

**THE ATTITUDE OF INSTRUCTORS TOWARDS THEIR  
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION WITH REFERENCE  
TO HAWASSA UNIVERSITY**

**BY  
TEMESGEN KINFU**



**A Thesis Presented to the School of Graduate Studies  
Addis Ababa University**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master  
of Arts in Educational Planning and Management**

**March 2007**

## Acknowledgements

My heart-felt thanks go to Dr. Zenebe Baraki, my thesis advisor, for his unreserved guidance and comments starting from very beginning to its realization. He has taken a great care to improve the contents of this thesis and tirelessly review the manuscript.

I am also grateful to my friends, especially Andualem Admassie, for his material and moral support. Moreover, I would like to thank my wife, Miheret Zekarias, for her love, support and insightful comment more often than challenged my thinking.

I give special thanks to W/o Zewuditu Tesfaye, Ato Adankegn Mekonnen and Ato Nuredien Bussera for their unreserved support throughout my study.

My greatest gratitude is also to my beloved Families, Especially to my father Ato Kinfu Gebresilassie and my mother W/o Zenebech Taddessie, who inexpressively supported me in whatever form necessary for the accomplishment of my study successfully.

Finally, I would like to thank Deans, Instructors and Technical Assistants of Hawassa University for their cooperation during data collection.

## Table of Contents

Contents	Page
Acknowledgements.....	i
Table of contents .....	ii
List of tables.....	iv
Abbreviations / acronyms.....	v
Abstract .....	vi
<b>CHAPTER ONE.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	3
1.3. Objectives of the Study.....	5
1.4. Significance of the Study.....	6
1.5. Delimitation of the Study.....	7
1.6. Limitation of the study.....	7
1.7. Research Methodology and Procedure of the Study.....	8
1.8. Definition of Terms.....	11
1.9. Organization of the Study.....	12
<b>CHAPTER TWO.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1. Introduction.....	13
2.2. Purpose of Performance Evaluation.....	15
2.3. Effective Performance Evaluation.....	16
2.4. Common Problems of Performance Evaluation.....	18
2.5. Performance Feedback.....	21
2.6. Teachers' Performance Evaluation.....	23
2.7. Approaches to Teachers' Performance Evaluation.....	24
2.8. Administration of the Evaluation.....	28
2.9. The Attitude of Teachers towards their Performance Evaluation.....	29

<b>CHAPTER THREE</b> .....	31
<b>3. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA</b> .....	31
3.1. Attitude towards the purpose of performance evaluation.....	31
3.2. Attitude towards the administration of performance evaluation.....	33
3.3. Student-instructor face-to-face evaluation .....	36
3.4. Attitude towards Students' evaluation.....	39
3.5. Attitude towards Colleagues' evaluation.....	42
3.6. Attitude towards Department heads' evaluation .....	45
3.7. Effectiveness of faculty teaching evaluation forms .....	47
<b>CHAPTER FOUR</b> .....	49
<b>4. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	49
4.1. Summary .....	49
4.2. Conclusions .....	51
4.3. Recommendations.....	53
<b>References</b> .....	55
<b>Appendices</b> .....	58

## List of Tables

Table	Page
1 - Distribution of the Population and the Sample Selected.....	9
2 - One sample t-test for the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation.....	32
2a - Descriptive statistics for the purpose of performance evaluation.....	32
2b- One-Way ANOVA for the purpose of performance evaluation by qualifications.....	33
3 - One sample t-test for the administration of performance evaluation.....	34
3a- Descriptive statistics for the administration of performance evaluation by experience .....	35
3b- One-Way ANOVA for the administration of performance evaluation by experiences.....	35
4 - One sample t-test for student-instructor face-to-face evaluation.....	36
4a- Descriptive statistics for student-instructor face-to-face evaluation.....	38
4b- One-Way ANOVA for student-instructor face-to-face evaluation by teaching experiences .....	38
5 - One sample for students' evaluation.....	39
5a- Descriptive Statistics for students' evaluation.....	40
5b- Descriptive Statistics for students' evaluation by teaching experiences.....	40
5c- One-Way ANOVA for Students' evaluation by qualification and by teaching experiences.....	40
6 - One sample t-test for colleagues' evaluation.....	42
6a- Descriptive Statistics for colleagues' evaluation by teaching experiences.....	43
6b- One-Way ANOVA for colleagues' evaluation by teaching experiences.....	43
7 - One sample t-test for department heads evaluation.....	45
7a- Descriptive statistics for department heads' evaluation by qualifications.....	46
7b- One-Way ANOVA for department heads' evaluation by qualifications.....	46
8 - One sample t-test for the effectiveness of the faculty teaching evaluation forms.....	47

## **Abbreviations/Acronyms**

AAU: - Addis Ababa University

ANOVA: - Analysis of Variance

DF: - Degree of Freedom

MOE: - Ministry of Education

SPSS: - Statistical Package for Social Sciences

## Abstract

This study has been set out to focus on the attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards their performance evaluation with reference to Hawassa University. In order to accomplish the study, basic questions on their attitude towards the purpose, administration, face-to-face evaluation, students', colleagues', and department heads' evaluation, and the effectiveness of the evaluation instruments/forms have been raised to be answered.

Descriptive survey method was employed to conduct the research. One sample t-test, one-way ANOVA, and mean comparisons were also used in the analysis. The study found out that instructors and technical assistants showed positive attitude towards such aspects as the purpose, administration, face-to-face evaluation. Moreover, the respondents demonstrated favorable attitude towards students' and colleagues' evaluation. In addition, the assessors included in students', colleagues' and department heads' rating instruments were perceived as appropriate, useful, and applicable by respondents. However, they showed negative attitude towards department heads' evaluation.

Furthermore, Significant attitudinal variation among respondents towards the purpose of evaluation, students' evaluation and department heads' evaluations by qualifications were also the findings of the study. There were also significant attitudinal variation among respondents towards the administration of the evaluation and towards colleagues evaluation by teaching experiences.

Finally, based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were forwarded:

- Faculties/colleges should provide adequate orientation to students about the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation.
- Faculties/colleges should arrange training program to instructors and technical assistants on the purpose and administration of faculty teaching performance evaluation.
- Faculties/colleges should continuously revise the assessors of the faculty rating instruments and include some standard open-ended questions that invite the evaluators to offer suggestions for improvement.
- Training to department heads, about how to make effective evaluation, should be given and items concerning the academic aspect should be included in the department heads' rating forms.
- Face-to-face evaluation should be applied so that instructors can get timely feedback about their strength and weaknesses from students.
- Comprehensive research should be done at a national level by the MOE in collaboration with the universities of the country.

# CHAPTER ONE

## 1. THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH

### 1.1. Background of the Study ✓

Performance evaluation is the process of identifying, evaluating and developing the work performance of employees in the organization, so that organizational goals and objectives are more effectively achieved, while at the same time benefiting employees' in terms of recognition, receiving feedback, catering for work needs and offering career guidance (CCH, 1981:2). It includes formal system of periodic review and evaluation of employee's job performance to achieve organizational goals and objectives. In this regard, instructor evaluation is the periodic review and evaluation of an instructor in the teaching-learning process to realize the attainment of educational goals and objectives.

Evaluation is important at all levels of education for two major reasons: for effective achievement of educational objectives and for making administrative decisions such as pay, promotion and retention (Hussein and Neville, 1994:6015). According to Tulle and Murray (cited in Atsede, 1991:14), university instructors are subject to evaluation of professional competence. In addition, the results of these evaluations are used with respect to retention, promotion, or dismissal of the teaching staff. Therefore, it seems logical that, all university instructors must understand its purpose and implement its procedures correctly and consistently.

In universities and colleges, evaluating instructors' performance provides the knowledge and understanding that directs improved teaching and learning. According to the document of the Ministry of Education (1994), teachers' performance evaluation has the following major objectives:

- a. to provide better educational opportunity, salary increment, promotion and reward for effective teachers;
- b. to identify inefficient teachers and arrange in-service training to help them minimize their weaknesses;

- c. to take proper measures on teachers who do not improve after taking in-service training; and
- d. to ensure the attainment of educational objectives.

An effective performance evaluation process for professionals should be designed and implemented to provide recognition and support for effective performance; and it is used as a critical component of motivation, attracting top skills and preventing turnover (Newman and Hendricks, 1980:4). In order to measure effective performance, the assessors in the rating forms must be very strong to generate accurate and objective evidence. Otherwise, as Melaku (1992:174) concluded, teachers perceived their level of satisfaction with the assessors to be far below from what has been expected. Therefore, it would be possible to expect that instructors will be uncooperative and unresponsive to evaluation system that is unable to provide objective and accurate performance data.

In order to be effective, the evaluation system must have the support of all members of the university. According to Gordon (1986:224), all instructors of universities must understand the purpose of evaluation and implement its procedures correctly and consistently. Therefore, universities should institute formal evaluation procedures that encourage positive attitudes. Therefore, administrators and instructors should view evaluation as useful, objective, fair and understand its purpose. However, as to Neal (cited in Wossenu, 2005:13), instructors and administrators have differences of perception about the purpose of the evaluation system. Instructors viewed evaluation for making personnel decisions; where as administrators considered it as a faculty development process. These differences of opinion about the purpose of evaluation would bring about problems of communication and cooperation.

In Ethiopia, evaluation of university instructor's performance has been carried out by students, colleagues (peers), and department heads. No matter the evaluator or evaluatees are; the evaluation process should be perceived by both as fair, objective, and comprehensive. From this one can conclude that, if the instructor perceived the evaluation system as invalid, biased or subjective, his/her contribution to the attainment

of educational objectives will be negatively affected.

However, literatures show that, many educators and scholars have differences of opinion about students', colleagues', and department heads' evaluation of instructors' performance: some in favor and others against. In the same way, university instructors, themselves, who are being evaluated by their students, colleagues, and department heads developed either positive or negative attitude towards the current faculty teaching performance evaluation system.

Therefore, the rationale behind this study is to examine these different views and attitudes of instructors and technical assistants at the university level. Studying instructors' and technical assistants' views and attitudes regarding their performance evaluation in universities is useful in order to identify its appropriateness, usefulness, and applicability and examine additional sources that may be included to make the instructional process effective.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

The main reason to rely on evaluation of teaching and learning is that it lays the basis for recognition and reward for good teaching (Assefa, 1999). On the other hand, good teaching demands knowledge of the subject and the ability to synthesize and communicate that in a meaningful way (Park, 1996). Therefore, in evaluating good teaching, both the act of teaching and the content or the subject matter taught is considered to be important.

Currently, the sources of information to evaluate teaching effectiveness may vary from country to country or institution to institution. However, in higher institutions of Ethiopia, Students, Colleagues and department heads are the most common sources of information for evaluating teaching effectiveness. According to Areola (cited in Wossenu, 2005), the credibility of these sources depend on the opportunity that the source has to be a first hand observer as well as the willingness of the teachers being evaluated to accept and believe

what the sources have to say.

Universities conduct performance evaluation for administrative and/or developmental purposes. As to Gomez-Mejia et al. (1995:257), performance measurements are used administratively whenever they are the basis for decision about the instructors' work conditions, including promotions, terminations, and rewards. Developmental uses of evaluation are geared toward improving instructors' performance and strengthening their skills by providing feedback on their strong and weak sides as well as offering further training.

The above statements indicate that universities use students, colleagues, and department heads as a source of information for evaluating the quality of instruction as well as for making administrative decisions. However, still there is controversy, among instructors, on the issues related to bias, competence, accuracy, and fairness of the sources that affect instructors' attitude, performance and effectiveness.

Moreover, the criteria of measuring teachers' performance were regarded to be too weak to generate accurate and objective performance evidence (Melaku, 1992:174). Because of this, the reaction of most teachers towards such criteria becomes far below from what has been expected. Therefore, it could be possible to expect that teachers would be uncooperative and unresponsive to the evaluation system that has subjective assessors in the evaluation instruments. Furthermore, teachers might have perceived administrative decisions that are based on such performance data to be unfair, incompetent and invalid.

In addition to the above statements, the researcher heard from the instructors of various universities and colleges of the country, especially from Hawassa university instructors (when he has been in the city for the last four years), about their performance evaluation made by students, colleagues and department heads: some in favor and others against. This issue initiated the researcher to raise questions concerning the views, opinions and inclinations of university instructors towards the current faculty

views, opinions and inclinations of university instructors towards the current faculty teaching evaluation system.

Despite evaluating university instructors by their students, colleagues, and department heads, has been continued, there is controversy on issues related to accuracy, bias, competence and fairness of the system, which has influence on the attitude of instructors, their performance and effectiveness.

Therefore, the study seeks to find out answers for the following basic questions:

1. What is the attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards the purpose of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation?
2. What is the attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards the administration of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation?
3. What is the perception of instructors and technical assistants towards student-instructor face-to-face evaluation?
4. How do instructors and technical assistants perceive students', colleagues' and department heads' evaluation of the current faculty teaching performance?
5. How do instructors and technical assistants perceive the effectiveness (appropriateness, usefulness, and applicability) of the items included in the students', colleagues' and department heads' rating forms of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation?

### **1.3. Objectives of the Study**

#### **1.3.1. General Objective**

The main objective of this study is to investigate the attitude of university instructors and technical assistants towards the current faculty teaching performance evaluation made by students, colleagues and department heads.

### 1.3.2. Specific Objectives

- i) To find out the attitude of instructors and technical assistants with regard to the purpose of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation.
- ii) To find out the attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards the administration of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation.
- iii) To identify the perception of instructors and technical assistants towards student-instructor face-to-face evaluation.
- iv) To find out the attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards students', colleagues' and department heads' evaluation.
- v) To identify the perception of instructors with regard to the competence of assessors in the students', colleagues' and department heads' rating questionnaire of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation.

### 1.4. Significance of the Study ✓

This study is considered significant for the following reasons:

1. The study identifies the major factors that affect the effectiveness of the evaluation system so that policy makers and concerned authorities can take timely measures.
2. The study is expected to be useful for Hawassa University and others, which apply teaching performance evaluation, to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty teaching performance evaluation.
3. The findings of the study and its recommendations are expected to be helpful background for improvement of the system of faculty teaching performance in universities and colleges in the future.
4. The study further contributes literature in the area and opens ways for other researchers.

### **1.5. Delimitation of the Study**

According to Education Statistics Annual Abstract (2004-05), there were eight government universities in Ethiopia in 2004-05. However, the study is delimited to one university, i.e. Hawassa university instructors' attitude towards their performance evaluation.

The study tried to treat the topic by assessing the attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards factors such as: purpose of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation, its administration, student-instructor face-to-face evaluation, the appropriateness, usefulness, and applicability of assessors in the students, colleagues, and department heads rating questionnaires.

### **1.6. Limitation of the Study**

The instrument used in this study is a research questionnaire with both close-ended and open-ended items. However, because of shortage of time and resource, other instruments such as observation of the process and interviews to department heads and deans were not employed. Thus, the study did not show what measures were taken to improve the existing faculty teaching performance evaluation.

Moreover, there are similar rating items used by all universities to evaluate instructors' performance in the country, except those at Addis Ababa University, the findings of the study would not display problem areas of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation to all university instructors of the country as it was perceived by Hawassa University instructors.

Therefore, because of these shortcomings, the study by no means claimed to be conclusive. It would rather serve as a springboard to study the problem of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation in a more detailed and comprehensive manner.

## **1.7. Research Methodology and Procedure of the Study**

### **1.7.1. The Research Method**

Since this study was exploratory aimed to examine and describe the major problems encountering the current faculty teaching performance evaluation with reference to Hawassa University, descriptive method was used. Comparison were made to find out whether or not there could be attitudinal variation among instructors and technical assistants by faculty, qualification and experience on the current faculty teaching performance evaluation.

