

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting a dissertation written by Jeffrey L. Rector entitled “Faculty Perceptions of Faculty Evaluation Programs at Selected Private Colleges/Universities in the Southeast United States.” I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Learning and Leadership.

---

Dr. Valerie Rutledge, Chairperson

We have read this dissertation  
and recommend its acceptance.

---

Dr. Hinsdale Bernard

---

Dr. Beth Dodd

---

Dr. James Tucker

Accepted for the Graduate Council:

---

Dr. Stephanie Bellar  
Interim Dean of the Graduate School

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY EVALUATION PROGRAMS  
AT SELECTED PRIVATE COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES  
IN THE SOUTHEAST UNITED STATES

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education Degree

The University of Tennessee, Chattanooga

Jeff Rector

November 24, 2009

Copyright © Jeffrey L. Rector, 2009  
All rights reserved.

## DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife and daughter for the support they provided to me throughout this endeavor. Their sacrifice and understanding have allowed me to accomplish this lifetime goal.

I dedicate this dissertation to my loving wife, Melita. I thank her for her constant encouragement, her commitment to the accomplishment of this milestone and for the sacrifices she made in order to make this possible. Her assistance with maintaining a home, doing research, proofreading, and so many other tasks helped me in attaining this degree.

I dedicate this dissertation to our daughter, Danielle. Her example of hard work, persistence, and “love of life” has inspired me throughout this process. Danielle, may my accomplishment of this dissertation be an example to you of setting goals and striving to attain them, achieving your dreams, and being a life-long learner.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank God for all the “blessings of life” he gives me and for the salvation He provided through His Son Jesus Christ.

I would like to thank my dissertation committee for the hours they invested in my dissertation, the challenges they set before me, and the motivation they provided. The assistance and direction given by my committee has been a great help throughout this process. Thank you Jenny Holcombe for your assistance with the statistics involved with this research. I thank each one of the professors in the Learning and Leadership program, Dr. John Freeman, Dr. Jesse Register, Dr. Vicki Petzko, Dr. Peggy Roblyer, Dr. Lloyd Davis, Dr. Eugene Bartoo, Dr. Ted Miller, Dr. Valerie Rutledge, and Dr. James Tucker. I thank each one of you for the part you played in helping me become a better leader. Thank you Becca McCashin for your ability to coordinate everything in the program and keep us all on track; you have been a real blessing. Beverly Simmons played a large part in gathering research and giving direction in use of resources; thank you Beverly for all your help.

Thank you to all of my committee members; Dr. Rutledge, committee chair, for the endless encouragement; Dr. Hinsdale Bernard, for your direction in making sure my methodology was correct and that it was correctly followed; Dr. James Tucker, for keeping the big picture always out front and thank you for the challenges you set before me; Dr. Beth Dodd, for the many suggestions and for allowing me to be myself in doing the writing.

## Abstract

This study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the faculty performance appraisal programs at the participating institutions. Faculty perception, regarding the effectiveness of the faculty evaluation appraisal program at their institution can be an important part of assessing the program itself. The study attempted to identify whether or not faculty members perceive that faculty performance appraisal is effective?

Institutions continue to have difficulty in implementing a successful faculty performance appraisal program (Cashin, 1978). This difficulty and the need for institutions to implement effective faculty performance appraisal programs were the rationale for this study. Through analysis of the appraisal programs of the participating institutions, the researcher sought to offer information which may assist other institutions in implementing faculty performance appraisal programs that are successful. Successful faculty performance appraisal programs are defined as programs that are effective in the area of true appraisal and lead to improved instruction.

The study involved selected private “faith-based” universities/colleges in the Southeast United States. The full-time faculty (N= 290) of these private institutions were surveyed. The institutions combined serve approximately 6,000 students. Three of the institutions offer both undergraduate and graduate degrees and one institution offers undergraduate degrees only. Participants only evaluated their respective institutions; no institutions were specifically compared with other institutions. The population of the study was full-time faculty members of the aforementioned institutions.

The data were analyzed using several strategies. Whereas this was a descriptive study, it was conducted using a survey relating to faculty perception of faculty performance evaluation. Initially, the data was reduced by analyzing the answers of the survey. The survey data were

categorized into six main categories: Purpose of Evaluation, Criteria of Faculty Evaluation, Approaches of Evaluation-Teaching Performance, Approaches of Evaluation-Scholarship/Research Performance, and Use of Faculty Evaluation. These responses were analyzed according to how the components of faculty evaluation were emphasized. Means and standard deviation were the main statistical techniques used for the analysis of the data to answer the three research questions posed.

The results of the study provided information pertaining to those components faculty perceive to be important within their respective evaluation programs (in rank order). Participants identified areas such as *Purposes of Evaluation, Criteria of Faculty, Approaches to Faculty Evaluation: Faculty's Teaching Performance, Approaches of Evaluation: Faculty's Scholarship or Research Performance, and Uses of Faculty Evaluation.*

Information gathered during the study indicated that 60.2% of faculty perceive the evaluation program at their institution accurately measured overall performance. The study also revealed that 63.1% of respondents were "satisfied" with the present process of evaluation at their institution; 11.7% responded they were "very dissatisfied" with the present process of evaluation at their institution.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| CHAPTER ONE .....                                   | 1  |
| Introduction and Overview .....                     | 1  |
| Performance Appraisal in the Business Setting ..... | 1  |
| Performance Appraisal and Education.....            | 3  |
| Statement of the Problem.....                       | 5  |
| Research Questions .....                            | 5  |
| Significance of the Study .....                     | 6  |
| Overview of the Methodology .....                   | 7  |
| Methodological Assumptions .....                    | 7  |
| Delimitations.....                                  | 8  |
| Limitations .....                                   | 8  |
| Conceptual Framework.....                           | 9  |
| Definition of Terms.....                            | 11 |
| CHAPTER TWO .....                                   | 13 |
| Review of Literature .....                          | 13 |
| Purpose of Performance Appraisal .....              | 13 |
| Formative Performance Appraisal .....               | 14 |
| Summative Performance Appraisal .....               | 15 |
| Methods of Performance Appraisal .....              | 16 |
| Summary .....                                       | 19 |
| CHAPTER THREE .....                                 | 20 |
| General Methodology .....                           | 20 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Purpose of the Study .....                                  | 20 |
| Population and Sample .....                                 | 20 |
| Ethical Considerations .....                                | 20 |
| Research Questions.....                                     | 21 |
| Research Design.....  | 21 |
| Instrument Used in Data Collection.....                     | 21 |
| Reliability of the Instrument .....                         | 22 |
| Validity of the Instrument.....                             | 22 |
| Procedures Used.....  | 22 |
| Reliability of the Procedures.....                          | 24 |
| Validity of the Procedures .....                            | 24 |
| Data Analysis .....   | 24 |
| CHAPTER FOUR.....   | 25 |
| Findings and Data .....                                     | 25 |
| Introduction.....   | 25 |
| Research Procedures .....                                   | 25 |
| Instrumentation .....                                       | 26 |
| Data Analysis .....   | 27 |
| Research Questions.....                                     | 27 |
| Summary .....   | 37 |
| CHAPTER FIVE .....  | 39 |
| Findings, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations..... | 39 |
| Statement of the Problem.....                               | 39 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Significance of the Study .....   | 40 |
| Literature Overview .....   | 41 |
| Overview of the Methodology .....   | 44 |
| Findings and Discussion .....   | 45 |
| Conclusions.....  | 58 |
| Implications.....   | 59 |
| Recommendations.....  | 59 |
| Recommendations for Further Study .....   | 60 |
| REFERENCE LIST .....  | 62 |
| References.....   | 63 |
| APPENDICES .....  | 69 |
| Appendix A.....   | 70 |
| Survey Instrument.....  | 70 |
| Appendix B.....   | 73 |
| IRB Approval.....   | 73 |
| Appendix C.....   | 74 |
| Letter/Directions to Participants .....   | 74 |
| Appendix D.....   | 76 |
| List of Suggestions for a Successful Faculty-Performance Appraisal Program..... | 76 |
| VITA.....   | 77 |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table  | Page |
|--|------|
| Table 4.1: Reliability of the Faculty Evaluation Program Survey.....   | 27   |
| Table 4.2: Means and Standard Deviations – Purposes of Evaluation Subscale .....   | 29   |
| Table 4.3: Means and Standard Deviations – Criteria of Faculty Evaluation Subscale .....   | 30   |
| Table 4.4: Means and Standard Deviations – Approaches of Evaluation: Faculty’s<br>Teaching Performance Subscale .....                  | 31   |
| Table 4.5: Means and Standard Deviations for Approaches of Evaluation: Faculty’s<br>Scholarship or Research Performance Subscale ..... | 32   |
| Table 4.6: Means and Standard Deviations for Uses of Faculty Evaluation Subscale .....   | 33   |
| Table 4.7: Means and Standard Deviations for Survey Questions 62 & 66 .....  | 34   |
| Table 4.8: ANOVA Results for Question 62 .....   | 35   |
| Table 4.9: ANOVA Results for Question 66 .....   | 35   |
| Table 4.10: Means and Standard Deviations for Survey Questions 63, 64, & 65 .....  | 36   |
| Table 4.11: ANOVA Results for Question 63 .....  | 36   |
| Table 4.12: ANOVA Results for Question 64 .....  | 37   |
| Table 4.13: ANOVA Results for Question 65 .....  | 37   |

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction and Overview

Performance appraisal often tends to be a stressful activity for both the evaluator and the one being evaluated in all vocations and professions. Whereas the process of performance appraisal is not by any means a new concept, its use and interest have increased over the past 20-30 years (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). Performance appraisal is a process that is necessary for the purpose of keeping an organization functioning as efficiently and productively as possible. Whether a formal type of appraisal in which pen and paper is used or an appraisal using mental notes and observation, performance appraisal is constantly taking place. Consciously or subconsciously, objectively or subjectively, performance appraisal is an ongoing process that involves everyone within the workplace (Torrington & Hall, 1991).

Although the process is somewhat different today, performance appraisal has occurred since the third century A.D. According to Patten (1977), Chinese philosopher Sin Yu criticized a rater of the Wei dynasty for rating subjects not according to merit, but according to the likes and dislikes of the subjects. In the 1800s, performance appraisal was used in Robert Owen's cotton mills in New Lanark, Scotland. Wooden cubes were hung over a worker's work area; the cubes were color coded and represented different levels of merit. As a worker's performance changed, the appropriate colored block was hung over the work station (Heilbroner, 1953). This may appear to be a crude form of appraisal; however, the system was effective in performance appraisal.

### Performance Appraisal in the Business Setting

The process of performance appraisal is used in many different environments. Whereas this paper will deal with evaluation of faculty within higher education, performance appraisal is

not limited to education. Performance appraisal or faculty performance appraisal in education is not exempt from the same limitations, caveats, and controversial issues that other industries face. Business faces many similar obstacles concerning performance appraisal.

