

STUDENTS' EVALUATION TOWARDS TEACHING QUALITY: STUDENTS' FEEDBACK IN AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

**SHAFINA FISAL
NORZIAH OTHMAN
ALAWIYAH TENGAH
NURSYAMIMI HARUN**

Kolej Universiti Islam Antarabangsa Selangor

shafina@kuis.edu.my, alawiyah@kuis.edu.my, syamimi@kuis.edu.my,
norziah@kuis.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Students' feedback is usually gathered in institutions of higher education to evaluate the teaching quality from the students' perspective, using questionnaires administered at the end of the courses. These evaluations are useful to pinpoint the course strengths, identify areas of improvement, and understand the factors that contribute to students' satisfaction. They are an important mechanism for improving the teaching and learning processes. This study explores the feedback of undergraduate student regarding the teaching quality of their lecturers in terms of students' test evaluation, teaching style, and method of teaching been used. Descriptive statistics have been employed to rate and compare responses obtained through an adapted 5-point Likert type scale. Students have rated lecturer quality of teaching as the highest based on their preference. The overall level of teaching quality of university lecturers in respect of all the five sub-scales is found to be at an excellent level. This study also suggests several strategies to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

Keywords: *Student evaluations of teaching, Students' feedback, Teaching quality.*

1.0 Introduction

One of the main concerns in higher education is ensuring the best possible education is provided to students. Hence, lecturers need information on performance and guidance on how to improve their teaching quality. Student evaluations of teaching (SET), are accepted practices and have been common in universities all over the world (Kuzmanovic et al. 2013; Surgenor 2013). Specifically, the use of student ratings of teaching (which are essentially student opinions of teaching capability) is the most common process employed at universities to evaluate faculty teaching quality/competence (Slocombe, Miller, and Hite, 2011). They are popular because the measurement is easy where students simply fill out forms that require little class and faculty time. Averages obtained from students' ratings are deemed to portray objective evaluation since they are numerical. Moreover, comparing the average rating of any lecturer to the average for a department as a whole is simple and can be easily measured. Students are also interested in SET in order to gauge whether they obtained ant benefits from the performance of their lecturers (Goh and Wong, 2015). Badri et al. (2006) noted that SET has become a factor in promotion, long-term contracts, merits, and award-related decisions, and contract renewals for teachers in most institutions.

Additionally, it has also become gradually common for academicians to monitor their students' experiences for curriculum development and quality assurance purposes (Saputra, Handrianto, Pernantah, Ismaniar and Shidiq, 2021). Biggs (1999) highlighted that quality learning among students is facilitated by quality teaching. Students' opinions and perceptions about their teaching and learning may be used by themselves and others to make better choice of programmes and academics (Akareem & Hossain, 2016; McKeachie, 1979). The use of SET questionnaires in monitoring student evaluation of teaching quality has been greatly reviewed and found to be valid and reliable (Marsh, 1984). Most SETs consist of Likert-scale items and are used to evaluate various aspects of teaching (Kuzmanovic et al. 2013). The evaluation of teachers and teaching is an important part of higher education (Nasser and Fresko, 2002) and can be used to help improve teaching quality. Given both students and governments (Pepe and Wang, 2012) have made large financial investments in education, it is important that lecturers are evaluated to help ensure greater return on those investments. To a certain extent, SET is considered as a tool contributing to decisions regarding faculty tenure, promotion and salary.

Hence, it is the objective of this study the outcomes of student evaluation of teaching (SET) on lecturers from the Department of Accounting & Finance, Faculty of Management & Muamalah (FPM), Selangor International Islamic University College. Based on past studies, it is also intended to suggest or recommend improvisations on the methods and processes conducted in SET that can be implemented by FPM of as a whole in order to have a more accurate and representative SET for the benefits of both students and lecturers. This is with the intention to engage students to become active participants in improving teaching quality of lecturers.