### **1.7.2. Sources of Data**

The major sources of data used in the study are of two types; i.e. primary and secondary data sources. The secondary data sources were gathered from relevant publications, journals, books and other materials. Primary data were collected by using both closed-ended and open-ended questionnaire. In addition, the major sources of primary data were instructors and technical assistants currently working in two colleges and seven faculties of Hawassa University.

### **1.7.3. Sampling Technique**

Currently there are 725 instructors and technical assistants (diploma holders) working in Hawassa University. Out of these, 118 instructors and technical assistants were new employees, they were excluded from this study. Besides that, 84 instructors left the University for further education and 46 instructors were expatriates, whose evaluation results were sent to the MOE, they were also not included in this study.

Furthermore, 25 instructors and technical assistants were involved during the pilot study and, therefore, they were excluded from this study. Thus, out of the remaining 452 instructors and technical assistants, 180 (40 percent) were taken as the subject of the study (see table 1).

In order to make the sample representative, stratified random sampling technique was employed. Respondents were classified based on college/faculty, qualification and teaching experience.

Table 1- Distribution of the Population and the Sample Selected.

No	College/Faculty	Population							Sample						
		Qualification				Service Year			Qualification				Service Year		
		a	b	c	d	e	f	g	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
1	Faculty of Business and Economics	-	14	9	1	21	2	1	-	6	4	-	9	1	-
2	Faculty of Law	-	4	2	-	6	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-
3	Faculty of Natural Sciences	16	13	31	5	49	7	9	6	5	13	2	19	3	4
4	Faculty of social sciences	-	8	12	-	16	-	4	-	3	5	-	6	-	2
5	Faculty of Technology	18	12	20	1	45	2	4	7	5	8	-	19	1	-
6	Faculty of Veterinary Medicine	-	3	6	4	11	1	1	-	1	2	2	4	1	-
7	College of Agriculture	16	13	40	19	41	18	29	6	5	16	8	16	7	12
8	Wondo Genet College of Forestry and Natural Resources	9	18	29	9	29	14	22	4	7	12	3	12	5	9
9	College of Health Sciences	13	30	77	-	97	23	-	6	12	30	-	39	9	-
Total		72	115	226	39	315	67	70	29	46	90	15	126	27	27

**Code:** a. Diploma  
b. Bachelor degree  
c. Master's degree  
d. PhD  
e. 1-5 years  
f. 6-10 years  
g. 11 years and above

#### 1.7.4. Data Collection Instruments

To obtain data on the current system of faculty teaching performance evaluation, a set of survey questionnaire, 180 in total, was distributed to instructors and technical assistants working in the two colleges and seven faculties of Hawassa University.

The questionnaire contained a total of 46 items. For attitude rating choices the statements were constructed in the form of five point likert-type scale ranging from

questionnaire also included three biographical questions at the beginning and six open-ended questions in the last section (see Appendix-1). The questionnaire has four parts and the items included in these parts were on the broad topics as background information, purpose of instructors' performance evaluation, administration of evaluation, student-instructor face-to-face evaluation. Students, colleagues, and department head evaluators as a source of evidence of measuring instructors' performance were also discussed. Finally the effectiveness of items included in students, colleagues and department heads rating instruments were examined.

#### **1.7.5. Methods of Data Analysis**

Following collection of data, it was then systematically organized and the responses from open-ended questionnaire were compiled to meaningful categories to allow interpretation.

In addition, the following statistical tools were employed to analyze the data gathered.

1. Descriptive statistics was used to determine both favorable or unfavorable instructors' and technical assistants' attitude towards the current faculty teaching performance evaluation.
2. One sample t-test was used to test whether or not the observed sample mean is different from the population expected mean at 0.05 significance level.
3. One-Way ANOVA was performed to know whether there are significant variations in the attitude of each group to each basic question at 0.05 significance level.
4. Mean comparison was made in order to determine whether there were attitudinal differences among instructor's from the point of view of faculty, qualifications and experiences.

### **1.7.6. Procedure of the Study**

In order to secure relevant data, the sample that are subject to investigation were appropriately selected from the population, i.e. from instructors and technical assistants that were found in Hawassa University, by considering their college /faculty, qualification and teaching experience.

Before the questionnaire was administered, the investigator approached deans and/or assistant deans of all colleges and faculties of Hawassa University in person and presented them a letter of cooperation written from the Department of Educational planning and Management (A.A.U.). Once rapport was established with the university the researcher selected three assistant data collectors from among third year students, one from Wondo Genet College of Forestry and Natural Resources, and two from college of Agriculture. They assisted the researcher in distribution and collection of the questionnaire by giving orientation on how to administer the instrument. Finally, the questionnaires were filled and returned within three weeks.

### **1.8. Definition of Terms**

The following terms are used throughout this study as operationally defined hereunder.

Attitude – the general feeling and thinking instructors and technical assistants show regarding faculty teaching performance evaluation.

Colleagues evaluation – the evaluation of instructors performance by their colleagues.

Department heads evaluation – the evaluation of instructors' performance by their department heads.

Effectiveness – the appropriateness, usefulness, and applicability of items included in students', colleagues' and department heads' rating questionnaire.

Students evaluation – the evaluation of instructors performance by their students.

Teacher evaluation – an estimate or measure of the quality of teacher's behavior based

on the information obtained from students, colleagues and department heads.

Teachers evaluation form – a checklist of a teacher qualities, teaching activities or techniques, or conditions observed in teaching situations; used by students, colleagues and department heads for evaluation (Good, 1973:93).

### **1.9. Organization of the Study**

The study consists of four chapters. The first chapter deals with the problem and its approach in which background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives, significance, delimitation and limitations of the study, the research methodology and procedures of the study, and definition of terms were included. The second chapter deals with the review of the related literature documented from various secondary sources. The third chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of data. The last chapter includes, summary of the major findings, conclusions, and recommendations. A list of references and appendices were included at the end of the report.

## CHAPTER TWO

### 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This Chapter deals with the literature review on different aspects of performance evaluation. It begins by introducing some basic principles from similar studies about teachers' performance evaluation and then raises different issues on the purpose of performance evaluation. It also presents various points about effective performance evaluation. Then the literature discusses various reasons why performance feedback is necessary. The bulk of the literature focuses on teachers' performance evaluation followed by different approaches of evaluating teachers' performance. Furthermore, various points about the administration of teachers' performance evaluation and the major factors that affect teachers' attitude towards performance evaluation are discussed.

#### 2.1. Introduction

The evaluation of teaching has a long history. Evaluation started in 399 BC when Socrates was executed for having corrupted the youth of Athens with his teaching. In addition, around 350 AD in Antioch, any father who was not happy with the kind of instruction given to his son was able to examine the case. If the teacher was found to have neglected his duties, the father could file a formal complaint to a panel of teachers and nonprofessionals and could immediately transfer his son to another teacher (Marsh cited in Assefa, 1999).

In modern Universities and colleges, teaching effectiveness can be evaluated by using multiple sources of data including students, colleagues, administrators, and self-evaluation. In addition, these sources are important basis for recognition and reward for good teaching as well as for faculty development purposes. According to Zakrajsk (cited in Wossenu, 2005), proper evaluation of teachers' performance is important for

faculty member to make a valuable contribution to the achievement of the goals of the university.

One can deduce from the above statements that there is a common view of the purpose of faculty teaching evaluation among instructors and administrators. However, most instructors perceived evaluation in different ways than administrators (Wossenu, 2005). Instructors perceived that the primary purpose of evaluating teaching effectiveness is to make personnel decisions, while most administrators considered its purpose primarily for faculty development process. Therefore, such attitudinal difference towards the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation may bring problems of communication and coordination.

According to the survey conducted by Ayalew (cited in Melaku, 1992), the current practice of teachers' performance evaluation in Ethiopian school systems was the major contributor that causes job dissatisfaction among teachers. According to the research, this was due to lack of evaluation skills and competence on the part of the evaluators; teachers mistrust their evaluators; inadequacy of the frequency and time length of the classroom observation; lack of pre-evaluation knowledge about the purpose and criteria of the evaluation system; and failure of adequate post-appraisal feedback.

Moreover, it was concluded( in Melaku,1992:174), that teachers perceive that the system of their evaluation was ineffective in serving its purpose and also their level of satisfaction with the items included in faculty teaching evaluation forms were far below from what has been expected.

Therefore, it is possible to expect that for evaluation to be effective, both teachers and administrators should have mutual understanding about the purpose of evaluating teachers' performance and they both should agree on the performance criteria (standard) against which the teacher effectiveness should be evaluated. Because of this, it is essential to have a brief discussion on the issues related to performance evaluations in the next sections.

## 2.2. Purpose of Performance Evaluation

The most immediate reason for performance evaluation is to acquire information about employees' job performance periodically in order to help the organization manage them wisely.

One major purpose of performance evaluation is to help employees do a better job. According to Goodale (1992: 279), this purpose includes several specific objectives, which are:

1. To clearly state the employee's job responsibilities, work goals, and performance standards to be achieved.
2. To discuss the employee's level of job performance.
3. To promote the development of employees by identifying training needs and counseling, as well as coaching and motivating employees to improve their performance.
4. To discuss the employee's view of the causes of his/her job performance and suggestions for improvement.
5. To promote career development by discussing long - range plans for development and promotion.

In addition, Newman and Hendricks (1980:2) mentioned several purposes of performance evaluation. Among these are: for finding exceptional talents, for furnishing a basis for discharging totally unfit employees, for helping to assign work in accordance with workers' abilities, for stimulating people to improve, and for preventing grievances by helping workers understand the basis for actions which may be taken into the future and by clearing misunderstandings about past actions that have affected them.

Burke, Wetzel, and Weir (1978) identified a number of other benefits of performance evaluation. Among these benefits are: the development of greater mutual understanding of the institution, its goals and employee's tasks in relation to the goals; a feeling of fair treatment; satisfaction; motivation to improve job performance; actual performance improvements; and a positive look forward to future performance evaluation.

Moreover, Laser and Walter (1977: 86) also identified another purpose and benefit of performance appraisal, namely, to build the self-esteem of employees. This is

particularly important for professional employees, since their jobs often occupy a central position in their lives. A great portion of their self-image is derived from their work activities. In addition to their work activities, performance appraisal process can nurture a professional's self-image or self-esteem, it is all that better for the individual and the organization.

In education, the general purpose of teacher appraisal is to safeguard improve the quality of instruction. According to Mekonnen (2000:14), the process of performance appraisal is justified for the following purposes:

- 1) to improve instructions,
- 2) to provide information for personnel decisions for retention, promotion tenure, and salary increases,
- 3) to stimulate professional growth and development and to direct and guide faculty efforts,
- 4) for administrators, to give a chance to standing judgment (just- as teachers feel the need to judge students, some administrators feel the need to judge teachers), and
- 5) to gather data for research on teaching and learning.

From the above statements, it is possible to conclude that performance appraisal is a systematic process and can be used for making administrative decisions as well as for teachers' career development and hence could contribute a lot to the improvement teaching-learning process.

### **2.3. Effective Performance Evaluation**

Because performance evaluation is a central part of the management process, it is of vital importance that all managers and employees should have feelings of ownership of the performance appraisal scheme, and should recognize that their whole-hearted involvement is central to its success. According to Towers (1998: 128), one of the key conditions for successful performance appraisal, design, and implementation is consultations. Consultation at the design stage with groups- including directors, senior and middle managers, supervisors, employees, trade unions - should not only help to alleviate anxieties and generate interest and commitment but also stimulate innovative

ideas about appraisal methods and implementation procedures.

According to Walker (1980:215) and Bernard in (2003:143), an effective performance appraisal incorporates three factors. First, an appraisal needs to be reasonable in the view of its users and critics. This means the appraisal must be generally understood and accepted as reasonably useful, fair, necessary, and objective. The purpose/s of the process is clearly stated and procedures for the implementation should not be vague.

A second important factor is relevance. An appraisal is relevant if it covers those aspects of work that are important and only those aspects. Relevance is assured by clear statements of job requirements and the kinds of on-the-job activities of behaviors that are necessary for successful performance (Walker, 1980, and Beatty, 1981).

Third, appraisals need to be reliable. This means they should be free from significant defects. Evaluations of performance for the same individual at the same time should be consistent when applied by different raters. They should contain a minimum of subjectivity that leads to distortion. Performance ratings are used as indirect measures and are highly dependent on the quality of information available about performance, on the ability of appraisers to make reliable judgments, and on the use of consistent standards (criteria) against which ratings are made (Walker, 1980:128)

Holley and Field (cited in Newman and Hendricks, 1980:27), also forwarded some guidelines for developing and administering performance evaluation systems in educational settings. Among these are:

- a) The method should be shown to be job related through content and/or empirical validation procedures.
- b) The content should be developed from a thorough job analysis.
- c) Evaluations should frequently observe employees at work.
- d) Evaluations should be based on observable job behaviors.
- e) Evaluations should be administered and scored under standardized conditions.
- f) Evaluations should not be discriminatory in intent, application, or results.
- g) The language on evaluation forms, including directions for use, should be precise and uniform.
- h) Evaluators should be trained in how to use the evaluation instruments.
- i) Several evaluators should be used, and their evaluations should be conducted

independently.

- j) Evaluation should be supported by objective evidence of performance results.
- k) In selecting factors to be used, or designing evaluation instruments, input should be solicited from various groups (faculty members, administrators).
- l) Performance evaluation must be conducted before any personnel decisions on which it is based are made.
- m) Criteria and procedures to be used in the evaluations should be communicated to the persons being evaluated.
- n) Teachers and faculty members should be informed of the results.
- o) School systems should develop policies pertaining to the use of performance evaluation, procedures for administration, and rules governing decisions, and these should be communicated to the teachers and faculty members.

From the above statements, it is possible to generalize that, effective teacher-appraisal should indicate ways in which excellent performance can be recognized and shortcomings can be minimized. To maintain such an objective, appraisal has to be based on common principles, which benefit both the appraiser and the appraisee equally. In addition, there should be clear understanding by teachers, support by administrators and the appraisal should be done by trained and dedicated persons.

#### **2.4. Common Problems of Performance Evaluation**

While there has been considerable progress in improving the instruments of performance evaluation systems, especially by shifting from the more subjective, often simplistic methods to more sophisticated, objectively based approaches, the implementation of performance appraisal still faced many problems.

According to Towers (1998:216), one difficulty is the face-to-face situation of the appraisal interview, where the appraiser sits down with the appraisee and interviews his/her performance. Performance appraisal is easy to do when: performance and potential are good, superior and subordinate have an open relationship, promotions or salary increases are abundant, and there is plenty of time for preparation and discussion.

According to the survey conducted by Laser and Wikstrorn (cited in Walker, 1980:198), the problems with performance appraisal system identified by 25 personnel executives

in the Conference Board Survey reflect limitations in both the design and implementation of appraisal systems. Among the problems identified in that survey were:

1. Reliance on ratings of personality rather than performance.
2. Rater biases such as halo persistence in ratings.
3. Managers not trained to administer appraisals.
4. Managers dislike for giving feedback.
5. No developmental or performance follow-up.
6. Conflicting coach and evaluator roles.
7. No impact of appraisal on performance.

Performance appraisal refuses to run properly when deficiencies in performance are being addressed. Tower (1998) cited Beer, suggested three main sources of difficulty:

- a) the quality of the relationship between appraiser and appraisee;
- b) the manner and skill with which the interview is conducted; and
- c) the appraisal system itself, namely the objectives the organization expects it to achieve, the methodology, the documents and procedures that make up the system.