As mentioned previously, the frustration of performance appraisal is not limited to education. Regardless of industry, performance appraisal can leave supervisors and employees alike frustrated and, in some cases, fearful (Painter, 2003). In today's society there is much pressure to have measurable objectives that produce positive results; those things that are immeasurable such as emotions tend to be overlooked (Simmons, 2003). Simmons (2003) goes on to say that feelings become one of those immeasurable objectives; in many cases performance appraisal leaves the employee with bad feelings toward the supervisor or the company. Although performance appraisal in the business arena causes feelings of apprehension, it is still necessary. Performance reviews give managers a tool by which to evaluate employees in an effort to increase and/or improve job performance (Waugh, 2002). This is true both in the business arena and in education.

One shared factor between performance appraisal in higher education and performance appraisal in the business field is "time." Supervisors simply do not want to take the time or do not feel as though they have the time to do an adequate performance appraisal (Grote, 2006). A good performance appraisal system takes time to develop and should be an ongoing process. Painter (2003) conveys that maintaining a continuous record of observed performance is an important component in a fair and useful appraisal. Whereas one might agree with Painter, it is also easy to understand that such an appraisal program would take a considerable amount of time. On the other hand, if performance appraisal is as important as many portray it to be, it

should be well worth the time involved to produce and maintain a quality performance appraisal system.

### Performance Appraisal and Education

Because teacher performance has an impact on student performance, teachers face mounting pressure to produce quality students. According to Fossey (1999) such accountability demands (on higher education teachers) are coming from students, parents, legislators, the public, and national level policy makers.

The issues with education, and specifically higher education and performance appraisal, relate to the criteria by which faculty members are evaluated (Cashin, 1978; Chan 2001). Many components are involved in performance appraisal, but no one seems to have been able to establish clear, consistent criteria or describe concisely what is most effective (Chan, 2001). The question must be asked: Is faculty performance appraisal effective at all? Some performance appraisal programs are ineffective because they are implemented or designed poorly (Larson, 1984). Other appraisal programs do not fit the environment in which they are being deployed. The result has often been organizational frustration and a fragmented employee/employer relationship (Arreola, 1995).

The higher education arena is no different when it comes to the issues of performance appraisal programs. Performance appraisal programs have been used for years, and yet there are still questions about the effectiveness of such programs. The literature has much to say about the problems associated with appraisals; however, the question that continues to surface is: Are they needed at all (Coens & Jenkins, 2000)? Much of the ineffectiveness of performance appraisals can be related to unclear criteria, unfair questions, and ambiguous evaluations. Evaluations are often performed at the last minute with no consideration for the evaluation process or the

individual. Not only do many faculty feel appraisal programs appear ineffective, few are sure about what components make up an effective program. In higher education, appraisals include the components of peer ratings, supervisor ratings, student course evaluations, student grades, research activity, self-evaluation, and many others (Coens & Jenkins, 2000).

Although there can be many answers to the questions concerning faculty performance appraisal, the issue that must be resolved is, “Can institutions derive an effective faculty performance appraisal program?” A faculty evaluation program is needed that will offer the tools needed to sustain an ongoing program of professional development with which both administration and faculty are pleased. Because there is no perfect program that can be purchased, the onus is on individual institutions to implement an effective faculty performance program that is successful in meeting the institution’s established goals. Only when this is achieved will faculty performance appraisal be regarded positively. At that point, appraisal programs will no longer be feared as a summative process, but will be viewed as a formative tool designed to assist faculty members in becoming better educators.

The subject of performance appraisal lends itself to the concept of learning and leadership. It is important to remember that one must be a continual learner. The information gained from performance evaluation provides an opportunity for authorities to learn about individuals, their perceptions of their work environment, and those who make decisions about the work setting and employees’ performance.

Because the topic of performance appraisal tends to be an area of general “unrest” there must be a concerted effort of all constituents to develop an amenable solution. As knowledge (learning) is gained about what can strengthen the performance appraisal process, the process

transpires from one of frustration to a program through which faculty members can improve in the many different areas pertaining to the teaching process.

The component of “leadership” is evident when the leader actively moves employees from seeing evaluation as a negative, threatening process to utilizing the process for the purpose of strengthening the organization. Leadership often involves influencing attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of a person or group of persons and moving them toward a common goal (Ott, Parkes, & Simpson, 2008). Through this process the leader can assist with the transformation of a lackadaisical performance appraisal program to a productive program that is beneficial to all those involved.

#### Statement of the Problem

Faculty evaluation is generally looked upon negatively. Measuring faculty perception of the evaluation process may help to identify those components which lead to effective faculty evaluation programs. This study examined the effectiveness of the faculty performance appraisal programs at four participating institutions. That is, did faculty members at the participating institutions perceive that the appraisal program at their institution is effective? Because no perfect performance appraisal programs exist, it was important to assess the opinions of those involved as to the effectiveness of their institution’s evaluation program. In short, is faculty performance appraisal effective?

#### Research Questions

1. What is the nature of the performance appraisal systems as perceived by faculty at selected private colleges?
2. How satisfied are the faculty with their performance appraisal systems?
3. What do faculty members perceive as important components of their performance appraisal systems?

## Significance of the Study

Because faculty-performance appraisal continues to be an issue in institutions of higher education, there must be a continued search for an effective, successful approach. This study should assist the leadership within institutions in becoming more knowledgeable in the area of faculty-performance appraisal. The study attempted to identify key components that make participating institutions successful in the area of performance appraisal. By identifying successful faculty-performance appraisal programs, the researcher is optimistic that other institutions will benefit from the research.

Because faculty members directly affect the quality of the product (students) that higher education institutions produce, it is necessary to attempt to determine what is involved in implementing an effective faculty-performance appraisal program. When institutions of higher learning produce quality students, society benefits; an educated work force that is trained in its respective area is much more productive. This educated work force is made up of quality professionals, trained technicians, and effective educators and teachers who are prepared for service in their related field(s).

On the other hand, many people, particularly educators and specifically educators in the higher education arena, have become frustrated because of the process of performance evaluation. However, the frustration does not stop with the person being evaluated. The evaluator is often just as frustrated with the process when the appraisal program is not effective or is not seen as effective.

It is intended that, as a result of this study, institutions will recognize ways to make the performance appraisal program at their respective institution more effective. Because the study identified key components that educators felt were necessary to an effective appraisal program,

other similar institutions should/may be able to apply these same components to their appraisal programs.

The researcher used the feedback to compile data that could be helpful to other similar institutions in implementing a successful faculty-performance appraisal program. Because of the nature of faculty evaluation, this study may have the potential to be generalized to a large number of similar higher education institutions. That is, any information leading to more effective faculty evaluation programs is valuable. However, because the study was limited to private institutions with enrollments of 500-4000, the results will be most generalized to the same type and size of those institutions that participated in this study.

#### Overview of the Methodology

This quantitative research used primarily a descriptive design and a survey instrument to gather the data. A literature review was conducted in the area of performance appraisal in an attempt to identify faculty perceptions of faculty-performance programs or systems. Those institutions that participated in the study and the sample of participating faculty members were not identified.

The survey instrument from a previous study was used and permission was obtained for its use (Szeto & Wright, 2003). The study involved selected “Faith-based” universities/colleges in the Southeast United States. Participants only evaluated the faculty-performance evaluation programs of their respective institutions. No inter-institution comparisons were made.

#### Methodological Assumptions

Within this research, the researcher assumed that the participants gave accurate responses to the survey questions. Although all responses were kept anonymous, there was a concern that some faculty members might fear retribution if their responses appeared negative toward their

supervisor or their respective institution. However, it was also assumed that the participating institutions wanted to improve their individual faculty-performance appraisal programs and ensured to the highest degree possible that faculty members and administration would give accurate responses to questions that were asked. It was also assumed that all participants were familiar with faculty-performance appraisal programs within the higher education setting and offered information which was useful to the study.

#### Delimitations

The study looked at the faculty-performance appraisal programs of selected private institutions of higher learning in the Southeast United States. Whereas the results of the study provided good information concerning faculty evaluation at the higher education level, it should be noted that the institutions that participated in the study were relatively small institutions of higher learning. The researcher used a survey instrument to obtain faculty perceptions of their institution's faculty-evaluation program. Although the faculty-performance appraisal programs of the participating institutions were analyzed and participant perceptions were reported, the programs were not specifically compared to each other or judged by the researcher as effective or ineffective. The researcher only reported survey responses of the participants.

#### Limitations

A major limitation to the study was an institution's decision not to participate because the study only surveyed the faculty of selected institutions. The number of faculty responses was also a limitation because the institutions involved in the study were relatively small. Since some of these institutions had a small number of full-time faculty members, the study was limited by that factor.

The study was also limited in that there was no information from a previous study relative to the reliability and validity of the instrument. Although content validity and face validity are discussed later in chapter three, no information was available from the author who previously used the instrument.

Getting data back from the participants was also a limitation of the study. Because faculty were sometimes unavailable during the summer months, in an effort to overcome this particular limitation, the researcher sent out two reminder e-mails, one at the end of the first week and the second at the end of the second week of the collection of survey responses.

### Conceptual Framework

By way of a vigilant evaluation of the literature, various ideas related to an appropriate conceptual framework were considered. Careful review of organizational theory revealed that multiple theories were relevant to this research. Among these were Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, McGregor's Theory X & Y, and others. Ultimately, a conceptual framework which this study will model was identified. The established framework which helped to formulate this study was based on Arreola (1995).

Arreola (1995) proposes a framework that suggests several general tenets or assumptions. One important aspect to remember is that no "one size fits all" when it comes to faculty evaluation programs. In other words, no one program or system can be applied to all situations. Just as organizations are different, the program that assesses or evaluates the progress or production of that organization must be different as well.

Other components suggested by Arreola (1995) that served as a framework for this study are:

1. The appraisal process must be related to the organization's strategy and woven into the strategic plan of the organization (Shelley, 1999; Elbo, 2000).
2. The evaluation program must be based on a specific set of values. This, in turn, is what makes the evaluation program "custom built" for the institution. A faculty evaluation program must be built on the values and culture of the environment it is serving, thereby helping to identify the nature of the particular institution.
3. Faculty involvement in the development of the evaluation program is an essential component. Although a mix of constituents on a committee is recommended, the faculty must be well-represented.
4. The evaluation program must have some way to measure performance; an integral part of the evaluation program is the rating system. The institution may use percentages, satisfactory/unsatisfactory, or any of a multitude of other measurement paradigms; however, some type of systematic measurement system must be included in the program.
5. True objectivity in an evaluation program cannot be attained. The goal should be to control the subjectivity. The many sources used in the evaluation process are dependent upon the subjective judgment of students, supervisors, and peers. These subjective sources must be taken into account when developing the program.
6. The evaluation program must serve two purposes: assisting with faculty development and assisting with making personnel decisions

7. Finally, the program must use several sources in gathering the evaluative data. A key point to remember when developing an evaluation program or doing an evaluation is that all sources have strengths and weaknesses.

