provides additional material apart from the textbook	15	60	15	45	15	30	29	19
Q-5	Gives real life EXAMPLES or applications relating to the topic of lecture	26	104	27	81	15	30	18	10
Q-6	Communication skills of the Instructor are very effective and appealing	31	124	41	123	16	32	11	1
Q-7	Instructor shows respect towards students	50	200	40	120	6	12	1	1
Q-8	Instructor encourages class participation during his teaching	39	156	21	63	16	32	5	9
Q-9	Instructor maintains an environment that is helpful for learning	35	140	33	99	12	24	6	6
Q-10	Instructor arrives on time	37	148	30	90	15	30	10	1
Q-11	Instructor leaves on time	46	184	38	114	10	20	2	1
Q-12	The Instructor has good class control	21	84	38	114	26	52	4	6
Q-13	The Instructor gives assignments and projects on important topics	6	24	8	24	19	38	25	37
Q-14	Available after class for consultation or any academic query	29	116	35	105	12	24	11	11
Q-15	Subject matter presented in the course has increased knowledge of the subject	27	108	40	120	7	14	11	6
Q-16	Provided you the course outline of his/her syllabus	22	88	17	51	11	22	14	28
Q-17	Clearly states course/lecture objectives before teaching	11	44	15	45	15	30	21	35
Q-18	Prepared us according to pattern of exam as well	28	112	21	63	5	10	10	29
Q-19	The length of material prepared was appropriate for the allocated time	28	112	37	111	18	36	9	3
Q-20	Used audio visual aids e.g. multimedia/ OHP during his teaching	25	100	33	99	13	26	6	10

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

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

XY University of Health Sciences
Teachers' Evaluation Result
Department- Wise Ranking 2006-2007
Department of Anatomy, _____ Medical College

1st _____ 77.73%

2nd _____ 73.14%

3rd _____ 70.95%

4th _____ 70.06%

Top Scorers through **THIS QUESTIONNAIRE**

Name	75% & above		50% To 75%		25% To 50%		Less than 25%	Not Atnd.		Total No. Resp		
A	61		21		12		4	0		98		
B	19		29		29		13	0		90		
C	16		21		8		6	1		52		
D	10		11		4		4	0		29		
E	9		22		33		31	0		95		
F	8		8		13		4	0		33		
G	7		6		8		36	0		57		
H	2		3		8		5	0		18		
I	1		3		7		8	0		19		

Name	A	Score	B	Score	C	Score	D	E	Score	No. Resp	Mar. Obt	Tot Marks
A	72	288	17	51	6	12	0	0	0	95	351	380
B	30	120	37	111	15	30	0	0	0	82	261	328
C	8	32	13	39	16	32	4	4	0	45	107	180
D	4	16	9	27	13	26	4	1	0	31	73	124
E	3	12	8	24	7	14	9	2	0	29	59	116
F	11	44	18	54	31	62	16	11	0	87	176	348
G	1	4	11	33	25	50	14	3	0	54	101	216
H	1	4	1	3	11	22	6	0	0	19	35	76
I	0	0	2	6	10	20	3	1	0	16	29	64

Name	A	Score	B	Score	C	Score	D	E	Score	No. Resp	Mar. Obt	Tot Marks
A	52	208	30	90	3	6	0	1	0	86	304	344
B	20	80	33	99	24	48	4	2	0	83	231	332
C	10	40	13	39	11	22	6	4	0	44	107	176
D	2	8	1	3	7	14	5	0	0	15	30	60
E	4	16	6	18	8	16	4	6	0	28	54	112
F	1	4	17	51	30	60	21	16	0	85	136	340
G	1	4	1	3	7	14	3	3	0	15	24	60
H	1	4	8	24	16	32	18	13	0	56	78	224
I	4	16	7	21	11	22	67	3	0	92	126	368