Therefore, it is possible to expect that the underlying quality of the department - instructor relationship play a major role on the appraisal process, since it is part of interactions between the department and instructor. Unless there is good mutual trust and understanding, the instructor is likely to view appraisal discussions with apprehension and suspicion. When both instructors and departments perceived the appraisal process has problems, the department views appraisal time as a daunting experience where instructor hostility and resistance are likely to emerge.

#### **2.4.1. Human Errors in Performance Evaluation Process**

Errors in performance appraisal process occur due to the error by supervisors and/or managers. In addition, all methods of performance appraisal are subject to errors. However, it could be minimized through providing training to managers and supervisors. Many writers of human resource management discussed several appraisal errors. Among these:

**a. Supervisory Bias.** Such biases are not related to job performance and may stem from personal characteristics such as age, sex, or race, or from organization related characteristics such as seniority, friendship with top managers (Carrel, 1992:237).

**b. Halo Effect.** It is a tendency to influence the evaluation of other traits by the assessment of one trait. It takes place when traits are not clearly defined and are unfamiliar to supervisors. It can be either negative or positive. A negative halo occurs when an employee is poor in one trait but is generally rated as overall poor. Negative halo errors are minimized when the appraisal process is open for review by employees, who will point out that they are not particularly weak in areas in which they have been rated poorly. Employees with positive halos seldom point out that they did not performed as well as their supervisors had indicated. Thus, a positive halo is more difficult to minimize (Carrel, 1992:237, and Saiyadain, 1998:205).

According to Carrel (1992:138), the halo problem can also be minimized through supervisory training. Supervisors should be trained to recognize that all jobs require the application of many different skills and behaviors. Training should also focus on the fact that it is not usual for employees to perform well in some areas and less effectively in others, and training should concentrate on those areas in need of improvement.

**C. Central Tendency Error.** When supervisors evaluate everyone as average, the result is central tendency. They may find it difficult and unpleasant to evaluate some employees higher or lower than others, even though performances reflect a real difference (Carrel, 1992:239). This problem may also occur when supervisors cannot objectively evaluate employee performance because of lack of familiarity with the work, lack of supervisory ability, or fear that they will be reprimanded if they evaluate subordinates too highly or too strictly (Milkovich, 1988:207).

Moreover, as Gordon (1986:244-246) stated, managers experience difficulties in improving employee performance for three reasons. First, they react to their own

assumptions about individual behaviors and attitudes. Second, managers fail to recognize that the organizational or environmental situations may contribute to performance problems; subordinates may have the motivation to perform but not the opportunity. Third, no clear prescription for effective performance exists.

According to Hussein and Neville (1994: 6018), the most practical way to increase the validity of teacher ratings is to take steps to decrease the influence of halo on ratings. Halo is most likely to distort ratings when no behavior relevant to an item to be rated is observed. In such cases the ratings must be based either on behavior irrelevant to the item or on the rater's overall impression of the teacher, neither of which yield a valid ratings.

In general, there is no doubt that the purpose of appraising teachers' performance is to improve teaching - learning process. However, the process of appraising teachers is a complex matter. Therefore, those that are engaged in such activities should be aware of its complexity, of the possibility of arriving at erroneous judgments, and of the consequences that follow from appraisals. In addition, the risk of this error occurring depends mostly on the item itself. Therefore, the rating scale used should include behaviors that may be expected to occur frequently enough to make it likely that the rater will see them in the classroom of each teacher who is to be rated. The duration and frequency of periods of observation should be sufficient to provide ample opportunity for behaviors relevant to every item on the scale to occur, and raters should undergo enough training, practice, and retaining so that they will see and recognize relevant behaviors.

## **2.5. Performance Feedback**

Most employees are very interested in how well they are doing at present, as well as how they can do better in the future. They wish to have this information not only for the personal satisfaction that positive feedback provides, but also to help them improve performance in order to qualify for organizational rewards such as promotions and merit pay. Performance feedback is very important to employees, and in the absence of

assumptions about individual behaviors and attitudes. Second, managers fail to recognize that the organizational or environmental situations may contribute to performance problems; subordinates may have the motivation to perform but not the opportunity. Third, no clear prescription for effective performance exists.

According to Hussein and Neville (1994: 6018), the most practical way to increase the validity of teacher ratings is to take steps to decrease the influence of halo on ratings. Halo is most likely to distort ratings when no behavior relevant to an item to be rated is observed. In such cases the ratings must be based either on behavior irrelevant to the item or on the rater's overall impression of the teacher, neither of which yield a valid ratings.

In general, there is no doubt that the purpose of appraising teachers' performance is to improve teaching - learning process. However, the process of appraising teachers is a complex matter. Therefore, those that are engaged in such activities should be aware of its complexity, of the possibility of arriving at erroneous judgments, and of the consequences that follow from appraisals. In addition, the risk of this error occurring depends mostly on the item itself. Therefore, the rating scale used should include behaviors that may be expected to occur frequently enough to make it likely that the rater will see them in the classroom of each teacher who is to be rated. The duration and frequency of periods of observation should be sufficient to provide ample opportunity for behaviors relevant to every item on the scale to occur, and raters should undergo enough training, practice, and retaining so that they will see and recognize relevant behaviors.

## **2.5. Performance Feedback**

Most employees are very interested in how well they are doing at present, as well as how they can do better in the future. They wish to have this information not only for the personal satisfaction that positive feedback provides, but also to help them improve performance in order to qualify for organizational rewards such as promotions and merit pay. Performance feedback is very important to employees, and in the absence of

meaningful feedback from the supervisors, employee will resort to informal methods to assess their job performance. Employees may become very sensitive to whether supervisors speak to them, spend time with them, or take them into their confidence regarding departmental affairs. These informal methods can approach superstition, and are the unfortunate consequences of a failure to provide adequate regular performance feedback (Leap, 1989: 319).

Feedback is an essential element of the learning process. According to Newman and Hendricks (1980:10), without it, it is virtually impossible to learn, to adapt, or to advance. Feedback about the effectiveness of an individual's behavior has long been recognized as essential for learning and for motivation in performance-oriented settings. In terms of its psychological and behavioral effects and benefits, some feedback is better than no feedback in most performance settings.

Effective feedback can serve three important purposes (Gordon, 1986:251): (1) relieving productive employees from worrying needlessly about their job performance and the security of their job; (2) helping marginal employees to improve their job performance; and (3) providing systematic information in case of dismissal. In effect, the supervisor can create a working environment that is more conducive to good job performance through the use of effective feedback.

Moreover, Performance feedback on specific aspects of job performance should be specific, timely, accurate, and understandable, presented in an atmosphere of cooperation and support, and incorporate both positive and negative aspects of employees' performance, can improve the quality of subsequent employee performance (Gordon 1986). In addition, it may serve as a source of satisfaction and motivation, and, when necessary, a guide to the adjustments necessary for performance improvement. While constant negative criticism is probably not conducive to motivation or performance, the employee should know where they stand with the management. Employees should not be left with the impression that performance is meeting the supervisor's work standards if it is marginal (Leap, 1989: 322).

According to Boyd and Ronald (cited in Mekonnen, 2004:10), a teacher- evaluation system should give teachers useful feedback on classroom needs, the opportunity to learn new teaching techniques, and suggestions from principals and other teachers on how to make changes in their classrooms. To achieve these goals, evaluators must first set specific procedures and standards before giving feedback. The standards should be:

- a) related to important skills
- b) as objective as possible,
- c) clearly communicated to the teacher before the evaluation begins and be reviewed after the evaluation is over, and
- d) linked to the teachers' professional development.

## **2.6. Teachers' Performance Evaluation**

The evaluation of teachers has received a great deal of attention in the recent past, purportedly due to the declines in educational achievement (Priestly, 1982:252). This is due to the roles and responsibilities of teachers are diverse and the requirements for effective teaching are complex; also, the consequences of incompetence in the teaching profession can be considerable. Thus, teaching seems an ideal prospect for an assessment center to evaluation. Moreover, evaluation provides the knowledge and understanding that directs improved teaching and learning. Therefore, there is a good reason to believe that this evaluation of teaching and learning process lays the basis for recognition and reward for good teaching (Assefa, 1999).

Many aspects of education are subject to evaluation from among these aspects teachers' performance evaluation has long assumed increasing importance. The demand for education has shifted from broad issues of finance and program management to specific concerns about the quality of classroom teaching aspects and teachers. From the elementary school classroom to higher education level, evaluations of teachers' performance have received considerable value (Hammond, 1990).

Teachers' performance appraisal is the process of estimating the value of teacher's work. It is a series of activities and actions that are inter - connected and related to a

According to Boyd and Ronald (cited in Mekonnen, 2004:10), a teacher- evaluation system should give teachers useful feedback on classroom needs, the opportunity to learn new teaching techniques, and suggestions from principals and other teachers on how to make changes in their classrooms. To achieve these goals, evaluators must first set specific procedures and standards before giving feedback. The standards should be:

- a) related to important skills
- b) as objective as possible,
- c) clearly communicated to the teacher before the evaluation begins and be reviewed after the evaluation is over, and
- d) linked to the teachers' professional development.

## **2.6. Teachers' Performance Evaluation**

The evaluation of teachers has received a great deal of attention in the recent past, purportedly due to the declines in educational achievement (Priestly, 1982:252). This is due to the roles and responsibilities of teachers are diverse and the requirements for effective teaching are complex; also, the consequences of incompetence in the teaching profession can be considerable. Thus, teaching seems an ideal prospect for an assessment center to evaluation. Moreover, evaluation provides the knowledge and understanding that directs improved teaching and learning. Therefore, there is a good reason to believe that this evaluation of teaching and learning process lays the basis for recognition and reward for good teaching (Assefa, 1999).

Many aspects of education are subject to evaluation from among these aspects teachers' performance evaluation has long assumed increasing importance. The demand for education has shifted from broad issues of finance and program management to specific concerns about the quality of classroom teaching aspects and teachers. From the elementary school classroom to higher education level, evaluations of teachers' performance have received considerable value (Hammond, 1990).

Teachers' performance appraisal is the process of estimating the value of teacher's work. It is a series of activities and actions that are inter - connected and related to a

specific purpose. Since teachers deal with complex problems, they should be evaluated as professionals, which means their standards should be developed by their peers and their appraisal should focus on the degree to which they solve professional problems competently. The emphasis of their evaluation should be on their teaching and not on them as individuals. It should also take into consideration the involvement and responsiveness of others involved in the education process (Sawa cited in Mekonnen; 2004:10).

In evaluating good teaching, both the act of teaching and the content or subject matter taught are considered to be important. Additionally, students should be able to indicate the objectives of the course and its relationships among the various assigned tasks to the achievement of the objectives. Hence, evaluation should include an appraisal of teaching, assignments, examinations, text books used, enthusiasm (like expressive speech, movements while lecturing, gestures, facial expression, uses of humor, etc.) of the instructor, interpersonal skill of the instructor, friendliness and helpfulness, organization, and so on (Assefa, 1999).

Furthermore, McDonald cited in Priestley (1982:252) documented the progress made in a project design to improve performance-based teacher evaluation. He contended that standard methods of assessing teacher performance, e.g., classroom observations, needed to be improved because they lack sufficient controls. He also recommended the use of simulated teaching techniques to assess performance in controlled situations. These include "Microteaching units", in which teachers are assessed on only one specific skill at a time; and "reactive simulation devices" similar to simulations and management exercises used in assessment centers and in their non-educational settings.

## **2.7. Approaches to Teachers' Performance Evaluation**

Teachers' performance has been evaluated in one way or another as long as there have been teachers to evaluate. Researchers have suggested different approaches of evaluating teachers. Some are found to be productive while others are somewhat

evaluating teachers. Some are found to be productive while others are somewhat invalid (Morrill and Spees, 1982). These approaches usually include multiple data procedures that involved collecting different types of data in addition to students ratings (Smoke et al: 1973). In their computer assisted search of the literature on multi-data alternatives to quantified student ratings, Greenwood and Ramagli (cited in Mekonnen, 2004:14), found that sixteen percent focused on peer or colleague evaluation, twelve percent on direct measurement of student achievement, and twelve percent on instructor self-evaluation. Two percent of the literature was on integrated multiple data systems, while the largest amount (twenty five percent) examined the interrelations among different type of data (e.g., peer ratings versus administrative ratings, self-ratings versus students' ratings).

Teaching evaluation incorporate multiple sources of data including students, colleagues, and administrators (heads). These types of evaluation must provide valid, summative information regarding the quality of teaching and formative direction for faculty improvement efforts. Moreover, faculties should be entitled to a fair and consistent evaluation of teaching. Therefore, to be objective, faculties must rely on various sources to evaluate teachers' performance. Among these sources of evaluating teachers' performance- student evaluations, colleague evaluations and department head evaluations are discussed below.

**A. Students' Evaluation.** At college and university levels, students' rating of teaching are considered to be a valuable data sources for improving the teaching-learning process, providing feedback to instructors, and evaluating teaching for use in personnel decisions like merit salary increases.

Student ratings may help teachers to improve their instruction and aid students in courses or instructor selection (Cohen, 1980). Furthermore, student ratings may also help administrative evaluation of teaching effectiveness, and the development of faculty competence. In addition, students' evaluations of teaching are accepted method of evaluating faculty teaching in many institutions and are said to be statistically reliable than colleagues ratings (Marsh and Roche; 1997). However, there are heated debates

despite their use as indicators of teaching effectiveness.

On the other hand, there are arguments against students' ratings. Among these, according to Assefa (1999), are: they are not reliable; they are highly correlated to grades; students who receive good grades in a course give a positive evaluation to the instructor and the courses; students' appreciation of good course usually are seen after graduation from colleges and universities; and colleagues are more qualified than students in rating faculty performance. And also, students may not have the necessary knowledge to judge how well they are learning, students give high rating to courses with low standards and undemanding faculty members; teaching is not equally effective for every student, and what works for one class may not work for others (McKeachine cited in Assefa, 1999).

Generally, student ratings have their own strengths and weaknesses. However, this fact should not limit their practical application and it will be advisable to use them as one source of evidence for making decisions.

**B. Colleagues' Evaluation.** Subjective judgments currently play an important part in evaluating teaching performance. Among the groups that might provide judgment on teaching performance are teachers' colleagues. This subjective judgment is probably based on all the information that raters have accumulated about a teacher, i.e., the actual accomplishments and the subjective judgments that are communicated among faculty and students. Centra (cited in Mekonnen, 2004) concluded that colleagues could make a unique and important contribution to the evaluation of the faculty teaching performance.

Colleague evaluation has both advantages and disadvantages. It is certainly advantageous that colleagues, who are usually from the same discipline, are familiar with departmental goals, programs and priorities. However, such familiarity can also have negative consequences resulting from bias due to previous evaluations, personal relationships, and peer pressure (Areola cited in Wossenu, 2005). In addition to this, Peer ratings based on classroom visitation do not appear to be substantially correlated

with student ratings or with any other indicators of effective teaching (Marsh, 1984).

To summarize, colleagues' evaluation could provide information about teachers' performance and can contribute to the improvement of teaching-learning process. On the other hand, colleagues' evaluation of teachers' performance is less accepted method of evaluating teachers in many institutions and is less statistically reliable than student ratings. However, despite its demerits, it can give additional information for taking right decisions. Therefore, it seems wise to use colleagues' rating not an end of itself but as additional source of information to evaluate faculty teaching performance.

**C. Department Heads' Evaluation.** Ratings by appropriate administrators (e.g. department chair, dean, vice president) have a long history in faculty evaluation and were traditionally based on informal and unsystematic source of information, such as student complaints and comments from faculty colleagues. Sometimes administrators' judgments were base on classroom visitations, systematic student or peer ratings, examination of course materials, or examination of faculty members' productivity.