The knowledge gained from the framework developed by Arreola (1995) assisted the researcher throughout the scope of this study.

### Definition of Terms

The following terms and definitions are included for the purpose of clarification of unfamiliar terms used within the study.

**Components and Mechanisms** – The characteristics involved in the process (e.g. peer evaluations, a post evaluation interview, etc) of performance appraisal; the criteria or items that were assessed.

**Faculty-Performance Appraisal Program** – The systematic approach that an institution uses to determine if faculty members are being successful in meeting the performance criteria set forth by the institution. This term was used interchangeably with faculty evaluation.

**Faith-Based Institutions** – Institutions that hold to certain tenets or are associated with a particular denomination are referred to as faith-based. This term was used interchangeably with Christian institutions.

**Formative Evaluation** – Judging the program or process while it is happening; focus is on feedback and needed change in order to make the program or process more effective.

**Nature of Faculty Evaluation** – In developing a faculty evaluation program an institution may place a different emphasis on what's important when it comes to evaluating its faculty. That is, what is the focus or what is emphasized by the institution in determining a successful evaluation

program? Once these factors are identified, the “nature” of the faculty evaluation program may be established.

Professional Development – Any activity that leads to the improvement of the individual in increased performance of his or her duties.

Summative Evaluation – Judging the worth of a program or process at the end of the activity; the focus is on the outcome.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Review of Literature

#### Purpose of Performance Appraisal

As established in the introduction, performance appraisal has been conducted for many years. However, the debate about the purpose of performance appraisal has led to much confusion and tension (Chan, 2001). Although the debate continues about the purpose or purposes of performance appraisal, it is certainly not because there has not been enough research in the area of performance appraisal. Reviews of the literature in the area of performance appraisal have contributed a wealth of research information on the topic, but have not revealed much in the area of the practice of performance appraisal (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995).

In developing a faculty-performance appraisal program, administrators must determine goals and objectives for the program or, at a minimum, should identify the reason or reasons for which the program is being designed. The lack of goals and objectives for the performance appraisal program, or at least a well thought out purpose for the program, can lead to a disinterested faculty and administration and, essentially, an ineffective program. Performance appraisal is not the most popular assessment program within the educational arena as it stands. Holland (2006) notes that neither teachers nor administrators have a very high opinion of the performance rating process; Holland further states that performance appraisals are required bureaucratic rituals in schools and are often made up of empty formality. Another reason that performance appraisal is not necessarily regarded favorably is because research has not shown that performance appraisal improves an employee's performance or an organization's performance (Belanger, 1999). Although Holland's and Belanger's comments certainly are representative of many performance appraisal programs and the research concerning some of

those programs, there are appraisal programs that do add merit to employee performance and organizational efficiency. An appraisal program that has been carefully planned and implemented will have a great impact on teacher effectiveness (Larson, 1984).

If indeed performance appraisal is something that must take place in education, continued research is necessary to find ways to make performance appraisal a valuable tool for determining the effectiveness of faculty members and staff. One of the ongoing discussions concerning the purpose of performance appraisal is whether performance appraisal should be of a formative nature or a summative nature or both.

#### *Formative Performance Appraisal*

If performance appraisal is going to be implemented from the teacher viewpoint and used to assist in student learning and teacher effectiveness, then its purpose must be formative and developmental (Chan, 2001). While there can be many other applications, formative appraisal is used primarily for the purpose of teacher effectiveness and professional development.

According to Young, Delli, & Johnson (1999), formative appraisal involves the instructor and the professor using the appraisal experience to enhance the educational process. This method recognizes the (higher education) student as the consumer that gives feedback to the instructor and professor about course content and classroom behavior at the end of the course. However, the formative appraisal process is not limited to student feedback. If the intent or the objective of the performance appraisal program takes on a formative nature, everything that comprises that program is used to develop the instructor and to increase classroom effectiveness. Formative evaluations are not meant to be judgmental but are used to encourage instructors to be reflective concerning their personal and professional strengths and weaknesses (Antinello, Lare, & Waters, 2006). Research conducted by Chow, et al. (2002) found that senior teachers tend to regard the

appraisal by their direct supervisor as used primarily for formative purposes. Generally, when a subordinate knows the performance appraisal program is formative appraisal, there is less anxiety and apprehension during the evaluation process. Evidence suggests (Chow, et al., 2002) that these teachers were comfortable with their supervisor and knew that the appraisal they were facing was a formative type of appraisal. Instructors felt less threatened and believed the supervisor wanted them to improve their instruction as opposed to being worried about whether dismissal decisions were going to be made as a result of the performance rating. Formative evaluation is not generally used for organizational decision making; summative evaluation most often directs organizational decision making.

Formative performance appraisal has a connotation that the interest is in the teaching/learning process and is for the purpose of assisting the teacher in accomplishing classroom efficiency more effectively—it is a teacher-friendly program.

#### *Summative Performance Appraisal*

Summative evaluation typically provides information based on one or more formal evaluations and is used to summarize an instructor's performance (Antinello, et al. 2006). The evaluation is based on the evaluator's judgment and serves the organization in decision making. Many times, according to Antinello, et al. (2006), decisions such as tenure, salary, and assignment are based on summative evaluation. According to Murphy and Cleveland (1995), in the early days of performance appraisal, evaluation was done purely on a summative pretense. Business owners and organizations wanted to know if the products were being sold. In other words, was the organization successful in what it was doing? This type of assessment or appraisal was used to guide the decisions as far as future product development, employee productivity, and what could and could not be offered satisfactorily. When talking about

performance appraisal, management leans toward summative appraisal. Management often looks at performance appraisal through the lens of quality assurance (Chan, 2001) because the tendency is to look at the finished product.

### Methods of Performance Appraisal

There are many different methods that can be used to appraise an instructor or professor's performance. The most common types of performance indicators that people are familiar with are the supervisor observation evaluation and the student course evaluation. Although these two methods of evaluation (which will be discussed in greater detail later) can lend valuable information in the area of performance, there are several other methods of evaluation that can be used which may provide a much clearer picture of the effectiveness of a teacher. A 1967 study by Gustad listed 13 sources which were used for faculty-performance appraisal in four-year colleges. The following list is in order of the most frequently used sources to the least frequently used, with the most frequently used being number one:

1. Chairman evaluation
2. Dean evaluation
3. Colleagues' opinion
4. Scholarly research and publication
5. Informal student opinion
6. Grade distributions
7. Committee evaluations
8. Course syllabi and examinations
9. Student examination performance
10. Self-evaluation

11. Enrollment in elective courses
12. Systematic student rating, Alumni opinions, Classroom visits
13. Long-term follow-up of students (Gustad 1967, p 270)

It is interesting to note the change that has occurred in faculty-performance appraisal since 1966. Although many of the components on the list are still being used, there undoubtedly have been some modifications in order to meet the needs of a changing higher education environment.

More recently, faculty-performance appraisal has taken on several other components of appraisal. One of the newer tools of performance appraisal is the *peer evaluation*. According to Peterson, Kelly, & Caskey (2002), teacher involvement in the evaluation of other teachers is a controversial topic. However, the practice of peer evaluation is becoming more and more widely used in performance appraisal. Peterson et al. (2002) indicate that peer evaluation can include assistance in data gathering, reviewing materials, teacher collaboration, mentoring, school improvement planning, and leadership. The process of peer evaluation can be very effective in that the evaluator and the one to be evaluated can predetermine exactly what is going to be assessed. Knowing that the process is merely for the purpose of identifying and strengthening specific weaknesses is reassuring to the individual who is being evaluated. An additional strength of peer evaluation is that the faculty member doing the evaluation is familiar with institutional goals, priorities, and values (Arreola, 1995). However, according to Arreola (1995) peer evaluations should rarely be used for the purpose of personnel decisions unless the one doing the evaluation is part of a team designed for that purpose and uses a standardized rating instrument.

One of the more commonly used sources for faculty-performance appraisal is the student course evaluation process; this evaluation is typically done at the end of the semester. Some

research has reported that whether student course evaluation is a good or bad tool, some institutions require that faculty be evaluated at least in part using student course evaluations (McPherson, 2006). On the other hand, Heckert, Latier, Ringwald-Burton, & Drazen (2006) report that many times the only tool used to assess teacher effectiveness is student ratings. Student course evaluations can be a valuable piece in the faculty-performance appraisal puzzle, but evaluations should not be limited to only student evaluations.

Self-assessment can be one of the most productive forms of performance appraisal. In most cases, the individual should know best what weaknesses are prevalent in classroom teaching and can often identify those weaknesses more readily. Farh, Werbel, & Bedeian (1988) reported that supervisor, peer, and self assessments are the most frequently used in the appraisal process. When an individual has already identified something as a personal weakness, it is much easier for a supervisor or peer to identify the same weakness. Landy & Farr's research indicates that self-appraisal can be far more lenient than a peer or supervisor appraisal (as cited in Murphy & Cleveland 1995). With this in mind, it is also interesting to note that further study by Shrauger and Osberg (1981) indicated that self-appraisals (the process of evaluating oneself) are as predictive as other assessment methods with which they have been compared. This again substantiates the point that faculty-performance appraisal programs need to be developed on an institutional basis with institutional goals, philosophy, and viewpoints taken into consideration when the program is being developed.

One additional method of performance appraisal to be discussed is portfolios. Assessment portfolios are increasing in popularity as an assessment tool, and results indicate that administrators feel that portfolios are more accurate and comprehensive than the occasional classroom visit (Attinello, 2006). Portfolio assessment can address both formative and

summative evaluation (Tucker, Stronge, & Gareis, 2002). When using portfolios, instructors tend to feel as though they have a part in the performance appraisal process; through compiling a portfolio, an instructor can show mastery of the various areas of teaching (Donnelly, 2005).

### Summary

Faculty-performance appraisal deals with not only the program or process that has been established, but also includes the tools or methods that are used in the evaluation. Can faculty-performance appraisal be done successfully or effectively? To answer this question, it is necessary to define exactly what an effective or successful faculty-performance appraisal program entails. According to Arreola (1995) a successful evaluation program is “one that provides information which faculty, administrators, and, where appropriate, students consider important and useful” (p. 3). Notice that this definition can only be achieved by the constituents of the individual institution. Again, it is important to note that effective faculty-performance appraisal must be developed and implemented on an institution by institution basis and cannot be looked upon as a “one size fits all” process. The process, tools, and methods used can vary in many different ways; however, the institution must arrange those elements in such a way that they produce an effective faculty-performance appraisal program.

Much of the negative attitude ascribed to faculty-performance is derived from the lack of involvement on the part of the faculty. The effective assessment of faculty-performance must be a mutual effort that uses tools and methods comparable to the ones mentioned in this review. If the goal of faculty-performance appraisal is more effective teachers and an increase in teacher effectiveness, there should be a collaborative effort on the part of faculty, professional peers, students, and administrations.