2.0 Methodology

Content Analysis is used on the Lecturer's Performance Evaluation form. Content analysis is a research method used to identify patterns in recorded communication. To conduct content analysis, data from a set of questionnaires involving three constructs, i.e., Teaching Evaluation, Teaching Assessment and Use of Teaching Aids is systematically collected. In this context, the students fill in the evaluation forms obtained from the student portal known as the My Learning Management System (MyLMS) in which the system churn out results in averages on the all of the variables measured. Each lecturer is rated on two items for each Teaching Evaluation and Use of teaching Aid. The lecturers are also rated on eight items for teaching assessment. The lecturers are rated at the end of each semester based on five Likert scale: i.e. very poor, poor, moderate, good and excellent. The sample size involves 12 lecturers from the Accounting & Finance Department, FPM KUIS. It involves 234 undergraduate students in this research.

3.0 Analysis and Findings

The mean score is computed using the frequency test in Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). The mean is rated based on the descriptions below:

- if the mean score is between 1 and 1.49, the performance is rated as very poor
- if the mean score is between 1.50 and 2.49, the performance is rated as poor;
- if the mean score is between 2.50 and 3.49, the performance is rated as moderate.
- if the mean score is between 3.50 and 4.49, the performance is rated as good.
- if the mean score is between 4.50 and 5.00, the performance is rated as excellent.

Table 1: Performance Rating Guidance

1	2	3	4	5
1	1.5	2.5	3.5	4.5
Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Excellent

Table 2: Performance Rating

Evaluation Criteria	No. Item	Statement	Mean Score
Testing and Evaluation	1	The type and appropriate method of course evaluation (assignment/ test/ practical/ final examination/ etc.)	4.37
	2	The marks given by the lecturer is transparent and fair	4.37
Teaching Assessment	1	The planning and preparation of this course is good	4.36
	2	Lecturer with in -depth knowledge of the course	4.44
	3	Lecturer has skills in the delivery of course content	4.42
	4	Lecturer uses relevant and up-to-date examples	4.41
	5	Lecturer stimulates students' interest in the course through creativity/ innovation	4.36
	6	Lecturer interacts with students and are willing to help students	4.42
	7	Lecturer practices punctuality	4.33
	8	The appearance and personality of the lecturer is good	4.43
Use of Teaching Aids	1	Lecturer uses appropriate teaching aids	4.39
	2	Lecturer uses adequate teaching materials	4.38

The research found that all 12 items give the mean score with the range of 4.33 and 4.44. It means that all 12 lecturers in Finance Department averagely rated as very good by students. Moreover, the faculty never received any complaints from the students of any misconduct by the lecturers. In conclusion, the lecturers are rated very well in their teachings. The mean score for each attribute shows more than good rates of performance. They acknowledge that the lecturers have shown outstanding commitment in their teachings. However, the lecturers should increase their skill in delivering the knowledge online.

4.0 Conclusion & Recommendations

The results obtained in SET on the lecturers from the Department of Accounting & Finance, FPM have been outstanding. Despite the outstanding results, based on past studies, authors would like to recommend some improvisations on the current SET in order to achieve a more accurate and representative SET for the benefits of both students and lecturers. The recommendation is that SETs should include both summative and formative evaluations (Alok 2011; Kuzmanovic et al. 2013; Surgenor 2013; Winchester and Winchester 2014). SETs that are only summative are of little or no value in improving ongoing classes (Winchester and Winchester, 2012).