As a source for evaluating teaching, heads share many of the same advantages of colleagues in the department. According to Hanol and Mortensen (1980), department heads can evaluate teachers' performance through classroom observation, review of student learning data, and feedback from students. The strength of this approach is that classroom observation helps to interpret data from other approaches.

In evaluating instructors' performance, department heads share many of the advantages and disadvantages of colleagues' evaluation in the department. Nevertheless, it is logically impossible for department heads to visit class of all faculty members frequently enough to achieve reliability. As with colleague visitations, occasional observations by department heads can be biased by personal relationships, favored teaching methods, common values, etc (Wossenu, 2005:33)

In order to reduce bias from the department heads' evaluation, it is advisable to collect more reliable data from different sources as a basis to evaluate teachers' performance.

## **2.8. Administration of the Evaluation**

It is suggested that every evaluation form should contain some standard open-ended questions and each instructor should have the opportunity to add one or more questions, the results of which could go only to the instructor (Bain cited in Assefa, 1999). Examples include questions that indicate students' perceptions of teaching methods such as the primary teaching strengths of the instructor, the primary weaknesses of the instruction, and inviting the students to offer suggestions for improvement. Besides, others that indicate the learning process and that can be reported to individual instructor need to be included. For example, questions that show the number of hours per week a student spend on the course help the instructor to direct his/her method of teaching.

As to the time of administration, ratings administered during final exams are generally lower than those given during classes. Therefore, student-rating forms should be administered in the classroom during regular class hours (Braskamp and Ory cited in Assefa, 1999). Furthermore, differences may be found in ratings of courses and teachers, among classes that are grouped by their meeting time, i.e., time of day when the class is taught. However, in general there are no differences in ratings related to class meetings.

Differences in ratings occur when the directions in the forms indicate that the results will be used for personnel decisions rather than when they indicate that, the results will go only to the instructor. Ratings are higher if the use of the ratings is stated (for promotion purposes) and if the teacher being rated remains in the evaluation room. Mid-term ratings are reported to be less reliable; this may be due to the fear that the student raters can be identified. However, it is preferable that student ratings be administered during the last two or three weeks of the semester rather than during examination times (Braskamp and Ory cited in Assefa, 1999).

## 2.9. The Attitude of Teachers towards their Performance Evaluation

Ideally, evaluation should have a healthy purpose of educational improvement; however, Camp et al (1979:17) regret that the teacher evaluation process has been poorly handled by administrators. They view each evaluation in terms of job orientation rather than career development. The objective is seldom to improve the quality of education and to further professional development. Such misuse would definitely give rise to mistrust, fear, and feelings of insecurity, which would apparently be pedagogically counter productive. The undesirable consequences of errant administration of evaluation have led to many concerns of teachers. According to camp et al (1979), this was given as follows:

1. The majority of persons observing and evaluating teachers are lacking in proportional academic and pedagogical competence,
2. Forms surveyed by evaluators including survey sheets, which, at best, are highly objective, and in many cases, entirely useless for teacher improvement since they are avoided from any substance criteria or contents,
3. The absence of any similar evaluation for the evaluators as either evaluators or administrators presuppose that teachers comprise the only educational segment that needs improvement, and
4. There is lack of any active and defensible forms of formal evaluation for all professional members of the educational complex, which inhibits professional growth at all levels.

In a study of faculty attitude toward student evaluations, Marsh (cited in Amanuel, 1998) reported that although 80 percent felt the students' ratings are important, only 38 percent believed that such ratings give a correct picture of instructional performance. Fiche (cited in Mekonnen, 2004) also concluded that the purpose of student evaluations of teaching is to fairly evaluate the teaching quality of faculty members and help them to improve teaching. However, the perception of many faculty members is that the use of student evaluations of teaching achieves neither of these goals. Similarly, Berhanemeskel (1999) concluded that, since teachers believed that students are incompetent, not qualified, immature, subjective, lack experience to evaluate and make sensible judgments, they developed unfavorable perception towards student evaluation of teachers' performance. Darge (2002) in his study on the predominance of different

sources of stress among teachers in government senior high schools of Addis Ababa also suggested that some teachers are dissatisfied with the criteria (considering them to be too demanding), and with the evaluation process (e.g. evaluation by parents).

### **2.9.1. Factors Affecting Teachers' Attitude towards Performance Evaluation**

Experienced teachers often state that evaluations are not productive (Boyd and Ronald cited in Mekonnen, 2004: 24). Some of the dissatisfactions on the performance evaluation, based on research experiences are said to be avoidable. The following is a list of the major factors that affect performance evaluation:

1. Teachers not having any input into the evaluation criteria. Other professionals (doctors, lawyers, engineers) control the criteria for entering and maintaining membership in their profession. Teachers, on the other hand, often do not have that privilege. State laws or school boards decide the focuses of the evaluation. This leads teachers to distrust the evaluation process and to question the validity of the results it produces.
2. Evaluators not spending enough time on the evaluation. Teachers complain that the principal, or whoever is conducting the evaluation, does not provide useful feedback.
3. Evaluators not being well trained. Teachers complain that few evaluators have any special training to help them plan and carry out a successful evaluation. Even worse, many have had little or no recent experience in the classroom. The criteria for evaluation are often vague, subjective, and inconsistent.
4. Results of evaluations not being used to further teacher development. For many teachers, the evaluation process can be perceived as a dead end. The results do not figure into salary increases, promotions, or any meaningful program for professional development.

Generally, to improve instruction, performance evaluation of teachers should be accurate, reliable, and based on the acceptance of the teachers.

## CHAPTER THREE

### 3. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter of the study deals with the presentation and analysis of data that is collected from instructors and technical assistants of Hawassa University. As indicated in chapter one, 180 questionnaires were distributed to respondents. Out of these 153(85 percent) were filled in and collected. Then to make the collected data manageable for analysis, the respondents were classified based on college/faculty, qualification, and teaching experience. Based on qualification they were grouped in to three, namely 1-5 years of service, 6-10 years of service and 11 years and above. Based on qualification, they were grouped in to four, namely diploma, bachelor degree, master's degree, and PhD holders. Finally, the data collected were computed by using SPSS and the results are presented and analyzed against the basic questions for which answers have to be sought.

#### 3.1. Attitude towards the Purpose of Performance Evaluation.

Regarding the attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation, the following attitude rating statements (in the form of 5 likert-type scale) were presented to respondents (see Appendix 3.1). The purpose of Performance evaluation is:

1. to decide on instructors' salary increment, promotion and reward for effective instructors.
2. to identify incompetent instructors so that to arrange in-service training.
3. to identify incompetent instructors so as to dismiss them.
4. to improve the quality of instruction.
5. to stimulate professional growth and development.

The results of the responses obtained from the above questions were presented in table 2 below.

Table 2- One sample t-test for the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation.

No. of items	Expected mean	Observed mean	St. dev.	df	t	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
5	15	17.35	5.78	152	5.04	0.00*	2.35	1.43	3.28

\* P<0.05

In an attempt to see whether or not the academic staff show favorable attitude towards purpose of the faculty teaching performance evaluation by using one sample t-test, the result, shown in table 2, indicates that the observed mean of the sample (17.35) is substantially higher than the expected mean of the population (15) at 0.05 significance level. This means that most of the instructors and technical assistants responded above the population expected mean, and hence show favorable attitude towards the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation. This, therefore, indicates that faculty teaching performance evaluation, if properly conducted, may be used as a basis for instructors' promotion and capacity development. As shown in the literature review section, instructor performance evaluation is used as a basis for salary increments and reward for effective instructors, arranging in-service training and to avoid incompetent instructors. In addition, it may be used for improving the quality of instruction, and it simulates the professional growth and development of instructors.

### 3.1.1. Attitude towards the Purpose of Performance Evaluation by Qualifications.

Table 2a- Descriptive statistics on the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation.

Qualification	N	Mean	St. deviation
College diploma	25	15.24	5.56
Bachelor degree	40	17.80	6.47
Master's degree	81	17.19	5.29
PhD	7	24.29	0.49
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>17.35</b>	<b>5.78</b>

Table 2b- One-Way ANOVA for the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation by qualifications.

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between groups	458.33	3	152.78	4.93	0.01*
Within groups	4614.61	149	30.97		
Total	5072.94	152			

\*p < 0.05

As shown in table 2b there is significant attitudinal variation among instructors and technical assistants towards the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation by qualifications at 0.05 significance level. Similarly, table 2a shows that the mean response of diploma holder technical assistants (15.24) the least when compared to bachelor degree, master's degree and PhD holders (17.80, 17.19, and 24.29 respectively). This implies that faculties and colleges of the university did not provide adequate training/orientation to academic staff about the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation so that it could be well understood by all instructors and technical assistants.

### 3.2. Attitude towards the Administration of Performance Evaluation.

In an attempt to assess whether or not respondents show favorable attitude towards the administration of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation, the following attitude rating items (in the form of 5 likert-type scale) were presented to respondents (see Appendix 3.1).

1. Instructor evaluation takes place during the last two or three weeks of the semester.
2. Students are allowed adequate time to complete the evaluation form.
3. Students are allowed to direct the teaching methods of their instructors and suggest improvements.
4. The instructor who is being evaluated leaves the room when students are completing his/her evaluation.
5. Faculties show strong interest to keep the evaluation forms in a confidential manner.

completing his/her evaluation.

5. Faculties show strong interest to keep the evaluation forms in a confidential manner.

The results of the responses were presented in table 3 below.

Table 3- One sample t-test for the administration of performance evaluation.

No. of items	Expected mean	Observed mean	St. dev.	df	t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
5	15	17.34	6.03	152	5.04	0.00*	2.34	1.38	3.30

\*p<0.05

As indicated in table 3, the population expected mean is compared with the sample observed mean by using one sample t-test to see whether or not the two means are statistically different. In this regard, table 3, shows the observed mean of the sample (17.34) to be statistically higher than the expected population mean (15) at 0.05 significance level. So most of the respondents replied above the expected population mean and hence have favorable attitude towards the administration of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation. Therefore, it is possible to expect that the instructor evaluation takes place during the last two or three weeks of the semester, students are allowed adequate time to complete the evaluation forms, students are allowed to direct the teaching methods of their instructors and suggest improvements, and departments show strong interest to keep the evaluation results in a confidential manner. Moreover, to be effective, according to Braskamp and Ory (cited in Assefa; 1999), students rating should be administered in the classroom (during the last two or three weeks of the semester) rather than during examination time. In addition, students' evaluation of teaching effectiveness could enhance teacher-student collaboration if there is feedback that contains students' opinion about the course and their instructor (Bain cited in Assefa: 1999).

### 3.2.1. Attitude towards the administration of performance evaluation by teaching experiences.

Table 3a- Descriptive statistics for the administration of performance evaluation by teaching experiences.

Teaching Experience	N	Mean	Standard deviation
1-5 years	116	18.33	6.25
6-10 years	15	13.53	2.85
11 years and above	22	14.74	2.62
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>17.34</b>	<b>6.03</b>

Table 3b- One-Way ANOVA for the administration of performance evaluation by experiences.

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	775.47	2	387.74	12.24	0.00*
Within groups	4752.86	150	31.69		
Total	5528.33	152			

\* P<0.05

As indicated in table 3b, there is statistically significant attitudinal variation among instructors and technical assistants towards the administration of faculty teaching performance evaluation by teaching experience. In addition, table 3a shows the mean response of instructors and technical assistants with teaching experience one to five years (18.33) is the greatest from 6-10 years and 11 years and above ( 13.53 and 14.74 respectively). Besides that it is above the expected population mean (15). On the other hand, the mean responses of instructors and technical assistants with experience ranging from 6-10 years (13.53) and those that have teaching experience of 11 years and above, (14.74) were both less than the expected populations mean (15). In other words, this can be expressed as highly experienced instructors and technical assistants showed negative attitude towards the administration of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation. This might have happened due to the variations between expectations and attainments of evaluation feedback which probably passed through the process of administration of instructors' performance evaluation.

### 3.3. Student-Instructor Face-to-Face Evaluation.

In order to assess whether or not the respondents show favorable attitude towards student-instructor face-to-face evaluation, the following attitude rating statements (in the form of 5 likert-type scale) were presented for respondents to show their opinion (see Appendix 3.1).

1. Feedback to the instructor from face-to-face evaluation can enhance the relationship between the instructor and students.
2. Face-to-face evaluation has a positive impact on teaching-learning process.
3. Face-to-face evaluation enables instructors to correct their weaknesses by providing feedback.

The responses obtained from the above questions were presented in table 4 below.

Table 4- One sample t-test for student-instructor face-to-face evaluation.

No. of items	Expected mean	Observed mean	St. dev.	df	T	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
3	9	10.24	3.60	152	4.25	0.00*	1.24	0.66	1.81

\*p<0.05

In attempt to see whether or not there could be favorable attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards student- instructor face-to-face evaluation one sample t-test was applied. In addition, the result shows that the observed sample mean (10.24) is greater than the expected population mean (9). This means that most instructors and technical assistants scored above the expected mean and is significant at 0.05 level of significance (see table 4). This implies that, most instructors and technical assistants want to be evaluated by their students through face-to-face evaluation.

Moreover, two open-ended questions regarding student-instructor face-to-face evaluation were conducted in order to gather information about its strengths and weaknesses. The first question was "Do you think that student-instructor face-to-face evaluation has strong sides?" the major points that were responded by instructors and technical assistants were:

evaluation were conducted in order to gather information about its strengths and weaknesses. The first question was "Do you think that student-instructor face-to-face evaluation has strong sides?" the major points that were responded by instructors and technical assistants were:

1. Students may get chance to evaluate their instructors appropriately.
2. The instructor will get chance to explain things he/she does not accept.
3. It opens the possibility of coming to consensus on controversial matters.
4. *It will result in mutual understanding and matured discussion.*
5. The instructor can get the real and immediate feedback from students.
6. Since there is a two-way communication, misunderstanding will not be created.
7. Any point that students raise will be discussed at the spot.
8. It will create a friendly environment between instructors and students and hence is important for professional excellence.

In contrast to the strong sides, the following weak sides of student-instructor face-to-face evaluation that was replied by instructors and technical assistants for the question "Do you think that student instructor face-to-face evaluation has weaknesses?" were:

1. Students may discourage their instructors by using demoralizing words.
2. Some instructors can get a chance to identify students that give criticisms and hurt their academic future.
3. Some students may restrain from talking about their instructor's weak side for fear of retaliation.
4. Some students may evaluate only the kindness of their instructor.
5. Academically weak students may insult good instructors
6. Students may not feel free to criticize their instructors face-to-face.
7. It may decrease instructor- student relationship.
8. Some students can get the chance to evaluate their instructors by ideas that are not included in the criteria.

The above statements concerning the merits and demerits of face-to-face evaluation shows that, even if most of the respondents show favorable attitude by outweighing its

better in the future through face-to-face evaluation.

### 3.3.1. Attitude towards student-instructor face-to-face evaluation by teaching experiences.

Table 4a- Descriptive statistics on student-instructor face-to-face evaluation.

Teaching experience	N	Mean	Standard deviation
1 – 5 years	116	9.95	3.73
6 – 10 years	15	8.07	1.67
11 years and above	22	13.23	1.54
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>10.24</b>	<b>3.59</b>

Table 4b- One-Way ANOVA for student-instructor face-to-face evaluation by teaching experiences.