## CHAPTER THREE

### General Methodology

#### Purpose of the Study

In this study the researcher attempted to measure the perception of faculty members regarding their respective faculty evaluation program. A survey was used to collect details about the faculty's perception of their institutional evaluation program. The survey focused on determining the strengths of various aspects of evaluation programs.

#### Population and Sample

The population of the research subjects was full-time faculty members of the aforementioned institutions. The study involved selected private "faith-based" universities/colleges in the Southeast United States. The full-time faculty (N=approximately 400) of these private institutions was surveyed. The institutions combined serve approximately 10,000 students. Four of the institutions offer up to a graduate degree and one institution offers undergraduate degrees only. Once survey data were collected the data were analyzed. Participants only evaluated their respective institutions—no institutions were specifically compared with other institutions.

#### Ethical Considerations

All participants received information giving the details of the study. This information indicated the anonymity and confidentiality guidelines of the study. All surveys were done anonymously.

## Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

1. What is the nature of the performance appraisal systems as perceived by faculty at selected private colleges?
2. How satisfied are the faculty with their performance appraisal systems?
3. What do faculty members perceive as important components of their performance appraisal systems?

## Research Design

The research was a descriptive, quantitative study that used survey methodology. Survey methodology seeks to establish the current state of affairs of a particular phenomenon. The use of surveys can be one of the most valuable tools in data collection (Braverman, 1996). Surveys allow the respondents to answer the survey questions based upon their knowledge, experience, or current situation. Typically when completing a survey, people will provide valid responses if they are not led astray by the questionnaire (survey). This is most apparent when responses convey and emphasize the interpretation that the researcher intends. Furthermore, formal features such as numeric values and graphical layout can increase the reliability and validity of responses (Knäuper & Turner, 2000).

## Instrument Used in Data Collection

The research instrument, a survey adapted from Szeto and Wright (2003) was comprised of six sections (see Appendix A):

1. (Items 1-11) the purposes of evaluation,
2. (Items 12-23) the criteria of faculty evaluation,
3. (Items 24-37) the approaches of evaluation – faculty's teaching performance,

4. (Items 38-49) the approaches of evaluation – faculty’s scholarship or research performance,
5. (Items 50-61) the use of faculty evaluation,
6. (Items 62-66) the general perceptions of performance evaluation.

The survey used a scale which includes numerals 1 to 4. Subjects rated each question/statement by selecting the number that best represented his or her response; 1 = Always, 2 = Frequently, 3 = Seldom, and 4 = Never.

#### Reliability of the Instrument

The reliability of the instrument has been documented more specifically in chapters four and five. However, the instrument has shown reliability in a previous study. The author of the previous study was unable to provide the information pertaining to the instruments reliability, this was discussed in the limitations section.

#### Validity of the Instrument

Content validity was established by the fact that the instrument or a form of the instrument was used in several previous studies (Szeto, 1994; Turner, 1986; Centra, 1977). The instrument (with minimal changes) produced useable, measurable data for the prior studies.

The instrument lends itself to face validity by virtue of the layout of the survey. The survey questions are grouped together in self explanatory sub-sections and are appropriately divided. Respondents chose their suitable response from columns located next to each question.

#### Procedures Used

Several steps were involved in carrying out the data collection process. Initially, the appropriate person (either the Academic Dean or Vice-President of Academics) was contacted by

telephone for the purpose of explaining the study in an effort to see if the institution was willing to participate.

Following the initial indication of intent to participate, each institution was sent the finalized survey instrument and a formal letter of acknowledgment inviting the institution to participate in the study. The letter explained the study, confirmed the name of the institution contact person (designee), and requested that the institution send a statement of commitment to participate on institution letterhead to the researcher.

After receiving the commitment letter, the researcher contacted the designee at each institution to fully explain the study, outline the data collection process, and answer any questions. The only responsibility the institution had was to forward the email containing the survey web link to its full-time faculty members.

Distribution of the survey was done via a web service called Speed Survey. Speed Survey allowed results to be integrated with Microsoft Excel and Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The first couple of pages of the survey contained a cover letter explaining the purpose of the research and a paragraph explaining a returned survey indicated consent to participate. Whereas, the paragraph did not require a signature, it did include all the elements of a consent form. The letter also contained a confidentiality statement which guaranteed that any individual or school would not be identified and that all research data would be kept in a secure location. Furthermore, the letter explained that participation in the study was voluntary.

The timeline for receiving data was three weeks. A generic email was sent to each of the participants one week after distribution and again at two weeks after distribution. The email was a reminder stating “If you have not already completed the survey, please take time to do so.”

### Reliability of the Procedures

According to Merriman (2001) reliability is the extent to which a study can be replicated. All the steps within this study were systematized to the point that the study could be easily replicated. Institutions were not identified, permission for the study was granted by the institutions, and the instrument was identified. The process for the study included identifying a contact person at each institution and distributing the survey via the selected online service.

### Validity of the Procedures

One of the validity issues that was communicated to the participating institutions was the evaluative validity. Findings from the instrumentation were not used to evaluate, judge, or compare the institutions. In an effort to address this validity issue the researcher used specific directions for each subject that explained the study and the validity issue. In addressing these issues, the study and instrument were strengthened in the area of validity.

### Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using several strategies. Because this was a descriptive study, it was conducted by answering questions on a survey relating to faculty perception of faculty-performance evaluation. Initially, the data was reduced by analyzing the answers of the survey. All data was categorized into six main categories: Purpose of Evaluation, Criteria of Faculty Evaluation, Approaches of Evaluation-Teaching Performance, Approaches of Evaluation-Scholarship/Research Performance, and Use of Faculty Evaluation. These responses were analyzed according to how the components of faculty evaluation were emphasized at each institution. Means and standard deviation were the main statistical techniques used for the analysis of the data to answer the three research questions.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Findings and Data

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to research and evaluate teachers' perceptions of their institution's faculty evaluation program. This chapter presents the results of the three research questions.

1. What is the nature of the performance appraisal systems as perceived by faculty at selected private colleges?
2. How satisfied are the faculty with their performance appraisal systems?
3. What do faculty members perceive as important components of their performance appraisal systems?

Chapter four is divided into several sections. The first section presents a brief description of the research procedures, instrumentation, and the research questions. This is followed by a section that addresses the research questions and the item analysis of the research questions. The final section presents the data analysis of the online survey instrument.

#### Research Procedures

In this descriptive study, an online survey was utilized to collect and analyze the research data. The instrument was a 66 question Likert-scale survey deployed to full-time faculty members of four institutions of higher education. Survey responses were used to determine faculty perceptions of the faculty evaluation program used at their institution.

The online survey instrument was adapted from Szeto and Wright (2003) and included six sections (see Appendix A):

1. (Items 1-11) The Purposes of Evaluation,
2. (Items 12-23) The Criteria of Faculty Evaluation,

3. (Items 24-37) The Approaches of Evaluation – Faculty’s Teaching Performance,
4. (Items 38-49) The Approaches of Evaluation – Faculty’s Scholarship or Research Performance,
5. (Items 50-61) The Use of Faculty Evaluation,
6. (Items 62-66) The General Perceptions of Performance Evaluation.

Participants rated each question/statement by selecting the number that best represented his or her response; 1 = Always, 2 = Frequently, 3 = Seldom, and 4 = Never.

The online survey instrument was deployed via SpeedSurvey.com (2007). The survey link was emailed to all full-time faculty members at each institution allowing participants to go to the site at their convenience through use of the Internet. The response rate for the survey was 104 responses out of 290 invitations to participate (36%). The survey was available to participants for a three week period.

The researcher conducted reliability analysis on the overall instrument as well as on each individual scale. Descriptive statistics, frequency analyses, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to analyze the online survey data. Although ANOVAs were conducted to determine whether differences existed among the individual institutions, specific differences have not been explored in this study.

#### Instrumentation

A reliability analysis was performed using Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha. Cronbach’s Alpha assists in analyzing the internal consistency of an instrument. The highest rating possible when using the Cronbach’s Alpha is 1.0, this, an instrument’s reliability factor is increasingly higher the closer it is to the 1.0.

Cronbach's Alpha for the entire Faculty Evaluation Program Survey instrument, consisting of 66 items, was .947. Cronbach's Alpha for the six individual subscales in the Faculty Evaluation Program Survey was acceptable, ranging from .672 to .966. The results of the reliability analyses are presented in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1  
*Reliability of the Faculty Evaluation Program Survey*

| Scale                          | Number of Items | N (valid) | Alpha |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------|
| Overall Survey                 | 66              | 86        | .947  |
| Purposes of Evaluation         | 11              | 99        | .772  |
| Criteria of Faculty Evaluation | 12              | 99        | .864  |
| Approaches of Evaluation       |                 |           |       |
| Faculty's Teaching Performance | 14              | 100       | .809  |
| Faculty's Scholarship/Research | 12              | 97        | .966  |
| Use of Faculty Evaluation      | 12              | 99        | .763  |
| General                        | 5               | 102       | .672  |

#### Data Analysis

Each research question was examined and corresponding data were analyzed; descriptive statistics, frequencies, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were utilized to answer the research questions. For each of the research questions, the researcher used tables to summarize the data and facilitate comparisons of individual items of importance.

#### Research Questions

*Research Question #1: What is the nature of the performance appraisal systems as perceived by faculty at selected private colleges?*

Descriptive statistics were used to answer research question 1. Note that the lower the mean, the higher the overall agreement with the item. For the purpose of reporting frequencies, respondents answers of 1=Always and 2=Frequently were combined to arrive at the percentage of respondents who agreed with the item. Answers of 3=Seldom and 4=Never were considered as *not* contributing to the faculty evaluation process.

Table 4.2 demonstrates the means and standard deviations for the first sub-scale *Purposes of Evaluation*. As indicated in Table 4.2, the three items with the strongest mean in regards to *Purposes of Evaluation* were: To Meet Accreditation Requirements ( $M=1.54$ ), To Identify Areas of Improvement ( $M=1.78$ ), and To Improve Faculty Performance ( $M=1.91$ ). Overall, 88.5% of respondents reported *Meeting Accreditation Requirements* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives, 87.5% of respondents reported *To Identify Areas of Improvement* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives, and 80.8% of respondents reported *To Improve Faculty Performance* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives.

Table 4.2  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Purposes of Evaluation Subscale*

| Item (#)   | <i>N</i> | Mean | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|------|-----------|
| To meet accreditation requirements (10)  | 104      | 1.54 | .77       |
| To identify areas of improvement (3)   | 104      | 1.79 | .74       |
| To improve faculty performance (1)   | 104      | 1.91 | .74       |
| To evaluate college goal attainment by identifying faculty performance which contributes to those goals (11) | 104      | 2.16 | .86       |
| For promotion (5)  | 104      | 2.22 | .95       |
| To meet board policy (9)   | 102      | 2.26 | .99       |
| To recognize and reward good performance (2)   | 104      | 2.67 | .86       |
| For tenure (4)   | 104      | 2.67 | 1.17      |
| For disciplinary action (8)  | 103      | 3.00 | .69       |
| For transfers (7)  | 101      | 3.41 | .78       |
| For merit pay (6)  | 104      | 3.60 | .68       |

Table 4.3 demonstrates the means and standard deviations for the second sub-scale *Criteria of Faculty Evaluation*. As indicated in table 4.3, the three areas with the strongest mean in regards to *Criteria of Faculty Evaluation* were: Classroom Teaching ( $M=1.40$ ), Personal Qualifications ( $M=1.64$ ), and Campus Committee Work/Service to College ( $M=2.03$ ). Overall, 93.2% of respondents reported *Classroom Teaching* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives, 86.5% of respondents reported *Personal Qualifications* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives, and 70.6% of respondents reported *Campus Committee Work/Service to College* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives.

