

# LANGUAGE IN INDIA

Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow

Volume 11 : 4 April 2011

ISSN 1930-2940

Managing Editor: M. S. Thirumalai, Ph.D.

Editors: B. Mallikarjun, Ph.D.

Sam Mohanlal, Ph.D.

B. A. Sharada, Ph.D.

A. R. Fatihi, Ph.D.

Lakhan Gusain, Ph.D.

Jennifer Marie Bayer, Ph.D.

S. M. Ravichandran, Ph.D.

G. Baskaran, Ph.D.

L. Ramamoorthy, Ph.D.

## Faculty Classroom Performance

Safdar Rehman Ghazi, Ph.D.

Gulap Shahzada, M.A., M.Ed.

---

### Abstract

The study was conducted with the objective to assess the faculty classroom performance. One hundred eighty one students were sampled. A questionnaire of 20 items (Standardized HEC Teacher Evaluation form 2009) was used for the collection of data focusing on various aspects of faculty classroom performance. The collected data was analyzed, tabulated and interpreted using percentage. It was concluded that the teachers were efficient and well aware of their duties.

The strong areas of their performance were: prepare for each class, demonstrate the knowledge of the subjects, show respect towards students and encourage their class participation and their arrival on time, motivate students to do their best work, and explain the things clearly. The weakened areas of their performance were: to give citations regarding current situation with reference to Pakistani context, to use a good variety of teaching methods, and they never seemed to think about the demands made by other modules. A special training for teaching methods is recommended for the most weakened areas of their performance.

**Keywords:** Teacher, Faculty, Performance, University, Higher Education, Classroom

### Introduction

Language in India [www.languageinindia.com](http://www.languageinindia.com)

11 : 4 April 2011

Safdar Rehman Ghazi, Ph.D. and Gulap Shahzada, M.A., M.Ed.

Faculty Classroom Performance

Teacher performance can be thought of as those things a teacher does, both inside and outside of the classroom. Because specialized knowledge does not automatically translate to effective classroom performance, it is necessary to evaluate not only what a teacher knows but also what a teacher can do. Teacher performance thus includes such instructional basics as how well a teacher plans learning activities, maintains a positive classroom environment, communicates with students, and provides productive feedback. It also includes activities outside the classroom, such as advising student groups, taking part in committees and other school-wide work, and communicating with parents. Parents, students and society as a whole expect a return in higher education that is quantifiable, standard, and measurable in terms of values which are incongruent with those originally envisioned for such institutions.

### **On Defining Faculty Evaluation**

Miller (1987) faculty evaluation defines as a process designed to improve faculty performance (a development process), or (2) a procedure that assists in making personnel decisions (a reviewing process). Another particular concern has to do with evaluating the performance and vitality of tenured faculty members (Licata, 1986). Vitality refers to the faculty member's ability and interest in continuing to grow.

Performance evaluation is the process of evaluating the relative worth or ability of teacher against pre-determined, job-related performance standards usually set by job-descriptors. Faculty evaluation should focus on the teaching performance and not on the faculty member's scholarly reputation or productivity. Faculty evaluation must be tied to the institutions incentive-and-reward system and evaluation should be supported by means of faculty development in the form of instructional resources that facilitate classroom instruction.

Thornton (2006) found that dispositions "often loosely equate to values, beliefs, attitudes, characteristics, professional behaviors and qualities, ethics and perceptions." A common assumption is that teachers should be reflective, habitually monitoring their effectiveness and planning improvements.

Munoz and Chang (2007) aptly summarize, "Teacher characteristics and student growth have an elusive relationship, but practice in the classrooms tells us that they are two intertwined concepts."<sup>16</sup> As these researchers note, policymakers will need "to make the best decision based on their particular context" about which teacher characteristics might be important to assess.

### **A Review of Literature**

To evaluate teacher performance requires having a set of performance criteria. For example, elements that Goe, Bell & Little (2008) consider essential include whether teachers "use diverse resources to plan and structure engaging learning opportunities; monitor student progress formatively, adapting instruction as needed . . . collaborate with other teachers, administrators, parents, and education professionals to ensure student success, particularly the success of students with special needs and those at high risk for failure."<sup>17</sup> Kennedy (2008) includes as examples of relevant classroom practices "being organized, providing clear goals and standards, [and] keeping students on task"; as examples of typical practices outside the

classroom, she includes “interacting with colleagues and parents, planning a curriculum that engages students, providing supervision to the chess club.”