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	277.04	2	138.52	12.32	0.00*
Within groups	1686.49	150	11.24		
Total	1963.53	152			

\* P<0.05

As it was revealed in table 4b, there was statistically significant attitudinal variation among respondents by teaching experiences. Moreover, as shown in table 4a, the mean response of instructors and technical assistants with teaching experience between one to five years and with 11 years and above (9.95 and 13.23 respectively) were greater than the expected population mean (9). On the other hand, the mean response of instructors and technical assistants with teaching experience between six to ten years (8.07) was less than the expected population means (9). In other words, they did not like to be judged by students through face-to-face evaluation. This might be occurred probably due to lack of training and experience regarding student-instructor face-to-face evaluation.

### 3.4. Attitude towards Students' Evaluation.

In an attempt to assess whether or not respondents show favorable attitude towards the students' evaluation of instructors' performance, the following attitude rating statements (in the form of 5 likert-type scale) were presented to respondents to their opinion (see Appendix 3.2).

1. Students' evaluations are highly influenced by received or expected grade.
2. Students' evaluations are based on the instructors' personality rather than competence.
3. Students give high rating to courses with lower standards.
4. Students do not have experience and competence to evaluate their instructors.
5. Students' evaluation of instructors' performance negatively affects instructor-student relationship.

The responses obtained from the above questions were presented in table 5 below.

Table 5- One sample for students' evaluation.

No. of items	Expected mean	Observed mean	St. dev.	df	t	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
5	15	17.07	5.32	152	4.81	0.00*	2.07	1.22	2.92

\*p<0.05

In an attempt to see whether or not instructors and technical assistants show favorable attitude towards students' evaluation, one sample t-test was applied. The computed value, shown in table 5, indicates that the observed mean of the sample (17.07) is substantially higher than the population mean (15) at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, this indicates that instructors and technical assistants show favorable attitude towards students' evaluation. This may be because instructors are interested to know their strong and weak sides from their students. In addition, according to Wossenu (2005), students play an essential role in the evaluation of teaching. They are also the groups most directly affected by the quality of teaching. Because students are first hand observers in classes, they are in the best position to evaluate specific and critical aspects of classroom teaching.

### 3.4.1. Attitude towards Students' Evaluation by Qualification and by Teaching Experiences.

Table 5a- Descriptive Statistics for students' evaluation.

Qualification	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Diploma	25	15.12	4.48
Bachelor degree	40	17.45	5.83
Master's degree	81	16.80	4.95
PhD	7	24.86	0.38
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>17.07</b>	<b>5.32</b>

Table 5b- Descriptive Statistics for students' evaluation by teaching experiences.

Teaching experience	N	Mean	Standard deviation
1 – 5 years	116	16.71	5.50
6 – 10 years	15	13.60	1.68
11 years and above	22	21.32	3.03
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>17.07</b>	<b>5.32</b>

Table 5c- One-Way ANOVA for Students' evaluation by qualifications and by teaching experiences.

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
The attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards students' evaluation qualification wise	Between groups	531.11	3	177.04	7.00	0.00*
	Within groups	3766.24	149	25.28		
	Total	4297.35	152			
The attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards students' evaluation By teaching experience	Between groups	592.94	2	206.47	12.01	0.00*
	Within groups	3704.41	150	24.70		
	Total	4297.35	152			

\*P<0.05

In an attempt to see whether or not there could be attitudinal variation among the respondents towards students' evaluation faculty wise, qualification wise and experience wise one-way ANOVA was used. There were statistically significant attitudinal variation both qualification wise and experience wise (see table 5). This was supported in tables 5a and 5b, and discussed below.

As shown in table 5, the sample mean responses of diploma holder technical assistants, bachelor degree holder instructors, master's degree holder instructors, and PhD holder instructors (15.12, 17.45, 16.80 and 24.86 respectively) are all above the expected population expected mean (15) at 0.05 significance level. However, the mean response of diploma holders was the least when compared to bachelor degree, master's degree, and PhD holders. This may be they thought that student ratings are not reliable; students are not adequately trained/oriented to evaluate their instructors; and students' evaluation is based on instructors' personality rather than performance.

As shown in table 5b, the sample mean responses of instructors and technical assistants by teaching experience, the mean scores of instructors and technical assistants having teaching experience ranging from one to five years and eleven years and above (16.71 and 21.32 respectively) are greater than the expected population mean (15). While the mean responses of instructors and technical assistants with teaching experience between six to ten years (13.60) is less than the expected population mean (15). This indicates that, instructors and technical assistants between six to ten years of teaching experience negatively perceived students' evaluation of instructors' performance. This may be occurred probably due to the drawbacks of students' evaluation, such as the use of evaluation as a tool of revenge by students; students do not have experience and competence to evaluate their instructors; and students' evaluations of instructors' performance negatively affect instructor-student relationship.

Furthermore, an open-ended question which states: "Do you think that students' evaluation of instructors' performance has weaknesses?" was administered and the major responses are listed below:

1. There is no discussion on the evaluation feedback.
2. It is usually administered during final examination time so that students could carelessly fill it.
3. Students that score low grades in previous courses may revenge the instructor when they get him/her in another course.

4. Students do not have enough knowledge about the purpose of evaluation.

The statements mentioned above indicate that, most of the respondents show favorable attitude towards students' evaluation (shown in table 5) even though it has some drawbacks. Nevertheless, these drawbacks could be the reasons that caused attitudinal variation among respondents. Therefore, it seems logical that the effectiveness of students' evaluation could be questionable if it creates significant attitudinal variation among academic staff. Such variations may be happened due to lack of the provision of adequate training and orientation by the university to students and academic staff.

### 3.5. Attitude towards Colleagues' Evaluation.

To assess whether or not the respondents show favorable attitude towards colleagues' evaluation, the following attitude rating statements (in the form of 5 likert-type scale) were presented to respondents to their opinion (see Appendix 3.2).

1. Colleagues' evaluation is based on the instructors' personality rather than performance.
2. Colleagues have limited opportunity to obtain all necessary information about the instructors.
3. Colleagues' evaluation is not based on the classroom observation.
4. Colleagues are the not right persons to evaluate instructors' performance

The responses obtained from the above questions were presented in table 6 below.

Table 6- One sample t-test for colleagues' evaluation.

No. of items	Expected mean	Observed mean	St. dev.	df	t	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean difference	95% confidence level of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
4	12	12.78	3.94	152	2.46	0.02*	0.78	0.15	1.41

\*p<0.05

In attempt to see whether or not the respondents show favorable attitude towards colleagues' evaluation one sample t-test was used. As shown in table 6, the observed

sample mean (12.78) is significantly greater than the population expected mean (12) at 0.05 level of significance. This means that most of the instructors and technical assistants responded favorably towards colleagues' evaluation of instructors' performance. Therefore, most instructors and technical assistants perceive colleagues' evaluations as important indicator for teaching effectiveness. According to Shipman (cited in Melaku, 1992), colleague evaluation helps to uncover and observe teacher attainments, aptitudes, behaviors, and creativities which are important yet difficult to measure in a formal approach. It is certainly advantageous that colleagues, who are usually from the same discipline, are familiar with departmental goals, programs and priorities (Areola, cited in Wossenu; 2005). Besides systematically and fairly done peer appraisal would help to identify and consider the behaviors that a teacher exhibits outside the classroom (Darling-Hammond et al cited in Melaku; 1992).

### 3.5.1. Attitude towards Colleagues' Evaluation by Teaching Experiences.

Table 6a- Descriptive Statistics for colleagues' evaluation by teaching experiences.

Teaching experience	N	Mean	Standard deviation
1 – 5 years	116	11.554	4.031
6 – 10 years	15	16.431	1.254
11 years and above	22	16.785	2.478
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>12.784</b>	<b>3.944</b>

Table 6b- One-Way ANOVA for colleagues' evaluation by teaching experiences.

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	344.14	2	172.07	12.78	0.00*
Within groups	2019.74	150	13.47		
Total	2363.88	152			

\*P<0.05

In an attempt to see whether or not there could be attitudinal variation of instructors and technical assistants towards colleagues' evaluation faculty wise, qualification wise and experience wise one-way ANOVA was employed. The result shows, there was statistically significant attitudinal variation both qualification wise and experience wise at 0.05 significance level (as it is shown in the table 6b). This was supported in tables 6a, and discussed below.

sample mean (12.78) is significantly greater than the population expected mean (12) at 0.05 level of significance. This means that most of the instructors and technical assistants responded favorably towards colleagues' evaluation of instructors' performance. Therefore, most instructors and technical assistants perceive colleagues' evaluations as important indicator for teaching effectiveness. According to Shipman (cited in Melaku, 1992), colleague evaluation helps to uncover and observe teacher attainments, aptitudes, behaviors, and creativities which are important yet difficult to measure in a formal approach. It is certainly advantageous that colleagues, who are usually from the same discipline, are familiar with departmental goals, programs and priorities (Areola, cited in Wossenu; 2005). Besides systematically and fairly done peer appraisal would help to identify and consider the behaviors that a teacher exhibits outside the classroom (Darling-Hammond et al cited in Melaku; 1992).

### 3.5.1. Attitude towards Colleagues' Evaluation by Teaching Experiences.

Table 6a- Descriptive Statistics for colleagues' evaluation by teaching experiences.

Teaching experience	N	Mean	Standard deviation
1 – 5 years	116	11.554	4.031
6 – 10 years	15	16.431	1.254
11 years and above	22	16.785	2.478
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>12.784</b>	<b>3.944</b>

Table 6b- One-Way ANOVA for colleagues' evaluation by teaching experiences.

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	344.14	2	172.07	12.78	0.00*
Within groups	2019.74	150	13.47		
Total	2363.88	152			

\*P<0.05

In an attempt to see whether or not there could be attitudinal variation of instructors and technical assistants towards colleagues' evaluation faculty wise, qualification wise and experience wise one-way ANOVA was employed. The result shows, there was statistically significant attitudinal variation both qualification wise and experience wise at 0.05 significance level (as it is shown in the table 6b). This was supported in tables 6a, and discussed below.

Furthermore, table 6b shows that the sample mean responses of instructors and technical assistants with teaching experience of six to ten years and with eleven years and above (16.43 and 16.79 respectively) are greater than the expected population mean (12). But, the sample mean responses of instructors and technical assistants with teaching experience of one to five years (11.55) is less than the expected population mean (12). Therefore, it is possible to generalize that instructors and technical assistants with teaching experience of six years and above favored colleagues' evaluation. On the other hand, instructors and technical assistants having a teaching experience of five years and below perceived that: colleagues' evaluation is based on instructors' personality rather than competence, colleagues have limited opportunity to obtain all necessary information about the instructor, colleagues' evaluation not based on classroom visitation, and so colleagues are not the right persons to evaluate instructors' performance. In addition, according to Areola (cited in Wossenu, 2005), one of the negative consequences of colleagues' evaluation is that it brings bias due to previous evaluations, personal relationships, and peer pressure.

In addition to the above likert type questions, one open-ended question stated "Do you think that colleague evaluation of instructors' performance has weaknesses?" was administered and the major responses are summarized below:

1. Colleagues' evaluation is usually influenced by personal relationships.
2. Colleagues do not check each other on duties that are directly related to academics.
3. Most of the time it is done for formality.
4. Most of the time colleagues do not give due respect for evaluation.
5. Usually, instructors get high score even though they are known academically weak.

The weaknesses mentioned above as pointed out by respondents could result in attitudinal variation among respondents (as shown in table 6b). Therefore, it reflects that the respondents may not got adequate training/orientation about colleagues' evaluation.

### 3.6. Attitude towards Department Heads' Evaluation.

In an attempt to assess whether or not the respondents show favorable attitude towards the department heads' evaluation, the following attitude rating statements (in the form of 5 likert-type scale) were presented to respondents to their opinion (see Appendix 3.2).

1. Department heads' evaluation is based on the instructors' personality rather than performance.
2. Department heads have limited opportunity to obtain all necessary information about the instructors.
3. Department heads' evaluation is not based on the classroom observation.
4. Department heads are the not right persons to evaluate instructors' performance.

The responses obtained from the above questions were presented in table 7 below.

Table 7- One sample t-test for department heads evaluation.

No. of items	Expected mean	Observed mean	St. dev.	df	t	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
4	12	11.74	4.10	152	-0.79	0.43*	-0.26	-0.92	0.39

\*p>0.05

Table 7 shows the observed mean response of the sample (11.74) was less than the expected population mean (12). This shows that most instructors and technical assistants respond unfavorably toward department heads' evaluation. This was to some what similar as to the findings of Halon and Mortenson (cited in Atsede; 1991), stated that the major weaknesses of department heads evaluation that could affect teachers attitude are over expectations, personal relationships, reason for observation, own values and favored teaching methods. And Owen et al (1978) stated department heads evaluation is likely to depend on general impressions that are subject to halo-effect in which a single attribute colors the whole.

Moreover, an open-ended question which stated “Do you think that department heads evaluation of instructors performance has weaknesses?” was administered, and the major responses are summarized below.

1. It is based on more of administrative issue rather than academic performance.
2. Most of the time it is influenced by social approach or friendly relationships.
3. Most of the time it is not based up on classroom observation.
4. Some department heads do not seriously follow their subordinates' performance.
5. Sometimes they may use that chance of evaluating role to revenge opposed or disliked instructors.

In general, the above weaknesses of department heads' evaluation may encourage most respondents to show negative attitude towards it (see table 7). Therefore, this seems that department heads evaluate instructors and technical assistants in contrast to the role they were expected to provide in faculty teaching performance evaluation.

### 3.6.1. Attitude Department Heads' Evaluation by Qualifications.

Table 7a- Descriptive statistics for department heads' evaluation by qualifications

Qualification	N	Mean	Standard deviation
College diploma	25	12.224	3.097
Bachelor degree	40	12.325	4.293
Master's degree	81	11.333	4.000
PhD	7	11.353	1.718
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>11.74</b>	<b>4.10</b>

Table 7b- One-Way ANOVA for department heads evaluation by qualifications.

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	304.81	3	101.60	6.74	0.00*
Within groups	2246.73	149	15.08		
Total	2551.54	152			

\* P<0.05

As shown in table 7b there was statistically significant attitudinal variation among instructors and technical assistants towards department heads evaluation by

qualification at 0.05 significance level. In addition, table 7a showed the mean responses of master's and PhD holder instructors (11.33 and 11.35 respectively) were below the mean responses of diploma and bachelor degree holders (12.22 and 12.33 respectively). This implies that instructors holding master's degree and PhD might think that they were more qualified than those holding diploma or bachelor degree and they have tried to teach the subject in relatively better capacity but department heads might have failed to observe and evaluate them in line with their work.

### 3.7. The Effectiveness of Faculty Teaching Evaluation Forms

In an attempt to assess whether or not the respondents show favorable attitude towards the appropriateness, usefulness, and applicability of the faculty teaching evaluation forms, 12 items (3 from students', 4 from colleagues', and 5 from department heads' rating questionnaires) were randomly selected. Then these statements are presented in the form of likert-type scale, ranging from more appropriate (5 points) to more inappropriate (1 point), see Appendix 3-3. Finally, the results of the responses were presented in table 8 below.

Table 8- One sample t-test for the appropriateness usefulness and applicability of the faculty-teaching evaluation forms.

