

A STUDY OF STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF ADDU FACULTY

AMPARO C. CHAMEN

Introduction

Student evaluation of instructors is being used by an increasing number of universities and colleges especially in the United States (Costin, Greenough, and Menges, 1973). On the assumption that evaluation provides an accurate index of instructional quality, many of these universities and colleges base important decisions regarding salary, promotion, and tenure of instructors on it. (Kohlman, 1973).

However, despite the fact that it is widely employed, considerable debate continues over the usefulness of student evaluation of college instructors' performance. There are those who contend that students are consumers of instruction and as such are best qualified to judge the product being offered to them. On the other hand, there are those who argue that students' judgment of instructors' effectiveness reflect popularity and other factors unrelated to teaching performance. In order to decide between these two protagonists, it is first necessary to establish how valid student evaluation of instructor effectiveness is.

The Problem

It was the purpose of this study to determine the validity of the student evaluation of college instructors' effectiveness in the Natural Science Division of the Ateneo de Davao College of Arts and Sciences.

Specifically, this study would like to answer this question:

Is there a significant correlation between student evaluation and college instructor self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness?

Null Hypothesis:

There is no significant correlation between student evaluation and college instructor self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

Significance of the Study

It has been a standard practice in the Ateneo de Davao University, College of Arts and Sciences to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of instructors every

semester through student evaluation. But as of date, no attempt has been made to validate evaluation. This study is an attempt to determine the convergent validity of the student evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness.

Limitation of the Study

This study is limited to the student evaluation of twenty randomly selected college instructors of the Natural Science Division, College of Arts and Sciences, Ateneo de Davao University during the second semester, 1984-1985.

Of the several criteria for validating student evaluation, faculty self-evaluation will be used as the criterion for validating student evaluation in this study. A high correlation between student evaluation and faculty self-evaluation will indicate the convergent validity of student evaluation.

Downie (1952) reported that women faculty received significantly higher rating than men faculty for the extent to which they brought new books and authors in the classroom.

Thomas Miller (1962); Centra (1965); Pambookian (1966) were not able to detect significant difference in end of course ratings between instructors who received feedback and instructors who did not.

Two studies (Aleamoni and Yimer, 1973); (Aleamoni and Graham, 1974) found no relationship between student ratings and instructors rank, while Villano found that associate and full professors received higher rating than instructors and assistant professors.

Six studies (Blaird, 1973; Costin and Crush, 1973; Elmore and La Pointe, 1975; Isaacson, McKeachie and Lin and Mann, 1981) found that teacher warmth is an important variable influencing students' ratings of teacher effectiveness.

Patricia B. Elmore and John Pohlmann (1977) investigated the effect of teacher, student and class characteristics on student evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Instructor characteristics such as sex, academic rank, and warmth have been studied to determine their effects on student evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

Kulik and McKeachie (1975) concluded that student ratings give teachers information about their effectiveness and such information may be used in course redesign, but there is no convincing evidence that the information helps teachers improve their effectiveness.

Marsh and Overall (1979) mentioned some biases in student evaluation like course difficulty, grading leniency, instructor popularity, student interest in the subject course, course workload, class size and enrollment, required versus elective course.

Barbara L. Goebel and Valjean M. Cashen (1979) found out that across developmental levels, older teachers tended to receive lower ratings than younger teachers. Sex of the teachers appeared to be a more influential factor at grades and 13. Interactions showed that unattractive middle-aged female teachers and unattractive old male teachers frequently received lower ratings.

Herbert Marsh and his companions (1979) made a study to determine if faculty self-evaluation of their own teaching effectiveness would agree with the corresponding evaluation by their students. They found out that validity coefficients were statistically significant for all evaluation factors (median $r = .49$).

These findings which reaffirm the validity of student evaluation suggest the possible usefulness of faculty self-evaluation and should help reassure faculty about the accuracy of the student ratings.

Christopher Owen (1980) made a study, "Student Evaluation of Lecturers As An Indicator of Instructional Quality: A Validity Study." The multiple correlation ($r = .75$) obtained was highly significant. From these results it appears as if the students' evaluations were a highly accurate indication of the relative quality of instruction provided by various lecturers.

Methodology

The instrument used in this study was the faculty evaluation form developed by a committee composed of department heads and division chairmen of the College of Arts and Sciences, Ateneo de Davao University. The faculty evaluation form contained forty items divided into the following factors for evaluating teaching effectiveness: knowledge of the course material, techniques and methodology, classroom management and procedure and personality.

Twenty college instructors in the Natural Science Division were selected at random. The faculty evaluation forms were sent to these teachers two weeks before the end of the second semester, 1984-1985. They were asked to evaluate themselves with a set of items identical to those used by the students. They were asked to rate their own teaching effectiveness and not to report how students would rate them.

Three out of the six classes taught during the second semester of these instructors were randomly selected totalling to sixty classes. The students were asked to evaluate their instructors using the faculty evaluation form three weeks before the end of the second semester. The total number of filled-up evaluation forms was one thousand six hundred.