Table 4.3  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Criteria of Faculty Evaluation Subscale*

| Item (#)  | <i>N</i> | Mean | <i>SD</i> |
|---|----------|------|-----------|
| Classroom teaching (12)                                 | 104      | 1.40 | .62       |
| Personal qualifications (23)                            | 104      | 1.64 | .79       |
| Campus committee work, service to college (18)          | 102      | 2.03 | .94       |
| Student advising (17)                                   | 103      | 2.10 | 1.01      |
| Public or community service (20)                        | 103      | 2.40 | .92       |
| Activity in professional societies (19)                 | 103      | 2.65 | .81       |
| Personality factors (22)                                | 104      | 2.73 | .77       |
| Research and/or creative activity (15)                  | 102      | 2.87 | .71       |
| Number of publications (13)                             | 104      | 3.03 | .70       |
| Quality of publications (14)                            | 103      | 3.19 | .73       |
| Supervision of student research, MS/PhD committees (16) | 101      | 3.21 | .74       |
| Consultation (21)                                       | 104      | 3.26 | .65       |

Table 4.4 demonstrates the means and standard deviations for the third sub-scale *Approaches to Faculty Evaluation-Faculty's Teaching Performance*. As indicated in table 4.4, the three areas with the strongest mean in regards to *Faculty's Teaching Performance* were: Student Questionnaire ( $M=1.59$ ), Dean Evaluation ( $M=2.12$ ), and Self Evaluation ( $M=2.15$ ). Overall, 91.4% of respondents reported *Student Questionnaire* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives, 67.3% of respondents reported *Dean Evaluation* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives, and 59.6% of respondents reported *Self Evaluation* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives.

Table 4.4  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Approaches of Evaluation: Faculty's Teaching Performance Subscale*

| Item (#)   | <i>N</i> | Mean | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|------|-----------|
| Student questionnaire (24)                                   | 104      | 1.59 | .73       |
| Dean evaluation (28)   | 104      | 2.12 | .90       |
| Self-evaluation or report (37)                               | 102      | 2.15 | 1.01      |
| Classroom visit by colleague (35)                            | 103      | 2.25 | .89       |
| Chairman evaluation (27)                                     | 104      | 2.34 | .97       |
| Committee evaluation (29)                                    | 104      | 2.63 | .97       |
| Final grades distribution in courses (33)                    | 103      | 2.78 | .94       |
| Student examination performance (32)                         | 104      | 2.79 | .90       |
| Popularity of elective courses (34)                          | 103      | 2.82 | .81       |
| Opinions of former students still attending the college (25) | 104      | 2.85 | .79       |
| Long-term follow up of graduates (26)                        | 104      | 2.97 | .81       |
| Administrative review of teaching materials (30)             | 103      | 3.05 | .82       |
| Colleague review of teaching materials (36)                  | 103      | 3.21 | .76       |
| Review of video by dean with faculty member (31)             | 104      | 3.85 | .39       |

Table 4.5 demonstrates the means and standard deviations for the fourth sub-scale *Approaches to Faculty Evaluation-Faculty's Scholarship or Research Performance*. As indicated in table 4.5, the three areas with the strongest mean in regards to *Faculty's Scholarship or Research* were: Papers at Professional Meetings ( $M=2.71$ ), Books as Sole or Senior Author ( $M=2.92$ ), and Unpublished Papers or Reports ( $M=2.97$ ). Overall, 35.6% of respondents reported *Papers at Professional Meetings* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives, 21.2% of respondents reported *Books as Sole or Senior Author* as contributing to

faculty evaluation domains and objectives, and 23.1% of respondents reported *Unpublished Papers or Reports* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives.

Table 4.5  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Approaches of Evaluation: Faculty's Scholarship or Research Performance Subscale*

| Item (#)  | <i>N</i> | Mean | <i>SD</i> |
|---|----------|------|-----------|
| Papers at professional meetings (41)            | 104      | 2.71 | .83       |
| Books as sole or senior author (43)             | 104      | 2.92 | .81       |
| Monographs or chapters in books (45)            | 104      | 2.94 | .77       |
| Honors or awards from profession (49)           | 104      | 2.96 | .84       |
| Unpublished papers or reports (40)              | 104      | 2.97 | .72       |
| Books as junior author or editor (44)           | 103      | 2.99 | .76       |
| Publication in all professional journals (38)   | 102      | 3.05 | .74       |
| Articles in quality journals (39)               | 103      | 3.07 | .76       |
| Grants or funding received (46)                 | 103      | 3.08 | .76       |
| Honors or awards from professional journal (48) | 104      | 3.11 | .80       |
| Referee or editor of professional journal (47)  | 103      | 3.17 | .73       |
| Citations to published materials (42)           | 103      | 3.24 | .73       |

Table 4.6 demonstrates the means and standard deviations for the fifth sub-scale *Uses of Faculty Evaluation*. As indicated in table 4.6, the three areas with the strongest mean in regards to *Uses of Faculty Evaluation* were: To Satisfy Legal Requirements of Governing Agencies ( $M=1.98$ ), For Promotion ( $M=2.16$ ), and To Give Students a Sense of Involvement ( $M=2.28$ ). Overall, 69.9% of respondents reported *To Satisfy Legal Requirements of Governing Agencies* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives, 66.7% of respondents reported *For Promotion* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives, and 62.5% of

respondents reported *To Give Students a Sense of Involvement* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives.

Table 4.6  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Uses of Faculty Evaluation Subscale*

| Item (#)   | N   | Mean | SD   |
|--|-----|------|------|
| To satisfy legal requirements of governing agencies (59)                     | 103 | 1.98 | .95  |
| Promotion – rank (55)  | 102 | 2.16 | 1.00 |
| To give student a sense of involvement (60)                                  | 104 | 2.28 | .79  |
| As a means toward improving instructional methods (51)                       | 103 | 2.28 | .93  |
| Granting tenure (54)   | 103 | 2.56 | 1.20 |
| As a means of identifying outstanding faculty members (50)                   | 104 | 2.67 | .92  |
| As a foundation for developing faculty professional development program (53) | 103 | 2.66 | .82  |
| As a means to improve the student advising function of faculty members (52)  | 104 | 2.67 | .92  |
| To provide evidence of faculty accountability to the local community (61)    | 104 | 2.90 | .82  |
| Disciplinary action (58)   | 104 | 2.95 | .55  |
| Promotion to administrative position (56)                                    | 103 | 2.98 | .74  |
| Merit pay increases (57)   | 103 | 3.56 | .70  |

*Research Question #2: How satisfied are the faculty with their performance appraisal systems?*

Table 4.7 demonstrates the means and standard deviations for Research Question #2 in regards to faculty satisfaction. Survey question number 62 *In general, performance evaluation at this university accurately measures the faculty members overall performance areas (M=2.37)*

and survey question number 66, *In general, how satisfied are you with the present process of evaluating faculty performance at your department/institution* ( $M=2.34$ ) were used to assess faculty satisfaction.

Table 4.7  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Survey Questions 62 & 66*

| Item (#)   | <i>N</i> | Mean | <i>SD</i> |
|--|----------|------|-----------|
| In general, performance evaluation at this university accurately measures the faculty members overall performance (62)           | 103      | 2.37 | .70       |
| In general, how satisfied are you with the present process of evaluating faculty performance at your department/institution (66) | 103      | 2.34 | .87       |

Frequency analysis indicates that 63% of faculty members were satisfied with their faculty evaluation program. However, the faculty of one of the institutions was less satisfied than the other three.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between institution and mean response to items 62 and 66. The independent variable, institution, included four levels: Institution #1, Institution #2, Institution #3, and Institution #4. The dependent variable was the mean response to items 62 and 66.

As indicated in Table 4.8 the ANOVA for Item 62 was significant,  $F(3, 98) = 3.785, p < .05$ . The strength of relationship between the institution and the mean response, as assessed by  $\eta^2$ , was weak, with the institution factor accounting for only 10% of the variance of the dependent variable.

Table 4.8  
ANOVA Results for Survey Question 62

|                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F      | Partial Eta-Squared | Power |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|---------------------|-------|
| Between Groups | 5.148          | 3   | 1.716       | 3.785* | .104                | .80   |
| Within Groups  | 44.430         | 98  | .453        |        |                     |       |
| Total          | 49.578         | 101 |             |        |                     |       |

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .001$

As indicated in Table 4.9 the ANOVA for Item 66 was significant,  $F(3, 98) = 6.512$ ,  $p < .001$ . The strength of relationship between the institution and the mean response, as assessed by  $\eta^2$ , was weak, with the institution factor accounting for only 17% of the variance of the dependent variable.

Table 4.9  
ANOVA Results for Survey Question 66

|                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F       | Partial Eta-Squared | Power |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|---------------------|-------|
| Between Groups | 12.353         | 3   | 4.118       | 6.512** | .166                | .97   |
| Within Groups  | 61.970         | 98  | .632        |         |                     |       |
| Total          | 74.324         | 101 |             |         |                     |       |

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .001$

*Research Question #3: What do faculty members perceive as important components of their performance appraisal systems?*

Table 4.10 demonstrates the means and standard deviations for Research Question #3 in regards to the components of the performance appraisal system that were perceived to be most important by the faculty members. Survey question number 63 *More than one source should be used to obtain information for the performance evaluation process* ( $M=1.46$ ), survey question number 64 *Faculty should participate in the development of the performance evaluation process* ( $M=1.54$ ), and survey question number 65 *Classroom teaching should be the most important*

*determinant in evaluating faculty members* ( $M=1.65$ ) were used to assess what components faculty members perceived as most important.

Table 4.10  
Means and Standard Deviations for Survey Questions 63, 64, & 65

| Item (#)  | <i>N</i> | Mean | <i>SD</i> |
|---|----------|------|-----------|
| More than one source should be used to obtain information for the performance evaluation process (63) | 102      | 1.46 | .66       |
| Faculty should participate in the development of the performance evaluation process (64)              | 102      | 1.54 | .78       |
| Classroom teaching should be the most important determinant in evaluating faculty members (65)        | 102      | 1.65 | .62       |

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the relationship between institution and mean response to items 63, 64, and 65. The independent variable, institution, included four levels: Institution #1, Institution #2, Institution #3, and Institution #4. The dependent variable was mean response to items 63, 64, and 65. As indicated in Table 4.11 the ANOVA for Item 63 was not significant,  $F(3, 97) = .393, p > .05$ . The strength of relationship between the institution and the mean response, as assessed by  $\eta^2$ , was very weak, with the institution factor accounting for 1% of the variance of the dependent variable.