Variable	No. of items	Expected mean	Observed mean	St. dev.	df	t	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
									Lower	Upper
The attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards the appropriateness of the faculty teaching evaluation forms	12	36	47.63	1.03	152	11.25	0.00*	11.63	9.59	13.68
The attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards the usefulness of the faculty teaching evaluation forms	12	36	47.67	1.00	152	11.71	0.00*	11.67	9.70	13.64
The attitude of instructors and technical assistants towards the applicability of the faculty to teaching evaluation forms	12	36	39.23	1.07	152	3.02	0.01*	3.23	1.12	5.34

\*p<0.05

As it was indicated in table 8, the observed mean responses of the sample (47.63, 47.67 and 39.23 for appropriateness, usefulness and applicability respectively), were greater than the expected population mean (36). This indicates that instructors and technical assistants perceived favorably towards the appropriateness, usefulness, and applicability of the faculty teaching evaluation forms that are filled by students, colleagues and department heads.

In an attempt to see whether or not there could be significant attitudinal variation among instructors and technical assistants towards the appropriateness, usefulness, and applicability of the faculty teaching evaluation forms from the point of view of faculty , qualification and experience by using one-way ANOVA, the result shows that there is no statistically significant variation at 0.05 significance level.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### 4. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the summary of major findings of the study; and based on the summary conclusions are drawn and presented. Finally, the recommendations, which the investigator assumes to be operational, are forwarded.

#### 4.1. Summary

1. As revealed by the findings, most of the instructors and technical assistants of Hawassa University showed favorable attitude towards the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation. However, examined in terms of qualification, there were statistically significant attitudinal variations among respondents towards the faculty teaching performance evaluation. In this regard, the mean responses of diploma holders (15.24) are the least when compared with the mean responses of bachelor degree, master's degree, and PhD holders (17.8, 17.19, and 24.29 respectively).
2. The majority of instructors and technical assistants of Hawassa University showed favorable attitude towards the administration of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation. A statistically significant attitudinal variation among the respondents towards the administration of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation by teaching experience was observed. In this case, most instructors and technical assistants with teaching experience six years and above showed unfavorable attitude towards the administration of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation.
3. Regarding student-instructor face-to-face evaluation, most instructors and technical assistants of Hawassa University showed favorable attitude. They responded that student-instructor face- to- face evaluation, if properly conducted, could be useful to improve the quality of instruction by providing accurate and timely feedback about

the weak sides and strong sides of the instructors and technical assistants and help them to take timely measures to correct the weaknesses. On the other hand, the result showed statistically significant attitudinal variation regarding student-instructor face-to-face evaluation among instructors and technical assistants by teaching experiences.

4. Furthermore, the findings of the study indicate that the majority of instructors and technical assistants of Hawassa University showed favorable attitude towards students' evaluation. However, there was statistically significant attitudinal variation towards students' evaluation among instructors and technical assistants both by qualification as well as by teaching experience. In this regard, instructors and technical assistants with teaching experience ranging from six to ten years perceived negatively towards student's evaluation.
5. In addition to this, most of the instructors and technical assistants of Hawassa University showed favorable attitude towards colleagues' evaluation. However, there was statistically significant attitudinal variation regarding colleagues' evaluation among instructors and technical assistants by teaching experience. In this case, instructors and technical assistants having one to five years of teaching experience perceived unfavorably towards colleagues' evaluation.
6. The majority of instructors and technical assistants of Hawassa University showed unfavorable attitude towards department heads' evaluation. The possible reason for this could be it is biased by personal relationships, it is based up on administrative issues than academic performance, most of the time it is not based upon classroom observation, etc. Furthermore there were statistically significant attitudinal variation among instructors and technical assistants towards department heads' evaluation. In this case, the mean responses of instructors holding master's degree and PhD was below the expected average, and hence, they show unfavorable attitude towards department heads' evaluation.

7. Finally, most of the instructors and technical assistants of Hawassa University showed favorable attitude towards the effectiveness (appropriateness, usefulness, and applicability) of items included in the students', colleagues', and department heads' rating questionnaire of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation.

#### **4.2. Conclusions**

The findings of the study reveal that most of the instructors and technical assistants show favorable attitude towards the purpose and administration of faculty teaching performance evaluation. However, the average responses of technical assistants (diploma holders) were the least from that of instructors that have bachelor degree and above regarding the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation. In addition, instructors and technical assistants with teaching experience of six years and above show negative attitude towards the administration of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation. This implies that faculties and colleges of the university exert little effort to make the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation known by all instructors and technical assistants. Therefore, it could be concluded that faculty teaching performance evaluation has been carried out while there was attitudinal variations among the evaluatees towards its purpose and administration.

Faculty teaching performance evaluation is said to be reliable when multiple methods of collecting data about instructors' performance was applied. One of these methods was collecting data from student-instructor face-to-face evaluation. In this case, instructors and students are engaged in face-to-face conversation, in which feedback proceeds in both directions, and hence the effect on teaching performance would be more effective and could have a beneficial effect on students' attitude and achievement, hence could enhance the over all improvement of teaching-learning process. Even though, student-instructor face-to-face evaluation is not applied in Hawassa University currently, most of the instructors and technical assistants showed positive attitude towards it. Therefore, most of the instructors and technical assistants are interested to hear their strengths and weaknesses from student-instructor face-to -face evaluation and they were

interested to hear how well they are teaching at the present, as well as how they can do better in the future.

Despite the majority of instructors and technical assistants show favorable attitude towards students' evaluation, there were statistically significant attitudinal variation among instructors and technical assistants both by qualification and by teaching experience. This might have happened due to the drawbacks of students' evaluations, such as; lack of providing timely feedback from evaluation results, administration during final exam time, the use of evaluation as a tool of revenge by students, and the question of knowledge and competence of students to evaluate instructors. This clearly shows that faculties and colleges of the university demonstrated little effort to orient/train students and academic staff. Therefore, because of such variations instructors and technical assistants have developed a feeling of mistrust on students' evaluation. Hence, this could adversely affect the satisfaction of the academic staff from faculty teaching performance evaluation.

Rating of instructors' performance by colleagues was supported by most of the university instructors and technical assistants. In this regard, through different activities in the university and through work relations, colleagues become sufficiently familiar with the work of other instructors to pass judgments on the competency of their instruction. However, instructors and technical assistants with teaching experience between one to five years negatively perceived colleagues' evaluation. In this case, new staff members got low rating from colleagues' evaluation because it discriminates them from the existing (experienced) ones. Therefore, this could make new staff members unwilling and unresponsive to colleagues' evaluation.

It was found that department heads' evaluation of instructors' and technical assistants' performance has weaknesses such as it concentrated more on administrative issues rather than academic performance, it was mostly influenced by social approach or friendly relationships, and mostly it was not based on classroom observation. Further more, sometimes it was made without following instructors' performance, and its

susceptibility to revenge the opposed or disliked staff members. This clearly shows that faculties and colleges of Hawassa University did not provide adequate training to department heads, when they are appointed to the position. Therefore, most of the instructors and technical assistants show negative attitude towards department heads' evaluation; and furthermore, there is attitudinal variation among instructors and technical assistants by qualification. Hence, this could make them to be unsatisfied by the decisions that are made through using such information as an input.

Instructors and technical assistants demonstrated favorable attitude towards the effectiveness (appropriateness, usefulness and applicability) of items included in the students, colleagues and department heads rating questionnaire. However, these instruments employ a forced choice that asks students, colleagues, and department heads to make an assessment of the instructors' characteristics. Therefore, even though they showed favorable attitude towards the effectiveness of the assessors in students, colleagues, and department heads rating forms, there were no open-ended questions that indicate the evaluators' attitude of the primary teaching strengths and weaknesses of the instructor, and inviting evaluators to offer suggestions for instructional improvements.

#### **4.3. Recommendations**

1. Students' evaluation of instructors' performance can contribute to the effectiveness of faculty teaching performance evaluation when students fill the evaluation instruments/forms carefully. Therefore, to encourage a filling of seriousness and purposefulness in completing the evaluation instruments by students, the university management should provide adequate orientation to students about the purpose of faculty teaching performance evaluation and also administer the rating instruments to students before two or three weeks of the semester.
2. Faculties and colleges of the university should arrange training to the instructors and technical assistants on the purpose and administration of faculty teaching

performance evaluation. This enhances them to develop a clear understanding on the purpose and administration of the faculty teaching performance evaluation and hence can narrow the gap of attitudinal variation among them.

3. Faculties and colleges of Hawassa University should continuously revise the assessors in the students', colleagues' and department heads' rating instruments by participating instructors and technical assistants. In addition, they should include some standard open-ended questions in the rating instruments that indicate students', colleagues' and department heads' perceptions of the teaching methods of the evaluatees and invite the evaluators to offer suggestions for improvement.
4. The faculties and colleges of the university need to train department heads on how to make effective instructor evaluation and include questions concerning the academic aspect of instructors performance in the department heads' rating questionnaire.
5. The university should apply multiple methods of gathering information from students, colleagues, and department heads to make the faculty teaching performance evaluation reliable. In this case, they should apply student-instructor face-to-face evaluation by providing adequate orientation to students, instructors, and technical assistants. So that, instructors and technical assistants can get timely feedback about their work and hence help them improve their weaknesses immediately.
6. Effective performance evaluation is important for improving the quality of instruction by motivating instructors and technical assistants in the universities. Because of this, the MOE in collaboration with the universities of the country should undertake a comprehensive research at a national level to identify areas for improvement and to establish a system of faculty teaching performance evaluation that is acceptable by instructors, technical assistants, and administrators of the universities.

## References

- Assefa Berhane (1999). College Students' Evaluation of university teaching Effectiveness. A Review of Literature. *IER Flambeau*. 6:2, 32-47
- Atsede Beyene (1991) investigation of the Relationship Between Students' Evaluation of Teachers and Evaluation of Teachers by Principals and Department Heads in Ethiopian Higher Training Institutes. A.A.U. (Unpublished MA Thesis).
- Beatty, Richard W., and Craig Eric Schneider (1981). **Personnel Administration: An Experiential Skill- building Approach** (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). California: Addison - Wesley publishing company, Inc.
- Berhanemeskel Kebede (1999). Teachers' Perception of Their Performance Evaluation made by High School Students and Their Parents in Gurage Zone. A.A.U. (Unpublished MA Thesis).
- Bernardin, H. John (2003). **Human Resource Management: An Experimental Approach**. New York: The MC Graw-Hill Companies.
- Camp, C. et al. (1979). **The Supervision of Teacher Evaluation: A Brief Overview**. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 30:2, 17-22
- Carrel, Michael R. (1992). **Personnel/ Human Resource Management**. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- CCH Australia Limited (1981). **Employee Assessment, Appraisal and Counseling**. Sydney: CCH Australia Limited.
- Cohen, P. (1980). Effectiveness of student-rating feedback for improving college Instruction: A Meta-Analysis of Findings. *Research in Higher Education*. 13:4, 321-341
- Darge Wole (2002). The Predominance of Different Sources of Stress Among Teachers in Government Senior High Schools of A.A. *The Ethiopian Journal of Education*. 22:1, 1-32
- Gomez- Mejia, Luis R. et al. (1995). **Managing Human Resources**. USA: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Goodale, G. James (1992). **One to one. Interviewing, Selecting, Appraising, and Counseling Employees**. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Good, Carter V. (ed) (1973). **Dictionary of Education** (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). U.S.A.: Mc Graw -Hill, Inc.

- Gordon, Judith R. (1986). **Human Resource Management: A Practical Approach**. Boston: Ally and Bacon, Inc.
- Hano, J. and Mortensen L. (1980). Making Teacher Evaluation Work. **Journal of Higher Education**. 51,665-672
- Hussein, Torstein and Neville Postlethwaite T. (ed) (1884). **The International Encyclopedia of Education**. Great Britain: Elsevier Science Ltd. Vol. 10
- Leap, Terry L., and Michael D. Crino (1989). **Personnel /Human Resource Management**. New York: Macmillan publishing company.
- Marsh, H. and Roche L. (1997). Making Students' Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness Effective. **American Psychologist**. 52:11, 1187-1197
- Marsh, H.W. (1984). Students Evaluation of university Teaching: Dimensionality, Reliability, Validity, Potential Bias and Utility. **Journal of Educational Psychology**. 76,707-754
- Mekonnen Gofu (2000). Addis Ababa University Instructor Performance Evaluation Questionnaire: Reliability, Dimensionality and Usefulness. A.A.U. (Unpublished MA Thesis).
- Mekonnen Sintayehu (2004). Jimma University Teachers' Perception of the Faculty Teaching Performance Evaluation System. A.A.U. (Unpublished MA Thesis).
- Melaku Yimam (1992). Appraiser- Appraisee perception of Teacher performance Appraisal in Senior Secondary Schools of Addis Ababa. Addis Ababa University (Unpublished MA Thesis).
- Milkovich, George t., and John W. Boudreau (1988). **Personnel/Human Resources Management** (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) U.S.A.: Business publications, Inc.
- Ministry of Education (1994). **Education and Training Policy**. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2005). **Education Statistics Annual Abstract**. Addis Ababa: Orion Printing Press.
- Morrill, P.H., and Spees E.R. (1982). **The Academic Profession**. New York: Teaching in Higher Education Human Sciences Press.
- Newman, John E and John R. Hendricks (1980). **Performances Evaluation for Professional Personnel**. New York: Work n America Institute, Inc.
- Park, S. (1996). Teacher Evaluation in MC Akin (ed). **Encyclopedia of Educational Research**. New York.

Priestley, Michael (1982). **Performance Assessment in Education and Training: Alternative Techniques.** New Jersey: Educational Technology publications, Inc.

Saiyadain, Mirza S. (1988). **Human Resources Management.** New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill publishing co. Ltd.

Towers, Brain (1981). **Handbook of Human Resources Management.** New Delhi: Maya Publishers Pvt. Ltd. Co.

Walker, James W. (1980). **Human Resource Planning.** New York: Mc Graw-Hill, Inc.

Wossenu Yimam (2005). A look in to the System of Faculty Evaluation in Ethiopian Universities: The case of A.A.U. Andhra University (Unpublished PhD Dissertation).

## **APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX 1.1-** Questionnaire used to collect data about the purpose, administration, and student-instructor face-to-face evaluation.

**PART TWO-** The following are a set of statements about the purpose, administration, and student-instructor face-to-face evaluation of instructor' performance evaluation. Please read each item separately and indicate your opinion by putting a check mark (√) against your choice.

**Key:** - Strongly agree=SA, Agree=A, Undecided=UD, Disagree=D Strongly disagree=SD

No	Statement	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1	The purpose of performance evaluation is to decide on instructors' salary increment, promotion and reward for effective instructors.					
2	The purpose of performance evaluation is to identify incompetent instructors so that to arrange in-service training.					
3	The purpose of performance evaluation is to identify incompetent instructors so as to dismiss them.					
4	The purpose of performance evaluation is to improve the quality of instruction.					
5	The purpose of performance evaluation is to stimulate professional growth and development.					
6	Instructor evaluation takes place during the last two or three weeks of the semester.					
7	Students are allowed adequate time to complete the evaluation form.					
8	Students are allowed to direct the teaching methods of their instructors and suggest improvements.					
9	The instructor who is being evaluated leaves the room when students are completing his/her evaluation.					
10	Faculties show strong interest to keep the evaluation forms in a confidential manner.					
11	Feedback to the instructor from face-to-face evolution can enhance the relationship between the instructor and students.					
12	Face-to-face evolution has a positive impact on teaching-learning process.					
13	Face-to-face evolution enables instructors to correct their weaknesses by providing feedback.					

**APPENDIX 1.2-** Questionnaire used to collect data about students', colleagues', and department heads' evaluation of instructors' performance.

**PART THREE-** The following are a set of statements about students, colleague, and department head evaluators of instructors' performance. Please read each item separately and indicate your opinion by putting a check mark (✓) against your choice.