Teacher effectiveness can be considered the result of teacher activities. It encompasses a wide range of outcomes, obviously including student learning. Academic achievement is critical, but as noted earlier, defining teacher effectiveness only in those terms ignores several other important ways that teachers affect students and the school community. The limitations of assessment based on student achievement are amplified when achievement is measured only by standardized test scores, with no consideration of such other classroom data as student projects, performances, papers, learning logs, and the like.

As institutional constraints and calls for increased accountability continue into the decade of the 1990s in colleges and universities, faculty evaluation programs need reexamining to see how they fit with institutional purposes of evaluation. An assessment of practices of evaluation also should help to determine a program’s effectiveness in promoting faculty development and productivity. To provide adequate and unbiased evaluation programs, administrators must involve faculty members in the process of determining the evaluation’s purpose, as well as its scope, sources of data, participants, and assessment of effectiveness.

### **Disagreement in Literature**

Disagreement in the literature centers on whether one evaluation program can serve both to improve performance and to help in personnel decisions. One contention is that while both purposes are vital, they must be kept separate (Seldin, 1984). The argument is that both purposes can’t be served by one system. On the other hand (Miller, 1987) concedes that a dual system is ideal, but observes that limitations of time, money, and personnel render it impractical for most institutions. Nonetheless, Miller cautions, despite the need to find ways to improve faculty performance institution should not consider substituting one program that tries to combine both functions.

Seldin (1984) further asserts that evaluation systems aimed at faculty development which provide constructive feedback to the professor often create a kind of dissatisfaction that motivates the professor to improve. Chances for faculty improvement increases when:

- Immediate feedback is given,
- The professor wants to improve, and
- The professor knows how to bring about the improvement.

Although most institutions identify faculty improvement as their primary goal, Moomaw (1977) believes that most evaluation systems do not stimulate and support faculty development effectively. He cited the lack of connection between evaluation and development activities, and the absence of faculty involvement in the process of the evaluation as the chief reasons for the uneven, or poor, effectiveness of programs at most institutions.

In assessing programs for evaluation teaching, McKeachie (1987) admits that the literature does not support the claim that instructional evaluation alone improves teaching. Faculty

members often must be provided with an understanding of teaching and learning theories, as well as opportunities to develop and practice teaching skills in a non threatening environment. To be helpful in improving faculty performance, instructional evaluation must identify specific difficulties not just assess the general quality of instructions.

## **Objectives**

This study was conducted with the following objectives:

1. To assess the faculty classroom performance using Teacher Evaluation Form (2009) prescribed by the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan.
2. To find out the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty classroom performance in the universities of Pakistan.
3. To give applicable recommendations for the improvement of faculty classroom performance.

## **Significance of the Study**

Teacher is the most important factor in the process of education. The quality and level of excellence in education depend upon the quality and competence of teacher. Due to expansion of knowledge and contemporary changes it is very essential to replace the old and traditional concepts, thinking, approaches and methods of handling affairs and day to day emerging situation in higher education institution by new and modern methods. Being an area of a great importance evaluation of the faculty class room performance, it was felt to conduct study on this topic.

This study will be significant to address and identify:

1. Strengths and weaknesses of the faculty classroom performance.
2. The role of faculty at university level.
3. The mutual cooperation between the students and teachers.
4. How to improve the in competencies of the faculty.
5. The responsibilities of teachers and their role in the classroom.
6. The more effective approaches used in teaching, and using this knowledge to drive faculty development and possibly faculty training.
7. The abilities of faculty in leading and feedback to improve their capabilities.
8. Levels of faculty competency, professional advancements, and the need to adopt effective teaching approaches at university level.
9. The ways to help the administrators/chairs to improve the faculty performance.

## **Delimitations of the Study**

This study was delimited to the views of the students studying in the University of Science & Technology, Bannu, Pakistan and the criteria set by the Higher Education Commission, Pakistan in its Teacher Evaluation Form 2009.

## **Research Methodology**

Language in India [www.languageinindia.com](http://www.languageinindia.com)

11 : 4 April 2011

Safdar Rehman Ghazi, Ph.D. and Gulap Shahzada, M.A., M.Ed.

Faculty Classroom Performance

This study was descriptive in nature and was conducted to investigate the faculty classroom performance.