The mean of the individual evaluation items from the students' evaluation and the instructors' self-evaluation were computed. Convergent validity was determined by a correlation between the same evaluation factor rated by the students and the instructors. To determine the correlation between student evaluation and faculty self-evaluation, the Pearson-Product Moment coefficient of correlation (4) was computed. To determine the significance of the coefficient of correlation (r), the t-test was used.

Results and Discussions

SUMMARY OF MEAN EVALUATION RATINGS OF STUDENTS AND FACULTY

| Evaluation Factor | Mean Rating | | r |
|------------------------------|-------------|---------|-----|
| | Faculty | Student | |
| Knowledge of Course Material | 4.24 | 3.88 | .57 |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|------|------|-----|
| Techniques and Methodology | 4.20 | 3.59 | .48 |
| Classroom Management and Procedure | 4.71 | 4.10 | .55 |
| Personality | 4.55 | 4.12 | .49 |
| Over-all Rating | 4.45 | 3.93 | .52 |

The faculty rated themselves higher than the students in all the evaluation factors. There is a close agreement in the evaluation ratings of students and faculty in the following factors: 1) exhibits thorough knowledge of the subject matter; 2) employs effective teaching aids; 3) attends class regularly; 4) starts and ends class punctually; 5) uses time efficiently. Probably, these evaluation factors are concrete that they are easily perceived by both students and faculty. Thus, the close agreement.

There is a disagreement in the evaluation of students and faculty in such factors as 1) makes clear the purpose and objectives of the lesson for the day; 2) presents explanations clearly; 3) uses a variety of methods; 4) evaluates students fairly; and 5) informs students of their academic performance and how it is evaluated.

It is possible that college instructors presume that the introduction of the lesson already includes the objectives of the lesson. On the other hand, the students may expect the instructor to state verbally or write on the board the objectives of the lesson. Thus, the disagreement in the perception of this factor.

There may be some college instructors who believe that college students can be effectively taught by the lecture-discussion method alone. There may also be a number of college students who prefer a variety of teaching methods in order to learn effectively. Thus, the difference between student evaluation and faculty self-evaluation on this factor.

There are many variables that enter into the evaluation of student academic performance. These variables must be made clear to the students at the start of the semester to minimize feelings of inequity and injustice. It is possible that the reason behind the disagreement between student rating and faculty self-evaluation on this factor is the lack of proper orientation on the grading system. The highest evaluation rating by faculty was on their classroom management and procedure. This was also the factor given the highest rating by students. Techniques and methodology were rated lowest by both students and faculty.

The data revealed that there is a high positive correlation between student evaluation and faculty evaluation in all the evaluation factors. These data indicate that the student evaluation exhibits convergent validity.

The coefficient of correlation (r) of .52 revealed that there is a high positive correlation between student evaluation and faculty self-evaluation regarding teaching effectiveness.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, the following conclusions are drawn:
 1. There is a significant correlation between the student evaluation and

faculty self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

- a. Administrators are encouraged to look closely into the student evaluation to gather some insights into the planning for faculty development programs.
- b. A further study to determine teacher variables like sex, age, rank and educational qualifications that may influence student evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
- c. An expansion of the scope of this study especially to include the whole College of Arts and Sciences of Ateneo de Davao University. A study using other criteria for validating student evaluation like final exam grades, peer evaluation.
- d. A study using other criteria for validating student evaluation like final exam grades, peer evaluation.

SECOND ANNUAL JEA RELIGIOUS STUDIES/THEOLOGY CONVENTION

VIVIEN C. NOBLES

The Second Annual Jesuit Education Association: Religious Studies/Theology Convention was held in January 18-19, 1985 at the Loyola House, Ateneo de Davao University. Fr. Pasquale T. Giordano, S.J., Coordinator of the JEA Religious Studies/Theology sector presided over the meeting. Fr. Raul Bonoan, S.J., Chairman of the JEA Commission on Higher Education was present. The participants were: Ateneo de Davao: Mr. Reynaldo Tianero, Sr. Loretta Harriman, M.M.; Ateneo de Naga: Mr. Avelino Sales; Ateneo de Manila: Fr. Asandas Balchand, S.J.; Fr. Joseph Roche, S.J.; Ateneo de Zamboanga: Fr. Joseph Kavanagh, S.J.; Xavier University: Fr. Nicomedes Yatco, S.J., Mr. Henry Valmorla. Miss Vivien Nobles of the Ateneo de Davao was the Recording Secretary.

The Second JEA Religious Studies/Theology Convention began with each Chairman presenting a report on the RS/Theology situation in his own school. Then the focus turned to the reports assigned at last year's convention: Curriculum, textbooks, faculty evaluation, and faculty development.

One critical need that surfaced was the need for textbooks prepared by the RS/Theology faculty themselves. The writing of textbooks was considered a very important project. It is much easier to teach a course well when there is a good textbook.