**Key:** - Strongly agree=SA, Agree=A, Undecided=UD, Disagree=D Strongly disagree=SD

No	Statement	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1	Students' evaluations are highly influenced by received or expected grade.					
2	Students' evaluations are based on the instructors' personality rather than competence.					
3	Students give high rating to courses with lower standards.					
No	Statement	SA	A	UD	D	SD
4	Students do not have experience and competence to evaluate their instructors.					
5	Students' evaluation of instructors' performance negatively affect instructor-student relationship.					
6	Colleagues' evaluation is based on the instructors' personality rather than performance.					
7	Colleagues have limited opportunity to obtain all necessary information about the instructors.					
8	Colleagues' evaluation is not based on the classroom observation.					
9	Colleagues are the not right persons to evaluate instructors' performance.					
10	Department heads' evaluation is based on the instructors' personality rather than performance.					
11	Department heads have limited opportunity to obtain all necessary information about the instructors.					
12	Department heads' evaluation is not based on the classroom observation.					
13	Department heads are the not right persons to evaluate instructors' performance.					

### Open-ended questions

1. Do you think that students' evaluation of instructors' performance has weaknesses? If yes, mention them.
2. Do you think that colleagues' evaluation of instructors' performance has weaknesses? If yes, mention them.
3. Do you think that department heads' evaluation of instructors' performance has weaknesses? If yes, mention them.
4. Do you think that student-instructor face-to-face evaluation has strong sides? If yes, mention them.
5. Do you think that student-instructor face-to-face evaluation has weaknesses? If yes, mention them.
6. In your opinion, what should be done to improve the existing evaluation system?

**APPENDIX 1.3-** Questionnaire used to collect data about the effectiveness of students', colleagues', and department heads' rating questionnaire of the current faculty teaching performance evaluation.

**PART FOUR-** The following are set of items that are selected from students, colleagues, and department heads rating forms. Please read each item separately and indicate your opinion by putting a check mark (✓) against your choice.

**Key:** - More Inappropriate=1, Inappropriate=2, Undecided=3, Appropriate=4, More Appropriate=5

የክፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት መምህራን መገምገሚያ መስፈርቶች በተማሪዎች፣ በሥራ ባለደረጃቸው በኃላፊው የሚሞላ

ተ.ቁ	የመገምገሚያ መስፈርት	To what extent the item is appropriate?					To what extent the item is useful?					To what extent the item is applicable?				
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Students Rating Form</b>																
1	የተለዩ የትምህርት መረጃዎችን በመጠቀም ያስተምራል፤															
2	በሚሰጣቸው ፈተናዎች ለሚጠቃለሉ ጥያቄዎች ሚዛናዊ በሆነ መንገድ ዋጋ ይሰጣል፤ ለሚያወጣቸው ፈተናዎች የተመጠነ ጊዜ ይመድባል፤															
3	ሥነ ሥርዓት አክባሪነትና በሚያሳየው ሥነ ምግባር አርአያነት አለው፤ ለተማሪዎችም ተገቢውን ክብር ይሰጣል፤															
<b>Colleagues Rating Form</b>																
4	በክፍሉ የሚሰጡትን የፈተና ብቃት/ቫሊዩቲ/ባጋራ ይገመግማል።															
5	የኮሚቴ ሥራ ይቀበላል፤ ከስራ ባለደረጃቸው ጋር የተሰጠውን የኮሚቴ ሥራ/ስብሰባ/ በተገቢው ያከናውናል።															
6	ተማሪዎችን የሚገመግምበት ዘዴ በግልጽ ያስቀምጣል፤ ተማሪዎችን በሥራቸውና በተጨማሪ ውጤታቸው ያለአድልዎ በሚዛናዊነት ይገመግማል።															
7	የአልኮልና መጠጥ ወይም የሌሎች አደጋዎችን ሰጠው ተገዥ ላለመሆን ይጥራል።															
<b>Department Heads Rating Form</b>																
8	ተማሪዎችን እንደ አስፈላጊነቱ ተተር ያደርጋል፤															
9	ተማሪዎች የሚገመግሙበትን ዘዴ በግልጽ ያስቀምጣል፤ ተማሪዎችን በሥራቸውና በተጨማሪ ውጤታቸው ያለአድልዎ በሚዛናዊነት ይገመግማል፤															
10	ያለበቁ ምክንያትና የክፍል ኃላፊው ላይውቅ የሚያስተምርበትን የክፍል ሰዓት አይለውጥም፤ አያስተላልፍም፤ ከክፍል አይቀርም፤															
11	ራሱን የመገምገም፤ የሌሎችን የሥራ ብቃትና ውጤት የመገምገም፤ በሌሎች የመገምገም ሁኔታ መብትና ግዴታ መሆኑን ይቀበላል፤															
12	ያለውን ቅሬታ በግልጽና በተገቢው መድረክ ላይ ያቀርባል፤															

**APPENDIX 2.1- Students rating questionnaire**

የክፍተት ትምህርት ተቋማት መምህራን መገምገሚያ መስፈርት በተማሪዎች የሚሞላ

ተገምጋሚው መምህር ስም \_\_\_\_\_ ዓ.ም \_\_\_\_\_  
 የኮርሱ ዓይነት \_\_\_\_\_ ሲምሲተር \_\_\_\_\_ ክፍ \_\_\_\_\_  
 መግለጫ \_\_\_\_\_

1. እያንዳንዱን የመገምገሚያ ነጥብ በጥንቃቄ አንብብ
2. ከአነብበዘው የመገምገሚያ ነጥብ አካያ የመምህርህን
  1. የማስተማር ዝግጅት
  2. የትምህርት አቀራረብ
  3. አጠቃላይ ባሕሪ

በሚዛናዊነት ግምት

3. ከአነብበዘው የመገምገሚያ ነጥብ አካያ የመምህርህን የሥራ አፈጻጸም ከበጣም ዝቅተኛ እስከ በጣም ከፍተኛ በቀጥታ ተመንገሮ ከተቀመጠው ውስጥ አንዱን በመክበብ አመልክት፤

ተ.ቁ	የመገምገሚያ መስፈርት	በጣም ዝቅተኛ	ዝቅተኛ	መካከለኛ	ከፍተኛ	በጣም ከፍተኛ
1	የትምህርቱን አጠቃላይ ዝርዝር ዓላማ በግልጽ ለተማሪዎች ያሳውቃል፤ የትምህርቱን ዝርዝር ዓላማ በየጊዜው ለተማሪዎች ግልጽ ያደርጋል/ለምሳሌ በየምዕራፉ በየኒቱ ... ወዘተ ፤	1	2	3	4	5
2	የትምህርቱን ዝርዝር ይዘት/ኮርስ አውጥሎ በግልጽ ያሳውቃል፤ የትምህርቱን ዝርዝር ይዘት/ኮርስ አውጥሎ በጊዜ ሰሌዳ መጥኖ ያዘጋጃል፤ ያቀርባል፤	1	2	3	4	5
3	ስለሚያስተምረው ትምህርት ተገቢ ዝግጅት አድርጎ ያቀርባል ፤	1	2	3	4	5
4	የሚያስተምረውን ትምህርት ተግባራዊነቱን በምሳሌ እየደገፈ ያስረዳል፤	1	2	3	4	5
5	በትምህርቱ ዝርዝር ይዘት መሰረት ትምህርቱን ያቀርባል፤	1	2	3	4	5
6	በማስተማሪያ ቋንቋ በመጠቀም ትምህርቱን ያቀርባል፤	1	2	3	4	5
7	በክፍሉ ውስጥ የተማሪዎችን ጥያቄ ተቀብሎ ያስተናግዳል	1	2	3	4	5
8	በክፍሉ ውስጥ ተማሪዎች ስለትምህርቱ ሃሳቦቻቸውንና አስተያየታቸውን እንዲገልጹ ይፈቅዳል፤ በትምህርቱ ተሳታፊ እንዲሆኑ ያበረታታል	1	2	3	4	5
9	ለትምህርቱ ጠቃሚ የሆኑ መልመጃዎችን ይሰጣል፤ ያርማል፤ውጤቱንም ያሳውቃል፤ assignments, work sheets review questions	1	2	3	4	5
10	የተለየ የትምህርት መረጃዎችን በመጠቀም ያስተምራል፤	1	2	3	4	5
11	የሚጠቀሙባቸውን የምዘና ዘዴዎች ከነዋጋቸው በቅድሚያ ለተማሪዎች ይገልጻል፤	1	2	3	4	5
12	የፈተና ጥያቄዎችን ካስተማረው ትምህርት ጋር አዛም ያወጣል፤	1	2	3	4	5
13	በሚሰጣቸው ፈተናዎች ለሚጠቃለሉ ጥያቄዎች ሚዛናዊ በሆነ መንገድ ዋጋ ይሰጣል፤ ለሚያወጣቸው ፈተናዎች የተመጠነ ጊዜ ይመድባል፤	1	2	3	4	5
14	ለሚያስተምረው ትምህርት አስፈላጊ ጽሑፎችን ጠቃሚ የሆኑትን የማጣቀሻ /reference/ መጻሕፍት ዝርዝር አዘጋጅቶ ይሰጣል፤	1	2	3	4	5
13	በሚሰጣቸው ፈተናዎች ለሚጠቃለሉ ጥያቄዎች ሚዛናዊ በሆነ መንገድ ዋጋ ይሰጣል፤ ለሚያወጣቸው ፈተናዎች የተመጠነ ጊዜ ይመድባል፤	1	2	3	4	5
14	ለሚያስተምረው ትምህርት አስፈላጊ ጽሑፎችን ጠቃሚ የሆኑትን የማጣቀሻ /reference/ መጻሕፍት ዝርዝር አዘጋጅቶ ይሰጣል፤	1	2	3	4	5
15	በተመደበለት ትምህርት ክፍሉ ጊዜ ሰዓት አክብሮ ይገኛል፤ ለቀረበትም ክፍሉ ጊዜ ማካካሻ ይሰጣል፤	1	2	3	4	5
16	ክፍሉ ጊዜውን በአግባቡ ለማስተማር ተግባር አውሏል	1	2	3	4	5
17	ተማሪዎችን ለመርዳት የቢሮ ሰዓት መደብ ያውቃል ፤ በመደበው ሰዓት ተማሪዎች ለሚያቀርቡት የአካዳሚክ ችግሮች መፍትሔ ይፈልጋል ።	1	2	3	4	5
18	የተማሪዎችን ችግር ለማዳመጥ ፈቃደኛ ነው	1	2	3	4	5
19	ሥነ ሥርዓት አክባሪነትና በሚያሳየው ሥነ ምግባር አርአያነት አለው፤ ለተማሪዎችም ተገቢውን ክብር ይሰጣል፤	1	2	3	4	5

## APPENDIX 2.2- Colleagues Rating Questionnaire

የክፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት መምህራን መገምገሚያ መስፈርቶች በሥራ ባልደረቦቹ የሚሞላ

የተገምጋሚ ስም \_\_\_\_\_ ዓመተ ምህረት \_\_\_\_\_  
 የትምህርት ክፍል \_\_\_\_\_ ሴሚስተር \_\_\_\_\_ ክፍ \_\_\_\_\_

መግለጫ

- እያንዳንዱ ነጥብ በጥንቃቄ ያንብቡ
- ካንቡት የመገምገሚያ ነጥብ አኳያ የሥራ ባልደረባዎን የሥራ አፈጻጸም ከበጣም ዝቅተኛ እስከ በጣም ክፍተኛ በቁጥር ተመንዝሮ ከተቀመጠው ውስጥ አንዱን በመክበብ ያመልክቱ።
- ምናልባት እንደ የመገምገሚያ ነጥብ የሥራ ባልደረባዎን በሚመዘኑበት ጊዜ ነገር የማይመለከተው ከሆነ "አይመለከተውም" በሚለው ሥር የተቀመጠውን ምልክት " x" ይክበቡ።

ተ. ቁ	የመገምገሚያ መስፈርት	በጣም ዝቅተኛ	ዝቅተኛ	መካከለኛ	ክፍተኛ	በጣም ክፍተኛ	አይመለከተውም
1	በትምህርት ክፍሉ የመማር ማስተማር ሥራ የሚሻሻልበትን ሃሳብ ያቀርባል፤ ተሳትፎም ያደርጋል፤ በትምህርት ክፍሉ ችግሮች ሲከሰቱ የመፍትሄ ሃሳብ ያመነጫል፤ ተሳትፎም ያደርጋል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
2	በሙያው ጥናትና ምርምር ያደርጋል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
3	የጥናትና ምርምርን ሂደት በጥናቱ የተገኘውን ውጤት ለማመልከታቸው የኮሌጁ ሕብረተሰብ ያሳውቃል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
4	አስፈላጊ ሲሆን ለሚያስተምራቸው ኮርሶች የማስተማሪያ ጽሁፍ /ቲቸንግ ማቴሪያል /እና ወይም መጻሕፍት ያዘጋጃል፤ ይጽፋል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
5	እውቀቱን፣ ልምዱን ጉልበቱንና ጊዜውን ለተመደበበት ሥራ ያውላል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
6	እንደ አስፈላጊነቱ ከተቋሙ ላለው ሕብረተሰብ ሙያዊ አገልግሎት ያበረክታል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
7	ለመማር፣ ለመመራመር፣ ልዩ ልዩ የማስተማሪያ ጽሁፎችንና መጻሕፍትን ለማዘጋጀት አዳዲስ አሰራሮችን ለመጠቀምና ራሱን ለማሻሻል ጥረት ይደረጋል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
8	ከሥራ ኃላፊዎች ባልደረቦች፣ ተማሪዎችና ሠራተኞች ጋር ተግባብቶና ተባብሮ ይሰራል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
9	ያለውን ልምድና እውቀት ለባልደረቦቹ ለማካፈል ዝግጁ ይሆናል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
10	በክፍሉ በሚደረጉ ስብሰባዎች ላይ ይሳተፋል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
11	በክፍሉ የሚሰጡትን የፈተና ብቃት /ሻሊዲቲ/በጋራ ይገመገማል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
12	በክፍሉ የሚደረጉ የመምህራን ብቃት ግምገማ ይሳተፋል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
13	የኮሚቴ ሥራ ይቀበላል፤ ከስራ ባልደረቦቹ ጋር የተሰጠውን የኮሚቴ ሥራ /ስብሰባ/ በተገቢው ያከናውናል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
14	ተማሪዎችን የሚገመገምበት ዘዴ በግልጽ ያስቀምጣል፤ ተማሪዎችን በሥራቸውና በተጨማሪ ውጤታቸው ያለአድልዎ በሚዛናዊነት ይገመገማል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
15	ለማስተማሪያ ሥራዎች የተረከባቸውን መሣሪያዎች በጥንቃቄ እንዲቀመጡ ያደርጋል፤ የተበላሹ መሣሪያዎችና እቃዎች በየጊዜው እንደሁኔታው ይጠገናል እና ወይም እንዲጠገኑ ያደርጋል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
16	የስብሰባ ሰዓት ያክብራል፤ በስራ ምክንያት ለሥራ ጓደኞቹ የሰጠውን የቀጠሮ ሰዓት ያክብራል።	1	2	3	4	5	X