Currently, only summative SETs is being practiced in FPM where SET evaluations are distributed to students at the end of the semester. The goal of formative assessment is to monitor student learning to provide ongoing feedback that can be used by lecturers to improve their teaching and by students to improve their learning. More specifically, formative assessments: help students identify their strengths and weaknesses and target areas that need work on the immediate basis. Examples of formative assessment are:

1. Entry and exit slips
2. Interview assessments
3. Self-assessment (in the form of ongoing documented rubrics)

5. Future

Research

In order to practice and implement a more comprehensive student evaluation of teaching on the lecturers of FPM, the authors intend to formulate a standardized documented formative assessment to complement the current summative assessment. The authors also intend to carry out a study on students' attitude and perceptions on SETs, the manner in which they are administered, and the ways they are used by lecturers, in order to find out their enthusiasm and level of participation on SETs. (Raman & Nedundadi, 2020) argued that the effectiveness of systems for evaluating teaching effectiveness is debatable, particularly with respect to the ability of students to accurately and appropriately make judgements about their lecturers' competency; the validity of the surveys themselves; as well as the role of external factors such as class size, time of day, instructor qualifications, and course level, this validates the need to exercise a more comprehensive approach to assessing the quality of teaching through both both summative and formative evaluations. For instance, factors such as student perceptions of the teacher, individual student characteristics and the physical environment of the learning institution can influence the manner in which evaluations are made. In addition, students' ratings are often influenced by the charisma of the teacher. (Raman & Nedundadi, 2020) revealed that such factors as students' gender bias and emotions (such as fear of a particular teacher) also influence SET results. Hence, SET cannot be considered as a tool that flawlessly reflects actual teacher effectiveness.

References

- Akareem, H. S., & Hossain, S. S. (2016). Determinants of education quality: What makes students' perception different? *Journal Open Review of Educational Research*, 3(1), 52-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2016.1155167>
- Alok, K. 2011. "Student Evaluation of Teaching: An Instrument and a Development Process." *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 23 (2): 226–235.
- Badri, M., Abdulla, M., Kamali, M., & Dodeen, H. (2006). Identifying potential biasing variables in student evaluation of teaching in a newly accredited business program in the UAE. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(1), 43–59. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540610639585>
- Biggs, J. (1999). What the student does: Teaching for enhanced learning. *Journal Higher Education Research & Development*, 18(1), 57-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436990180105>
- Goh, P.S.C., & Wong, K.T. (2015). Exploring the challenges for teacher educators. *Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education*, 5(1), 37-45.
- Kuzmanovic, M., G. Savic, M. Popovic, and M. Martic. 2013. A New Approach to Evaluation of University Teaching Considering Heterogeneity of Students' Preferences. *Higher Education* 66 (2): 153–171. <https://doi:10.1007/s10734-012-9596-2>
- Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, potential biases, and utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(5), 707-754. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.76.5.707>
- McKeachie, W. J. (1979). Student ratings of faculty: A reprise. *Academe*, 65(6) 384-397. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40248725>

Nasser, F., and B. Fresko. 2002. Faculty Views of Student Evaluation of College Teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 27 (2): 187–198.

Pepe, J. W., and M. C. Wang. 2012. What Instructor Qualities Do Students Reward? *College Student Journal* 46 (3): 603–614.

Raman & Nedundadi, 2020. Adoption of Web-Enabled Student Evaluation of Teaching (WESET). *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning* Vol. 15, No. 24, 2020.

Saputra, Handrianto, Pernantah, Ismaniar and Shidiq, 2021. An Evaluation of the Course Experience Questionnaire in a Malaysian context for quality improvement in teaching and learning. *Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education* Vol. 11, No. 1, June 2021, 1-12

Slocombe, T., D. Miller, and N. Hite. 2011. “A Survey of Student Perspectives toward Faculty Evaluations.” *American Journal of Business Education* 4 (7): 51–57.

Surgenor, P. 2013. “Obstacles and Opportunities: Addressing the Growing Pains of Summative Student Evaluation of Teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 38 (3): 363–376.

Winchester, M. K., and T. M. Winchester. 2012. If You Build It Will They Come? Exploring the Student Perspective of Weekly Student Evaluations of Teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 37 (6): 671–682. doi:10.1080/02602938.2011.563278

Winchester, T. M., and M. K. Winchester. 2014. A Longitudinal Investigation of the Impact of Faculty Reflective Practices on Students’ Evaluations of Teaching. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 45 (1): 112–124. doi:10.1111/bjet.12019