### **Population**

Students of all departments of University of Science and Technology Bannu constituted the population of this study.

### **Sample**

One hundred and eighty one enrolled students of the university were sampled using convenient sampling technique.

### **Instrumentation**

HEC teacher evaluation form 2009 was used as a research instrument for the collection of data. This consisted of twenty statements. The distributions of questionnaires were made by the personal visits of one of the researchers' student.

### **Data Analysis**

The collected data was analyzed and tabulated and interpreted in the light of the objectives of the study. Statistical technique percentage was used to analyze the data.

**Table 1: Teacher's Classroom Performance as assessed by the students**

Sr. No	Area of Performance		SD	DA	UD	A	SA
1	Teacher's preparation for class	f	3	12	13	53	100
		%	1.65	6.62	7.18	29.28	55.24
2	Teacher's demonstrations for knowledge of the subject	f	2	11	22	66	80
		%	1.10	6.07	12.15	36.46	44.19
3	In time course completion	f	7	12	33	42	87
		%	3.86	6.62	18.23	23.20	48.06
4	Provision of the additional material apart from textbook	f	14	16	25	59	67
		%	7.73	8.83	13.59	32.59	37.01
5	Giving citations regarding Pakistan current situation	f	10	28	37	51	53
		%	5.52	15.46	20.44	28.17	29.28
6	Effectiveness of communications on subject	f	5	9	24	50	93
		%	4.97	2.76	13.25	27.62	51.38
7	Showing respect for students & encouraging participation	f	6	10	20	48	97
		%	3.31	5.52	11.04	26.51	53.59
8	Maintaining conducive to learning environment	f	4	11	24	61	81
		%	2.20	6.07	13.25	33.70	44.75
9	Teacher's in time arrival in the class	f	5	3	22	42	109
		%	2.76	1.65	12.15	23.20	60.22
10	Teacher's fairness in the examination	f	9	9	25	54	84
		%	4.97	4.97	13.81	29.83	46.40
11	Teacher's availability during office hours and after class	f	6	11	28	55	81
		%	3.31	6.07	15.46	30.38	44.75
12	Motivating students to do their best work	f	4	11	21	45	100
		%	2.20	6.07	11.60	24.86	55.24
13	Non approachability of the teacher	f	47	31	32	40	31
		%	25.96	17.12	17.67	22.09	17.12
14	Giving helpful advice if students having difficulties	f	7	12	24	45	93
		%	3.86	6.62	13.25	24.86	51.38
15	Teacher's enthusiasm about teaching students	f	5	14	32	60	70
		%	2.76	7.73	17.67	33.14	38.67
16	Explaining things clearly	f	7	13	16	45	100
		%	3.86	7.18	8.83	24.86	55.24
17	Good variety of teaching methods used on this course	f	9	17	30	56	69
		%	4.39	9.39	16.57	30.93	38.12
18	Giving constructive feedback on students' work	f	4	17	30	73	53
		%	2.20	9.39	16.57	40.33	31.49
19	No thinking about the demands of other modules	f	23	30	37	53	38
		%	12.70	16.57	20.44	29.28	20.99
20	Encouraging students' active participation in discussions	f	7	17	27	44	86
		%	3.86	9.39	14.91	24.30	47.51

Table 1 shows:

55.24 percent students strongly agree, 29.28 percent students agree, 7.18 percent students somewhat agree, 6.62 percent students disagree and 1.65 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher is prepared for each class”.

44.19 percent students strongly agree, 36.46 percent students agree, 12.15 percent students somewhat agree, 6.07 percent students and 1.10 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher demonstrates knowledge of the subject”.

48.06 percent students strongly agree, 23.20 percent students agree, 18.23 percent somewhat agree, 6.62 percent students disagree, 3.86 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher completes the whole course”.

37.01 percent students strongly agree, 32.59 percent students agree, 13.81 percent students somewhat agree, 8.83 percent students disagree, 7.73 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher provides additional material apart from the text book”.

29.28 percent students strongly agree , 28.17 percent students agree, 20.44 percent students somewhat agree, 15.46 percent students disagree and 5.52 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher gives citations regarding current situations with reference to Pakistani context”.

51.38 percent students strongly agree, 27.62 percent students agree, 13.25 percent students somewhat agree, 2.76 percent students disagree and 4.97 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher communicates the subject matter effectively”.