ተ. ቁ	የመገምገሚያ መስፈርት	በጣም ክፍተኛ	ገዛት	መካከለኛ	ክፍተኛ	በጣም ክፍተኛ	አይመለከተውም
17	በተቋሙ የሥራ ሰዓት በተቋሙ አዘውትሮ የመገኘት ልምድ አለው።	1	2	3	4	5	X
18	ግምገማ ከሥራ ሃይት አንዱ መሆኑን ይቀበላል፤ በግምገማ የተገኙ ገንቢ አስተያየቶችን ይቀበላል፤ አስተያየቶችንም በሥራው ለማካተትና ለመተርጎም ይጥራል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
19	የአልኮል መጠጥ ወይም ሌሎች አደንዛዥ እጾች ተገዢ ላለመሆን ይጥራል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
20	የሥራውን ደረጃና የሙያውን ክብር ይጠብቃል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
21	ለንደኞቹ ተገቢውን ክብር ይሰጣል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
22	ያለውን ቅሬታ በግልጽና በተገቢው መድረክ ላይ ያቀርባል።	1	2	3	4	5	X
23	ለማስተማሪያ የተረከባቸውን እቃዎች ካስፈለገ ሌሎች በመስኩ ከሚያስተምሩ መምህራን ጋር በጋራ ለመጠቀም ፈቃደኛ ይሆናል፤ የመሣሪያ እጥረት ሲያጋጥም ሌሎች መምህራን ለትምህርታቸው መሳካት የማያስፈልጋቸውን መሣሪያ በውስጥ ለመስጠት ፍላጎት አለው።	1	2	3	4	5	X
24	የተዋሳቸውን መሣሪያዎች በጊዜውና በተረከበበት ሁኔታ የመመለስ ግዴታውን ይወጣል።	1	2	3	4	5	X

### APPENDIX 2.3- Department heads rating questionnaire

የከፍተኛ ትምህርት ተቋማት መምህራን መገምገሚያ መስፈርቶች በኃላፊው የሚሞላ

የተገምጋሚው ስም \_\_\_\_\_ ዓመተ ምህረት \_\_\_\_\_

የትምህርት ክፍል \_\_\_\_\_ ሴሚስተር \_\_\_\_\_ ኮድ \_\_\_\_\_

መግለጫ

እያንዳንዱን የመገምገሚያ ነጥብ በጥንቃቄ አንብብ

በሚዛናዊነት ግምት

ከአነብብከው የመገምገሚያ ነጥብ አኳያ የመምራን የሥራ አፈጻጸም ክብጣም ዝቅተኛ እስከ በጣም ከፍተኛ በቁጥር ተመንዝር ከተቀመጠው አንዱን በመክብብ አመልክት፤

ምናልባት እንዲሁ የመገምገሚያ ነጥብ መምህራንን በምትመዝንበት ጊዜ ነገሩ የማይመለከተው ከሆነ አይመለከተውም በሚለው ሥር የሚቀመጠውን "X" ምልክት ክበቡ።

ተ.ቁ	የመገምገሚያ መስፈርት	በጣም ከፍተኛ	ዝቅተኛ	መካከለኛ	ከፍተኛ	በጣም ከፍተኛ	አይመለከተውም
1	ለሚያስተምረው ኮርስ በተዘጋጀው ሲለበስ /ኮርስ ዲስክሪፕሽን/ መሠረት ኮርስ አውትላይን ያዘጋጃል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
2	ፈተናን በጊዜው አርም ያስረክባል	1	2	3	4	5	X
3	የማስተማሪያ መረጃ መሣሪያዎች አግባብነት /Relevance/ እየገመገመ ይመርጣል፤ ያዘጋጃል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
4	ለትምህርቱ አስፈላጊ የሆኑ ጽሑፎችን ይጽፋል /ሀንድአውት/ ያዘጋጃል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
5	በሙያው ጥናትና ምርምር ያደርጋል፤ የጥናቱን ሂደት ለትምህርት ክፍሉ መምህራንና ተማሪዎች በተዘጋጀለት መድረክ ያሳውቃል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
6	ከጥናቱና ምርምሩ የተገኘው ውጤት ለሚመለከታቸው የተቋሙ ሕብረተሰብ ያሳውቃል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
7	ተቋሙ በሚያዘጋጃቸው ትምህርታዊ ስብሰባዎች ይሳተፋል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
8	ከተቋሙ ውጪ በሙያው የሚዘጋጅና እሱ እንዲገኝ በታዘዘበት ስብሰባ ይሳተፋል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
9	በሙያውና በአለው ልምድ ለተቋሙ የሚጠቅም ምርት በሚያስገኝ ሥራ ላይ ይሳተፋል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
10	በሚያስተምረው ኮርስ አዳዲስ ሁኔታዎችን ለመረዳት የሚያስችሉ መጻሕፍት እና ጆርናሎች እንዲገዙ ይጠይቃል ፣ ክትትልም ያደርጋል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
11	ከሥራ ኃላፊዎች ፣ ባለደረጃዎች ፣ ተማሪዎችና ሠራተኞች ጋር ተግባብቶና ተባብሮ ይሰራል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
12	ኘሮግራም አውጥቶ ለተማሪዎች የአካዳሚክ ምክር ይሰጣል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
13	ተማሪዎችን እንደ አስፈላጊነቱ ተተር ያደርጋል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
14	ተማሪዎች የሚገመገሙበትን ዘዴ በግልጽ ያስቀምጣል፤ ተማሪዎችን በሥራቸውና በተጨማሪው ውጤታቸው ያስከትልም በሚዛናዊነት ይገመገማል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
15	ለማስተማሪያ ሥራ የተረከባቸውን መሣሪያዎች በጥንቃቄ እንዲቀመጡ ያደርጋል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
16	የተበላሹ መሣሪያዎችና እቃዎች በየጊዜው እንደሁኔታው ይጠግናል እና /ወይም እንዲጠገኑ ያደርጋል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
17	ለሥራው የተሰጠውን የጽሕፈት መሣሪያ፣ የቢሮ መገልገያ እቃዎች በቁጠባና በተገቢው ለተቋሙ ሥራ ብቻ ያውላል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X

ተ.ቁ	የመገምገሚያ መስፈርት	በጣም ክፍተኛ	ገዛት	መካከለኛ	ክፍተኛ	በጣም ክፍተኛ	አይመለከተውም
18	አስቸኳይና አጣጣሪ ሥራዎች ሲከሰቱ ኃላፊው በሚመድበው ሥራ ላይ ይሳተፋል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
19	ለክፍሉ የተመደበለትን ሰዓት ያከብራል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
20	የሚያስተምረውን ኮርስ በሰዓቱ ጀምሮ በሰዓቱ ይፈጽማል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
21	ያለበቁ ምክንያትና የክፍል ኃላፊው ሳያውቅ የሚያስተምርበትን የክፍል ሰዓት አይለውጥም፤ አያስተላልፍም፤ ክፍል አይቀርም፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
22	የስብሰባ ሰዓት ያከብራል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
23	የቢሮ ሰዓት ነው ብሎ ባወጣው ሰሌዳ ይገዛል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
24	በተቋሙ የሥራ ሰዓት በተቋሙ አዘውትሮ የመገኘት ልምድ አለው ፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
25	ከሥራው ጋር በተያያዘ የሰጠውን ወይም የተቀበለውን የቀጠሮ ሰዓት ያከብራል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
26	ራሱን የመገምገም፤ የሌሎችን የሥራ ብቃትና ውጤት የመገምገም፤ በሌሎች የመገምገም ሁኔታ መብትና ግዴታ መሆኑን ይቀበላል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
27	በግምገማ የተገኙ ገንቢ አስተያየቶችን ይቀበላል፤ አስተያየቶችንም በሥራው ለማካተትና ለመተርጎም ይጥራል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
28	ለተማሪዎች ጥሩ ምሳሌ /ሮል ሞዴል/ ሊሆን ይጥራል፤ የሥራውን ደረጃና የሙያውን ክብር ይጠብቃል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
29	የአልኮልና መጠጥ ወይም የሌሎች አደንዛዥ ዕጾች ተገዥ ላለመሆን ይጥራል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
30	ለሥራ ኃላፊዎችና ባልደረቦች ተገቢውን ክብር ይስጣል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
31	ያለውን ቅሬታ በግልጽና በተገቢው መድረክ ላይ ያቀርባል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
32	ለማስተማሪያ የተረከባቸውን እቃዎች ካስፈለገ ሌሎች በመስኩ ከሚያስተምሩ መምህራን ጋር በውስጥ በመስጠት በጋራ ለመጠቀም ፈቃደኛ ይሆናል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
33	የተዋሳቸውን መሣሪያዎች በጊዜው በተረከበበት ሁኔታ የመመለስ ግዴታውን ይወጣል፤	1	2	3	4	5	X
34	ከሥራው ጋር ግንኙነት ያላቸው ሥራዎችን ከኃላፊው ሲሰጠው ያከናውናል፤ በተሰጠው የጊዜ ገደብ በሚፈለገው ሁኔታ ሰርቶ ለመጨረስ ይጥራል፡፡	1	2	3	4	5	X

**APPENIX 3.1-** Frequency distribution of the responses the purpose, administration, and face-to-face evaluation.

No	Statement	SA	A	UD	D	SD
	<b>Purpose</b>					
1	To decide on instructors' salary increment, promotion and reward for effective instructors.	52	47	26	15	13
2	To identify incompetent instructors so that to arrange in-service training.	36	38	41	18	20
3	To identify incompetent instructors so as to dismiss them.	14	16	42	50	31
4	To improve the quality of instruction.	72	39	20	13	9
5	To stimulate professional growth and development.	58	56	10	21	8
	<b>Administration</b>					
6	Instructor evaluation takes place during the last two or three weeks of the semester.	44	31	36	23	19
7	Students are allowed adequate time to complete the evaluation form.	32	55	12	30	24
8	Students are allowed to direct the teaching methods of their instructors and suggest improvements.	26	33	31	49	14
9	The instructor who is being evaluated leaves the room when students are completing his/her evaluation.	66	40	29	15	3
10	Faculties show strong interest to keep the evaluation forms in a confidential manner.	54	41	31	17	10
	<b>Face-to-face evaluation</b>					
11	Feedback to the instructor from face-to-face evolution can enhance the relationship between the instructor and students.	29	46	40	18	20
12	Face-to-face evolution has a positive impact on teaching-learning process.	36	48	34	20	15
13	Face-to-face evolution enables instructors to correct their weaknesses by providing feedback.	39	45	38	18	13

**APPENIX 3.2-** Frequency distribution of the responses regarding students', colleagues', and department heads' evaluation.

No	Statement	SA	A	UD	D	SD
	<b>Students' Evaluations</b>					
1	Students' evaluations are highly influenced by received or expected grade.	6	13	10	53	71
2	Students' evaluations are based on the instructors' personality rather than competence.	10	22	35	46	40
3	Students give high rating to courses with lower standards.	3	18	75	37	20
4	Students do not have experience and competence to evaluate their instructors.	18	50	31	25	29
5	Students' evaluation of instructors' performance negatively affect instructor-student relationship.	7	51	41	28	26
	<b>Colleagues' Evaluations</b>					
6	Colleagues' evaluation is based on the instructors' personality rather than performance.	5	58	29	42	19
7	Colleagues have limited opportunity to obtain all necessary information about the instructors.	9	43	26	57	18
8	Colleagues' evaluation is not based on the classroom observation.	42	84	18	6	3
9	Colleagues are the not right persons to evaluate instructors' performance.	33	44	38	25	13
	<b>Department heads' Evaluations</b>					
10	Department heads' evaluation is based on the instructors' personality rather than performance.	15	53	28	40	17
11	Department heads have limited opportunity to obtain all necessary information about the instructors.	13	49	22	60	9
12	Department heads' evaluation is not based on the classroom observation.	6	17	15	95	20
13	Department heads are the not right persons to evaluate instructors' performance.	50	41	35	19	8



ተ.ቁ	የመገምገሚያ መስፈርት	To what extent the item is useful?				
		a	b	c	d	e
<b>Department Heads Rating Form</b>						
8	ተማሪዎችን እንደ አስፈላጊነቱ ቱተር ያደርጋል፤	4	10	47	48	44
9	ተማሪዎች የሚገመገሙበትን ዘዴ በግልጽ ያስቀምጣል፤ ተማሪዎችን በሥራቸውና በተጨማሪ ውጤታቸው ያለአድልዎ በሚዛናዊነት ይገመገማል፤	2	1	36	46	68
10	ያለበቁ ምክንያትና የክፍል ኃላፊው ሳያውቅ የሚያስተምርበትን የክፍል ሰዓት አይለውጥም፤ አያስተላልፍም፤ ከክፍል አይቀርም፤	-	5	46	24	78
11	ራሱን የመገምገም፤ የሌሎችን የሥራ ብቃትና ውጤት የመገምገም፤ በሌሎች የመገምገም ሁኔታ መብትና ግዴታ መሆኑን ይቀበላል፤	9	-	45	33	66
12	ያለውን ቅሬታ በግልጽና በተገቢው መድረክ ላይ ያቀርባል፤	8	7	30	50	58

### Applicability

ተ.ቁ	የመገምገሚያ መስፈርት	To what extent the item is applicable?				
		a	b	c	d	e
<b>Students Rating Form</b>						
1	የተለዩ የትምህርት መረጃዎችን በመጠቀም ያስተምራል፤	15	14	89	24	12
2	በሚሰጣቸው ፈተናዎች ለሚጠቃሰሱ ጥያቄዎች ሚዛናዊ በሆነ መንገድ ዋጋ ይሰጣል፤ ለሚያወጣቸው ፈተናዎች የተመጠነ ጊዜ ይመድባል፤	4	23	51	47	28
3	ሥነ ሥርዓት አካባቢነትና በሚያሳዩው ሥነ ምግባር አርአያነት አለው፤ ለተማሪዎችም ተገቢውን ክብር ይሰጣል፤	12	9	61	25	46
<b>Colleagues Rating Form</b>						
4	በክፍሉ የሚሰጡትን የፈተና ብቃት /ቫሲዲቲ/በጋራ ይገመገማል፡፡	29	15	67	22	20
5	የኮሚቴ ሥራ ይቀበላል፤ ከስራ ባለደረጃ ጋር የተሰጠውን የኮሚቴ ሥራ /ስብሰባ/ በተገቢው ያከናውናል፡፡	11	16	65	34	27
6	ተማሪዎችን የሚገመገምበት ዘዴ በግልጽ ያስቀምጣል፤ ተማሪዎችን በሥራቸውና በተጨማሪ ውጤታቸው ያለአድልዎ በሚዛናዊነት ይገመገማል፡፡	18	13	59	21	42
7	የአልኮልና መጠጥ ወይም የሌሎች አደንዛኝ ፅጌች ተገኝ ላለመሆን ይጥራል፡፡	19	26	62	22	24
<b>Department Heads Rating Form</b>						
8	ተማሪዎችን እንደ አስፈላጊነቱ ቱተር ያደርጋል፤	15	10	77	25	26
9	ተማሪዎች የሚገመገሙበትን ዘዴ በግልጽ ያስቀምጣል፤ ተማሪዎችን በሥራቸውና በተጨማሪ ውጤታቸው ያለአድልዎ በሚዛናዊነት ይገመገማል፤	14	9	64	30	36
10	ያለበቁ ምክንያትና የክፍል ኃላፊው ሳያውቅ የሚያስተምርበትን የክፍል ሰዓት አይለውጥም፤ አያስተላልፍም፤ ከክፍል አይቀርም፤	9	25	60	29	30
11	ራሱን የመገምገም፤ የሌሎችን የሥራ ብቃትና ውጤት የመገምገም፤ በሌሎች የመገምገም ሁኔታ መብትና ግዴታ መሆኑን ይቀበላል፤	11	22	58	31	31
12	ያለውን ቅሬታ በግልጽና በተገቢው መድረክ ላይ ያቀርባል፤	20	9	63	37	24

## Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work, has not been presented for degree in any other university and that all sources of materials used for the thesis have been dully acknowledged.


Name: Temesgen Kinfu

Signature: 

Date: 6-03-2007

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as a university advisor.

Name: Dr. Zenebe Baraki

Signature: 

Date: 6/03/2007