Table 4.11  
ANOVA Results for Survey Question 63

|                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F    | Partial Eta-Squared | Power |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|---------------------|-------|
| Between Groups | .517           | 3   | .172        | .393 | .012                | .13   |
| Within Groups  | 42.532         | 97  | .438        |      |                     |       |
| Total          | 43.050         | 100 |             |      |                     |       |

As indicated in Table 4.12 the ANOVA for Item 64 in was not significant,  $F(3, 97) = 1.303, p > .05$ . The strength of relationship between the institution and the mean response, as

assessed by  $\eta^2$ , was very weak, with the institution factor accounting for less than 4% of the variance of the dependent variable.

Table 4.12  
ANOVA Results for Survey Question 64

|                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Partial Eta-Squared | Power |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|---------------------|-------|
| Between Groups | 2.368          | 3   | .789        | 1.303 | .039                | .34   |
| Within Groups  | 58.760         | 97  | .606        |       |                     |       |
| Total          | 61.129         | 100 |             |       |                     |       |

As indicated in Table 4.13 the ANOVA for Item 65 was not significant,  $F(3, 97) = 2.199$ ,  $p > .05$ . The strength of relationship between the institution and the mean response, as assessed by  $\eta^2$ , was very weak, with the institution factor accounting for less than 7 % of the variance of the dependent variable.

Table 4.13  
ANOVA Results for Survey Question 65

|                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Partial Eta-Squared | Power |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|---------------------|-------|
| Between Groups | 2.494          | 3   | .831        | 2.199 | .064                | .54   |
| Within Groups  | 36.674         | 97  | .378        |       |                     |       |
| Total          | 39.168         | 100 |             |       |                     |       |

### Summary

Chapter four reports the results of the data analyses. The SPSS statistical program was used in the treatment of the data. Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations of responses of the Faculty Evaluation Survey were tabulated and displayed in tables.

In chapter five, a brief overview of the research project will be presented and the problem and purpose, significance, overview of literature, and methodology will be revisited.

Explanations of the findings will be discussed and an exploration of the results will be conducted by discussing the implications and offering recommendations for future practice and research.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Findings, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter will summarize the main points of this study. The results will be presented along with conclusions concerning faculty perceptions of faculty evaluation. The purpose of this study was to measure faculty perceptions of the faculty evaluation programs at their respective institutions. The survey measured perceptions in the six areas of faculty evaluation:

1. Purposes of Evaluation
2. Criteria of Faculty Evaluation
3. Approaches of Faculty Evaluation – Faculty’s Teaching Performance
4. Approaches of Faculty Evaluation – Faculty’s Scholarship or Research Performance
5. Use of Faculty Evaluation
6. General

This research added to the current research regarding faculty evaluation and performance appraisal by surveying faculty members about the specific programs at their institution. Chapter five also includes: literature overview, research methodology, findings, implications and recommendations in the area of faculty evaluation.

#### Statement of the Problem

Faculty evaluation is generally looked upon negatively. Measuring faculty perception of the evaluation process may help to identify those components which lead to effective faculty evaluation programs. The study looked at the effectiveness of the faculty performance appraisal programs at the participating institutions. That was, do the faculty members at the participating institutions perceive that the appraisal program at their institution is effective? Because no perfect performance appraisal programs exist, it was important to assess the opinions of those

involved as to the effectiveness of their institution's evaluation program. In short, is faculty performance appraisal effective?

### Significance of the Study

Because faculty-performance appraisal continues to be an issue in our institutions of higher education, there must be a continued search for an effective, successful approach. This study should assist institution's administrations in becoming more knowledgeable in the area of faculty-performance appraisal. The study identified key components that make other institutions successful in the area of performance appraisal. By identifying successful faculty-performance appraisal programs, the researcher is optimistic that other institutions will benefit from the research.

On one hand, faculty members directly affect the quality of the product (students) that our higher education institutions produce; it is necessary to attempt to determine what is involved in implementing an effective faculty-performance appraisal program. When institutions of higher learning produce quality students, society benefits; an educated work force that is trained in its respective area is much more productive. This educated work force is made up of quality professionals, trained technicians, and effective educators and teachers who are prepared for service in their related field(s).

On the other hand, many people, particularly educators, and specifically educators in the higher education arena, have become frustrated because of the process of performance evaluation. However, the frustration does not stop at the person being evaluated. The evaluator is often just as frustrated with the process when the appraisal program is not effective or is not seen as effective.

It is intended that as a result of this study, institutions will recognize ways to make the performance appraisal program at their respective institution more effective. Because the study will identify key components that educators feel are necessary to an effective appraisal program, other similar institutions will be able to apply these same components to their appraisal programs.

The researcher will use the feedback to compile a list that will be helpful to other institutions in implementing a successful faculty-performance appraisal program (see Appendix D). Because of the nature of faculty evaluation, this study can be generalized to a large number of similar higher education institutions. That is, any information leading to more effective faculty evaluation programs is valuable. However, because the study was limited to private institutions with enrollments of 500-4000, the results may be most generalized to the same type and size of those institutions that participated in this study.

#### Literature Overview

Performance appraisal has been conducted for many years; however, the debate about the purpose of performance appraisal has led to much confusion and tension (Chan, 2001). Although the debate continues about the purpose or purposes of performance appraisal, it is certainly not because there has not been enough research in the area of performance appraisal. Reviews of the literature in the area of performance appraisal have contributed a wealth of research information on the topic, but have not accomplished much in the area of the practice of performance appraisal (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995).

Performance appraisal is not the most popular program within the educational arena as it stands. Holland (2006) noted that neither teachers nor administrators have a very high opinion of the performance rating process; Holland further stated that performance appraisals are required

bureaucratic rituals in schools and are made up of empty formality. Another reason that performance appraisal is not necessarily regarded favorably is because research has not shown that performance appraisal improves an employee's or an organization's performance (Belanger, 1999). Although Holland's and Belanger's comments certainly are representative of many performance appraisal programs and the research concerning some of those programs, some appraisal programs do add merit to employee performance and organizational efficiency. An appraisal program that has been carefully planned and implemented can have a great impact on teacher effectiveness (Larson, 1984).

If indeed performance appraisal is something that must take place in education, continued research is necessary to find ways to make performance appraisal a valuable tool for determining the effectiveness of faculty members and staff. One of the ongoing discussions concerning the purpose of performance appraisal addresses whether performance appraisal should be of a formative nature or a summative nature or both.

Formative evaluations are not meant to be judgmental but are used to encourage instructors to be reflective concerning their personal and professional strengths and weaknesses (Antinello, Lare, & Waters, 2006). Research conducted by Chow, et al. (2002) found that senior teachers tend to regard the appraisal by their direct supervisor as used primarily for formative purposes. Generally when a subordinate knows the performance appraisal program is formative appraisal, there is less anxiety and apprehension during the evaluation process. Evidence suggests (Chow, et al., 2002) that these teachers were comfortable with their supervisor and knew that the appraisal they were facing was a formative type of appraisal. Instructors felt less threatened and felt as though the supervisor wanted them to improve their instruction as opposed

to being worried about whether dismissal decisions were going to be made as a result of the performance rating.

Summative evaluation typically provides information based on one or more formal evaluations and has been used to summarize an instructor's performance (Antinello, et al. 2006). The evaluation is based on the evaluator's judgment and serves the organization in decision making. Many times, according to Antinello, et al. (2006), decisions such as tenure, salary, and assignment are based on summative evaluation. According to Murphy and Cleveland (1995), in the early days of performance appraisal, evaluation was done purely on a summative pretense. Business owners and organizations wanted to know if the products were being sold. In other words, was the organization successful in what it was doing? This type of assessment or appraisal was used to guide the decisions as far as future product development, employee productivity, and what could be and could not be offered satisfactorily. When talking about performance appraisal, management leans toward summative appraisal. Management often looks at performance appraisal through the lens of quality assurance (Chan, 2001) because the tendency is to look at the finished product.

Faculty-performance appraisal deals with not only the program or process that has been established, but also includes the tools or methods that are used in the evaluation. Can faculty-performance appraisal be done successfully or effectively? It is important to note that effective faculty-performance appraisal must be developed and implemented on an institution by institution basis and cannot be looked upon as a "one size fits all" process. The process, tools, and methods used can vary in many different ways; however, the institution must arrange them in such a way that they produce an effective faculty-performance appraisal program.

## Overview of the Methodology

This quantitative research used primarily a descriptive design and a survey instrument to gather the data. A literature review was conducted in the area of performance appraisal in an attempt to identify components of faculty-performance programs or systems. Those institutions participating in the study and the sample of participating faculty members were not identified.

The survey instrument from a previous study was used and permission was sought for its use. The study involved selected “Faith-based” universities/colleges in the Southeast United States. Participants only evaluated the faculty-performance evaluation programs of their respective institutions—no institutions were specifically compared with other institutions.

In this study the researcher attempted to measure the perception of faculty members regarding their respective faculty evaluation program. A survey was used to collect details about the faculty’s perception of their institutional evaluation program. The survey helped to determine faculty perception of various aspects of their evaluation programs.

Distribution of the survey was done via a web service called Speed Survey. Speed Survey allowed results to be integrated with Microsoft Excel and Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The initial pages of the survey contained a cover letter explaining the purpose of the research and a paragraph explaining that a returned survey indicated consent to participate. Whereas, the paragraph did not require a signature, it did include all the elements of a consent form. The letter also contained a confidentiality statement which guaranteed that any individual or school would not be identified and that all research data would be kept in a secure location. Furthermore, the letter explained that participation in the study was voluntary. The timeline for receiving data was three weeks.

## Findings and Discussion

In developing a faculty evaluation program, an institution may place a different emphasis on what is important when it comes to evaluating its faculty. That is, what is the focus or what is emphasized by the institution in determining a successful evaluation program? Once these things have been identified, those components make up the “nature” of the faculty evaluation program.

*Research Question 1: What is the nature of the performance appraisal systems as perceived by faculty at selected private colleges?*

This question was examined using the six different subscales of the faculty survey: purposes of evaluation, criteria of faculty evaluation, approaches of evaluation – faculty’s teaching performance, the approaches of evaluation – faculty’s scholarship or research performance, uses of faculty evaluation, and general perceptions of faculty evaluation.