53.59 percent students strongly agree, 26.51 percent students agree, 11.04 percent students somewhat agree, 5.52 percent students disagree and 3.31 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher shows respect towards students and encourages class participation”.

44.75 percent students strongly agree, 33.70 percent students agree, 13.25 percent students somewhat agree, 6.07 percent students disagree and 2.20 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “teacher maintains an environment that is conducive to learning”.

60.22 percent students strongly agree, 23.20 percent students agree, 12.15 percent students somewhat agree, 1.65 percent students disagree and 2.76 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher arrives on time”.

46.40 percent students strongly agree, 29.83 percent students agree, 13.81 percent students somewhat agree, 4.97 percent students disagree and 4.97 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher is fair in examination”.

44.75 percent students strongly agree, 30.38 percent students agree, 15.46 percent students somewhat agree, 6.07 percent students disagree and 3.31 percent students disagree to the Language in India [www.languageinindia.com](http://www.languageinindia.com)

statement “the teacher was available during the specified office hours and for after class consultations”.

55.24 percent students strongly agree 24.86 percent students agree, 11.60 percent students somewhat agree, 6.70 percent students disagree and 2.20 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher really motivates students to do their best work”.

17.12 percent students strongly agree, 22.09 percent students agree, 17.67 percent students somewhat agree, 17.12 percent students disagree and 25.96 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher is just not very approachable”.

51.38 percent students strongly agree, 24.86 percent students agree, 13.25 percent students somewhat agree, 6.62 percent students disagree and 3.86 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “students usually get helpful or advice if they are having difficulties with work”.

38.67 percent students strongly agree, 33.14 percent students agree, 17.67 percent students somewhat agree, 7.73 percent students disagree, 2.76 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “on the whole teachers are really enthusiastic about teaching students”.

55.24 percent students strongly agree, 24.86 percent students agree, 8.83 percent students somewhat agree, 7.18 percent students disagree and 3.86 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teachers explain things clearly”.

38.12 percent students strongly agree, 13.93 percent students agree, 16.57 percent students somewhat agree, 9.39 percent students disagree and 4.97 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “there is a good variety of teaching methods used on this course”.

39.49 percent students strongly agree, 40.33 percent students agree, 16.57 percent students somewhat agree, 9.39 percent students disagree and 2.20 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher gives constructive feed back on the work students do”.

20.99 percent students strongly agree, 29.28 percent students agree , 20.44 percent students somewhat agree, 16.57 percent students and 12.70 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “the teacher never seems to think about the demands made by other modules students are doing”.

47.51percent students strongly, 24.30 percent students agree, 14.91 percent students somewhat agree, 9.39 percent students disagree and 3.86 percent students strongly disagree to the statement “students are actively encouraged to participate in class discussions”.

## **Findings**

1. Majority of the students (f=153, 84.52%) supported “teacher is well prepared for each class”.
2. Majority of the students (f=146, 80.65%) agreed “the teacher demonstrate knowledge of the subjects”.
3. Majority of the respondents (f=129, 71.26%) supported “the teacher completes the whole course”.

4. Majority of the students (f=126, 79.60%) confirmed “the teacher provides additional material apart from the text book”.
5. Majority of the students (f=104, 57.45%) claimed “the teacher gives citations regarding current situation with reference to Pakistani context”.
6. Majority of the students (f=143, 79%) agreed “the teacher communicates the subject matter effectively”.
7. Majority of the students (f=145, 80.10%) confirmed “the teacher shows respect towards students and encourages class participation”.
8. Majority of the students (f=142, 78.45%) agreed “the teacher maintains an environment that is conducive to learning”.
9. Majority of the students (f=151, 83.42%) supported “the teacher arrives on time”.
10. Majority of the students (f=138, 76.23%) supported “the teacher is fair in examination”.
11. Majority of the students (f=136, 75.13%) were in favor “the teacher was available during the specified office hours and for after class consultation”.
12. Majority of the students (f=145, 80.10%) confirmed “the teacher motivates students to do their best work”.
13. Majority of the students (f=78, 43.08%) disagreed “the teacher is just not very approachable”.
14. Majority of the students (f=138, 76.24%) were in favor “the students usually get helpful advice if students are having difficulties with work”.
15. Majority of the respondents (f=130, 71.81%) agreed “on the whole teacher are really enthusiastic about teaching students”.
16. Majority of the students (f=145, 80.10%) were in favor “the teacher explains things clearly”.
17. Majority of the respondents (f=125, 69.05%) confirmed “there is a good variety of teaching methods used on this course”.
18. Majority of the respondents (f=126, 71.82%) claimed “the teacher gives constructive feedback on the work students do”.
19. Majority of the students (f=91, 50.27%) were in favor “the teacher never seems to think about the demands made by other modules”.
20. Majority of the respondents (f=120, 71.81%) claimed “the students are actively encouraged to participate in class discussion”