### *Purposes of Evaluation*

The literature has much to say regarding the purposes of faculty evaluation, to the point that the purpose of evaluation is paramount in designing an effective evaluation program (Webb, Montello, & Norton, 1994). Data collected from the survey indicated that nature of the evaluation programs at the participating institutions is very similar. The study reported the top three *Purposes of Evaluation* as 1. *To Meet Accreditation Requirements*; 2. *To Identify Areas of Improvement*; 3. *To Improve Faculty Performance*. Although those previously listed items were ranked as the top three with the strongest mean, one institution did rate “For Tenure” as its third choice in place of “To Improve Faculty Performance.” Gage (n.d.) identified three important reasons (purposes) of evaluation as being: 1. Administrative Decisions; 2. Basis for Self-Improvement; and 3. To Develop a Criteria that can be Employed in Research on Teaching and

Learning. Gage's writing would have been during 1967 or earlier during the time before there was a large emphasis on accreditation. It is interesting, however, to note that Gage's second important reason for evaluation correlates with the results of this study: *to identify areas of improvement*. For various reasons, many faculty members do not look favorably on evaluation although, according to Gage and according to this study, they do regard it as an opportunity to improve as a teacher.

The purpose of an institution's evaluation plan should be communicated to the faculty. An adequate faculty evaluation program should involve faculty participation when determining the purpose of the program (Neal, 1988). One important reason for clarifying the evaluation program's purpose is because in many instances faculty members perceive the purpose of the program differently than administrators (Moomaw, 1977). This study demonstrates that participants did have an understanding of the purpose of their institution's evaluation program, especially in the areas of accreditation, faculty performance, and improvement.

The purpose of the evaluation program must be the foundation of the process. "The purpose of evaluation shapes the questions asked, the sources of data utilized, the depth of the analysis, and the dissemination of findings" (Seldin, 1984).

A majority of participants (88.5%) responded that the number one purpose for evaluation at their respective institution was *To Meet Accreditation Requirements* ( $M=1.54$ ). Accreditation has become an important piece of the educational process. Not only do federal and state authorities feel accreditation is a reliable authority concerning academia, states often require accreditation in order for state funds to be available to institutions and students (Eaton, 2006). With the emphasis on accreditation within the educational arena, it is no surprise that the number one purpose for accreditation among the respondents was *To Meet Accreditation Requirements*.

Each institution that participated in this study indicated that accreditation requirements were the main purpose of faculty evaluation. In this study, only 2.9% of respondents reported that *To Meet Accreditation Requirements should* “Never” be the purpose of faculty evaluation while 8.7% felt it was “Seldom” a purpose for evaluation. In other words, only 11.6% determined that *Accreditation Requirements* was not important when it came to the purpose of faculty evaluation.

87.5% responded the second main purpose for evaluation at their respective institution was *To Identify Areas of Improvement* ( $M=1.79$ ) and 80.8% responded that the third main purpose for evaluation at their respective institution was *To Improve Faculty Performance* ( $M=1.91$ ) . There is some disagreement within the literature about whether or not an evaluation program can serve two purposes, such as determining areas of improvement and making personnel decisions (Neal, 1988). Some propose that the two must be kept separate (Seldin, 1984; Mills & Hyle 1999; Ory, 1999); however, other researchers believe both can be accomplished via one program (Centra, 1979; Miller, 1987; Arreola, 1995). The participants of this study appeared to support Centra, Miller, and Arreola in that their individual programs appeared to accomplish both—to a certain extent.

Out of the eleven items surveyed within the *Purposes of Evaluation*, six dealt with making personnel decisions; three dealt with improvement, whether at the institutional level or faculty member level; and two items dealt with policy or guidelines. Participants rated most of the items dealing with personnel issues at the bottom of the list when rating the purpose of the program. The items rated lowest were:

- For Merit Pay
- For Transfers

- ❑ For Disciplinary Action
- ❑ To Recognize and Reward Good Performance
- ❑ For Tenure
- ❑ For Promotion

All six items dealing with personnel issues were rated at the bottom of the purpose of each institution's evaluation program. The assumption could be made that because the participating institutions were smaller, private, faith-based institutions, a smaller faculty may be better "managed" and more formative evaluation is taking place. One also must consider that in these faith-based institutions many faculty members feel a "higher calling" to their vocation and an attitude of "good stewardship" to that higher calling. This in no way alleges that personnel decisions are not necessary in these types of institutions, only that this it may not have quite the focus because of the nature of these institutions as opposed to that of larger institutions.

Two of the top three *Purposes of Evaluation* address improvement, *To Identify Areas of Improvement* and *To Improve Faculty Performance*. This would tend to support that these programs represent a formative nature when it comes to evaluating faculty members. Although the number one response of participants regarding faculty evaluation was *To Meet Accreditation Purposes*, this too ties in with *Improvement*. Much of accreditation embodies identifying areas of weakness and taking steps to improve those areas; this, in turn, goes hand-in-hand with improvement and the faculty evaluation process. With that said, the relationship between the top three responses, *To Meet Accreditation Requirements*, *To Identify Areas of Improvement*, and *To Improve Faculty Performance*, can be more readily accepted. It can be assumed that participants were associating improvement of weak areas (whether programmatic or departmental) and improvement of teaching with improvement and the accreditation process.

The item of *To Meet Board Policy* was ranked seventh out of the eleven items. It could be presumed that this item also ties in with not only accreditation but also policy. Most educators realize that accreditation requires certain institutional board policies and certainly the evaluation of faculty and staff would be one of those policies. Participants of this study reported that although meeting board policy did make up a part of the nature of their evaluation programs, it was not as important as accreditation or improvement. It is interesting that meeting board policy did rank higher than the items dealing with personnel decisions.

#### *Criteria of Faculty Evaluation*

Data from the study indicates the top three *Criteria of Faculty Evaluation* were *Classroom Teaching* ( $M=1.40$ ), *Personal Qualifications* ( $M=1.64$ ), and *Campus Committee Work/Service to College* ( $M=2.03$ ). The criteria of evaluation have long been one of the frustrating areas when it comes to evaluating faculty (Cashin, 1978; Chan, 2001). Of the four institutions that participated in the study, the respondents perceived the number one criterion of their evaluation process was *Classroom Teaching*. None of the four participating institutions would be considered a “research institution;” therefore, this researcher did not find it surprising that these faculty members viewed *Classroom Teaching* as the most important criterion of the evaluation process. For the most part, it can be assumed that faculty members are dedicated to their cause of teaching and feel strongly that their classroom instruction is paramount when it comes to evaluation. This supports a study by Seldin (1975) which included 491 private colleges. Of 410 responses to his survey regarding components of evaluation, 99.3% rated classroom teaching as the highest major factor in overall faculty performance. Studies by Bolden (1981) and Williams and Rhodes (2002) also confirmed classroom teaching as the highest ranked criterion for evaluation.

One would expect *Personal Qualifications* ( $M=1.64$ ) to be rated highly for two reasons: faculty must possess the proper qualifications in order to be considered for a faculty position within higher education, and faculty are also proud of their academic accomplishments. In some cases, faculty must continue to pursue further qualifications in order to arrive at a tenured position; this would also make the item of *Personal Qualifications* important to faculty when being evaluated.

*Committee Work/Service to College* ( $M=2.03$ ) was reported as the number three item on the list of criteria for evaluation. Again, the nature of the institutions that participated in the study may help to drive that item up the list. The four faith-based institutions typically would draw a faculty member with a strong sense of service and commitment to the mission of the institution. This personal commitment to “serve” others would understandably spill over into the workplace, thereby, placing a certain importance on the item as it relates to faculty evaluation.

Whereas this study identified the top three criteria for evaluation as *classroom teaching*, *personal qualifications*, and *campus committee work*, Whitman and Weiss (1982) concluded that the literature identifies the traditional criteria as being teaching, research, and service; service carries less emphasis and teaching and research compete for the top position. Furthermore, Williams and Rhodes (2002) identified the top three evaluative items as being classroom teaching, scholarship performance, and college service; dean evaluation was ranked as number four on the list.

Items relating to research and publications ranked toward the bottom of the list ( $M=2.87$ – $M=3.21$ ). Participating institutions were not necessarily research institutions, which might have been the cause for the lower ratings for these items.

### *Approaches to Faculty Evaluation-Faculty's Teaching Performance*

This section deals with approaches to evaluation concerning evaluating teaching performance. Participants responded to those items that were used within their evaluation program. The results of this study concerning this area supported previous studies with reference to Student Questionnaires. Respondents reported that *Student Questionnaires* ( $M=1.59$ ) were the number one item with which they were evaluated. This supports suggestions by Miller (1974) and Centra (1977) that student evaluations should play an integral part when it comes to faculty evaluation. However, a study by Gustad (1966) of four-year colleges indicated that on a list of 15 items, student evaluations (systematic student ratings) tied for numbers 13 and 14 on a list of approaches used for evaluating. By the same token, a study of liberal arts colleges by Seldin (1975) resulted in student evaluations (systematic student ratings) being rated at number five on the same list of 15 approaches.

Although in those previous studies student evaluations were relegated to the middle of the rating list, a study by Seldin (1989) determined that student evaluations tied for first (with chair evaluations) in the faculty evaluation process. Also supporting the use of student evaluations was a study by Szeto and Wright (2003) which reported that five of six colleges within a large university chose student evaluations as the number one approach to assessing faculty performance. The other college chose it as the number two approach to assessing faculty performance.

Whereas similar studies indicated the importance of student evaluations, those same perceptions are prevalent in this study. In this study, each of the participating institutions ranked student evaluations as the number one approach to faculty's teaching performance. .

In the area of *Approaches of Evaluation – Dean Evaluation* ( $M=2.12$ ) was the second strongest mean dealing with *Approaches of Evaluation* reported in this study. This is not out of the ordinary because most expect to be evaluated by a supervisor. 67.3% of respondents reported that they perceived dean evaluation as an important approach to evaluation. On the other hand, 26% of respondents reported it was seldom important and their institution and 6.7% reported it was never important at their institution. The fact that the participating institutions are all somewhat small institutions is more than likely the reason this item ranked as high as it did. The smaller size of the faculty may allow the dean ample time to do the necessary evaluating of faculty. This would not be as common in larger institutions and would not be as generalizable as other portions of this study.

*Self Evaluation* ( $M=2.15$ ) was reported as the third strongest mean regarding evaluation approaches. 59.6% of participants perceived self-evaluation as important within their evaluation program. Webb and Nolan (1955) did not condone the use of self-evaluation because of “high incentives for distortion.” However, in a 1967 study by Austin and Lee it was reported that 67% of schools surveyed used self-evaluation as a method for evaluating faculty. This same study reported that self-evaluation was used more than systematic student ratings. In contrast, Blackburn and Clark (1971) conducted a study in an academic setting and determined self-evaluation could not be supported because associations between self-evaluations and other forms of evaluation were poor.