## Conclusions

1. Overall the performance of the faculty was good and the strongest areas of faculty performance were:
  - Teacher is prepared for each class.
  - The teacher demonstrates knowledge of the subjects.
  - The teacher shows respects towards students and encourages class participation.
  - The teacher arrives on time.
  - The teacher motivates students to do their best work.
  - Teacher explains things clearly.
2. The areas of marginal performance of the faculty were:
  - The teacher completes the whole course.
  - The teacher provides additional material apart from the text book.

- The teacher communicates the subjects matter effectively.
  - The teacher maintains an environment that is conducive to learning.
  - The teacher is fair in examination.
  - The teacher is available during the specified office hours and for after class consultation.
  - The teacher is just not very approachable.
  - The students usually get helpful advice if they are having difficulties with work.
  - On the whole teacher are really enthusiastic about teaching students.
  - The teacher gives constructive feedback on the work you do.
  - The students are actively encouraged to participate in class discussion.
3. The weakened areas of faculty performance were:
- The teacher gives citations regarding current situation with reference to Pakistani context.
  - There is a good variety of teaching methods used on this course.
  - The teacher never seems to think about the demands made by other modules

### **Recommendations**

On the basis of findings and conclusions the following recommendations were made:

1. Faculty may maintain or improve its performance standards by preparing for each class, demonstrating the knowledge of the subjects in a better way, showing respect towards students and encouraging their class participation, arriving in the class on time, motivating students to do their best work, and explaining the things clearly.
2. The faculty need to improve their performance by completing the whole course, providing the additional material to the students apart from the text book, communicating the subject matter effectively, maintaining an environment that is conducive to learning, being fair in examination, with their availability during the specified office hours and for after class consultation, be a good approachable teacher, helping students if they are having difficulties with work, being enthusiastic about teaching students, giving constructive feedback on students' work, and encourage students to participate in class discussion.
3. The faculty needs a special training in the most weakened areas of their performance; giving citations regarding current situation with reference to Pakistani context, using a variety of teaching methods, especially the area of modular teaching approach in education.

---

### **References**

Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Kennedy, M. M. (2008). Sorting out teacher quality. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(1),59-63.

Licata, C.M. 1986. Post-tenure Faculty evaluation: Threat or opportunity?

McKeachie, W.J.Fall (1987). Can Evaluating Instruction Improve Teaching?, in techniques for Evaluating and Improving Instruction, edited by L.M.Aleamoni. New directions for teaching and learning No.31.San Francisco: Jossey-bass.

Miller, R.I.(1987). Evaluating faculty for Promotion and Tenure, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Moomaw, W.E Spring (1977). Practices and problems in Evaluating Instruction, in Renewing and Evaluating Teaching, edited by J.A Centra-New directions for Higher Education No.1. San Francisco: Jossey –Bass

Munoz & Chang (2007). The elusive relationship between teacher characteristics and student academic growth: A longitudinal multilevel model for change. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 20(3-4): 147-164. Retrieved June 26, 2010, from SpringerLink database

Seldin, P. (1984). Changing Practices in faculty Evaluation: San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Thornton, H. (2006). Dispositions in action: Do dispositions make a difference in practice? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 33(2), 53-68, (4). Retrieved June 23, 2010, from ProQuest Education Journals

=====

Safdar Rehman Ghazi, Ph.D.  
Institute of Education & Research  
University of Science & Technology  
Bannu, 28100, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan  
[drsrghazi@yahoo.com](mailto:drsrghazi@yahoo.com)

Gulap Shahzada, M.A., M.Ed.  
Institute of Education & Research  
University of Science & Technology  
Bannu, 28100, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan  
[gulap\\_786@yahoo.com](mailto:gulap_786@yahoo.com)