#### *Approaches of Evaluation: Faculty’s Scholarship or Research Performance*

Items within this subscale were rated low which substantiates the fact that the participating institutions are not necessarily research institutions. The top three items with the strongest mean were *Papers at Professional Meetings* ( $M=2.71$ ), *Books as Sole or Senior Author*

( $M=2.92$ ), and *Unpublished Papers or Reports* ( $M=2.97$ ). Participants' responses indicate that this item was not rated as one of the more important aspects of faculty evaluation at their institution. 35.6% of respondents reported *Papers at Professional Meetings* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives. In contrast, 64.4% of participants responded that *Papers at Professional Meetings* did not contribute to faculty evaluation domains and objectives. 21.2% of respondents reported *Books as Sole or Senior Author* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives, while 78.9% of respondents perceived *Books as Sole or Senior Author* did not contribute to faculty evaluation domains and objectives and 23.1% of respondents reported *Unpublished Papers or Reports* as contributing to faculty evaluation domains and objectives. Although *Unpublished Papers or Reports* ( $M=2.97$ ) received the third strongest mean within this subscale, only 23.1% of participants responded that this item contributed to faculty evaluation domains and objectives. In turn, 76.9% determined that *Unpublished Papers or Reports* did not contribute to faculty evaluation domains and objectives at their institution.

It is the opinion of the researcher that these ratings would have been reported very differently if the participating institutions were research type institutions. This is not to say that research is not important at these institutions, only that, according to participant responses, it is not considered on one of the main approaches to evaluating faculty performance.

#### *Uses of Faculty Evaluation*

Data indicated that top three items pertaining to *Uses of Faculty Evaluation* were *To Satisfy Legal Requirements of Governing Agencies* ( $M=1.98$ ), *For Promotion* ( $M=2.16$ ), and *To Give Students a Sense of Involvement* ( $M=2.28$ ). 69.9% of respondents perceived, *To Satisfy Legal Requirements of Governing Agencies* was the strongest item when it came to *Uses*

*of Faculty Evaluation*. This response also bears a parallel to the strongest item within the *Purposes of Evaluation* subscale: *To Meet Accreditation Requirements* ( $M=1.54$ ). One would presume that participants who rated *To Meet Accreditation Requirements* as the strongest item within its subscale would also rate *To Satisfy Legal Requirements of Governing Agencies* as a very strong item within its subscale of *Uses of Faculty Evaluation*. These two responses could be an indication of the importance of accreditation at the participating institutions. Data indicates faculty members perceived *To Meet Accreditation Requirements* as the number one item in the *Purposes of Evaluation* subscale and *To Satisfy Legal Requirements of Governing Agencies* as the number one item in the *Uses of Faculty Evaluation* subscale.

Although *For Promotion* ( $M=2.16$ ) did receive a strong mean within its subscale, only 66.7% of respondents felt it was an important *Use of Faculty Evaluation*. In contrast, 33.3% perceived it was not important as a *Use of Faculty Evaluation* at their institution.

The third strongest mean in the *Use of Faculty Evaluation* subscale was *To Give Students a Sense of Involvement* ( $M=2.28$ ). This item correlates with *Approaches of Evaluation: Faculty's Teaching Performance* Subscale. Survey respondents reported *Student Questionnaire* ( $M=1.59$ ) as the item with the strongest mean in the *Approaches of Evaluation: Faculty's Teaching Performance* Subscale. Faculty members who perceived student questionnaires to be a valid approach to evaluating faculty performance would also be interested in student involvement. In an institution in which student questionnaires are used as a main component of faculty evaluation, student involvement in that evaluation would also be important. By participating in the evaluation of faculty performance, the student feels a sense of being involved in the educational process.

*Research Question 2: How satisfied are the faculty with their performance appraisal systems?*

Two items on the survey were used in an attempt to measure this research question. The first, item 62 of the “General” subscale asked; *In general, performance evaluation at this university accurately measures the faculty members overall performance (M=2.37)?* 60.2 % perceived that their faculty evaluation program did accurately measure faculty performance. Although 35% responded to this question with a response of “Seldom,” only 4.9% responded with “Never.”

Although over 60% of participants perceived their faculty evaluation program as accurately measuring performance, 39.9% responded negatively that their program “seldom” accurately measured performance or it “never” accurately measured performance. This data is in agreement with Szeto and Wright (2003) who concluded that large minorities and sometime the majority of faculty do not regard their faculty evaluation program as effectively measuring their performance. In a study by Szeto and Wright (2003) only 58.2% of faculty responded they were “somewhat” or “very satisfied” with their present faculty evaluation program.

The second, item 66 stated, *In general, how satisfied are you with the present process of evaluating faculty performance at your department/institution (M=2.34)?* 63.1% of respondents were satisfied with the present process of evaluation at their institution. Although 25.2% responded to this question with a response of “Somewhat Dissatisfied,” and 11.7% responded with “Very Dissatisfied.”

Despite the noted differences and apparent polarization of responses on these items, significant differences do exist between institutions. This could mean that some institutions (or one of the institutions) are generally in agreement with these statements while others (or one of the institutions) may not generally agree.

Although the results of this study are similar to the results of the Szeto and Wright study, the samples used were different. Szeto and Wright sampled a public comprehensive university (undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral) of 14,000 students. Six colleges within the university were surveyed: Arts, Business Administration, Education and Psychology, Liberal Arts, Science and Technology; the colleges were compared with each other.

In this study, four private universities/colleges were sampled, the largest serving approximately 4000 students; these institutions were not compared with each other. It is interesting to note that although the samples are different, the results are similar.

*Research Question 3: What do faculty members perceive as important components of their performance appraisal systems?*

Respondents rated three statements regarding the components of their program:

1. *More than one source should be used to obtain information for the performance evaluation process* ( $M = 1.46$ ), 2. *Faculty should participate in the development of the performance evaluation process* ( $M = 1.54$ ), and 3. *Classroom teaching should be the most important determinant in evaluating faculty members* ( $M = 1.65$ ). An overwhelming 91.1% perceived their evaluation program as using more than one source for evaluation. The study by Szeto and Wright (2003) found most institutions tend to focus on one evaluation method. This, in turn, can produce a faculty that is dissatisfied with the faculty evaluation process as a whole. Whether those sources are classroom teaching, student evaluations, dean evaluations, peer evaluations, self-evaluations, portfolios, research, or publications, it is important to use several different sources to evaluate faculty performance. An institution must determine which sources to use based on the objectives of its faculty evaluation program.

Respondents of this study also determined it was important that *Faculty should participate in the development of the performance evaluation process*. The literature supports that providing an effective and adequate faculty evaluation program involves including the faculty in the process of developing that program (Neal, 1988). 88.3% of respondents indicated the importance of having a part in the development of the evaluation program. Moomaw (1977) reported that the ineffectiveness of evaluation at most institutions could be the result of the lack of faculty participation in the process. Neal (1988) developed a list of 10 guidelines for faculty evaluation programs. Number one on the list was “a clear purpose” and number two on the list was “involve faculty in all aspects of evaluation. Faculty insights into the evaluation process can prove very beneficial in developing an effective evaluation program. However, this research also determined that 11.7% of respondents reported that faculty participation was not important in their faculty evaluation program.

Respondents reported the third strongest mean in the area of *important components* of a faculty evaluation program as *Classroom teaching should be the most important determinant in evaluating faculty members* ( $M = 1.65$ ). 92.1% of respondents reported classroom teaching as being important in their faculty evaluation program; 7.8% also reported it was not important. It does stand to reason that individuals who dedicate selves to the vocation of teaching would regard classroom teaching as an important aspect of their evaluation program. Miller (1972) developed a list of nine evaluation categories with classroom teaching being the most important. This also supports the previously mentioned study by Seldin (1975) which surveyed 491 private colleges. Out of 410 responses from higher education faculty, 99.3% of them rated classroom teaching as the most important facet of faculty evaluation.

## Conclusions

This research led to some interesting findings in the area of faculty evaluation. The literature revealed that for the most part both administrations and faculty members are unhappy with faculty evaluation. Because of this, the researcher expected the survey to be welcomed with “open arms” in an effort to assist with identifying strengths and weaknesses within the process. However, the researcher was met with some lack of willingness by institutions to participate and/or encourage participation among its faculty. This lack of participation on the part of some may indicate a sense of apathy towards the evaluation process.

Results included that faculty members of the participating institutions perceived that *Meeting Accreditation Guidelines* was the most important factor, being rated higher than *Identifying Areas for Improvement* and *To Improve Faculty Performance*. Based on the type of institutions (small, faith-based) which participated in the study, the researcher was not surprised to find that results indicated the top three criteria for evaluation as *classroom teaching*, *personal qualifications*, and *campus committee work*.

While the *Uses of Evaluation* results were somewhat unexpected, they did appear to associate with other data within the study. The study reported the top three uses as *To Satisfy Legal Requirements of Governing Agencies*, *For Promotion*, and *To Give Students a Sense of Involvement*.

Lastly, the data regarding “satisfaction” and “effectiveness” of the respective evaluation programs did appear to be the same as found in similar studies. Approximately 60% of respondents were satisfied with their program and felt the program effectively evaluated its faculty, and approximately 40% were not satisfied with their program and felt the program did not effectively evaluate its faculty.

The findings of this study are similar to what was expected by the researcher. As a result of the literature review, the researcher expected several of the subscale items to rate very closely to where they rated among participants of this study. These findings along with the suggested guidelines (Appendix D) will be helpful in the development of an evaluation framework. Much like the conceptual framework which assisted with the direction of this study, institutions should develop an evaluation framework which becomes the driving force of the evaluation program.

### Implications

The findings of this study will assist the leadership of institutions with developing a faculty evaluation program with which faculty members can be involved with its evaluation, and in turn, satisfied about its effectiveness. It was determined that faculty members might perceive the importance of components of faculty evaluation differently than administrators within their respective evaluation program. This would be a reason for administrations to reevaluate the components of their evaluation programs and include faculty members in that reevaluation if the faculty are not already being included in the process.

The results of this study also reveal implications regarding faculty attitudes toward their performance. Respondents listed both *To Identify Areas of Weakness* and *To Improve Faculty Performance* in the top three responses in the area of purpose for evaluation. These data can be an indicator to administrative personnel that these participants are concerned with improvement and performance and see faculty evaluation as a vehicle to accomplish both. This attitude toward faculty evaluation supports an attitude of faculty evaluation being a formative process.

### Recommendations

Based on the findings of this research the following recommendations are offered:

1. Each participating institution should look at the results of this study as a tool for strengthening their faculty evaluation programs which in turn should promote institutional learning outcomes.
2. Each institution should consider replicating this study and doing more specific analysis in an attempt to strengthen its evaluation program.
3. Institutions should reevaluate their faculty evaluation program using a committee of stakeholders such as administration, faculty, students, and any others who may contribute to the development of the program.
4. Institutional leadership should conduct in-service training in the area of faculty evaluation to be sure all constituents understand its objectives and purpose.
5. Faculty members should become knowledgeable in the area of faculty evaluation.
6. Faculty members should become involved in their institutions faculty evaluation program.

#### Recommendations for Further Study

As a result of this research, the following recommendations are suggested for further research:

1. This study focused on four small, faith-based institutions which are located in a specific geographical area. Further research should be conducted on both similar size samples and larger samples to measure the generalizability of this study.
2. Research should be done using subscales independent of one another. This would allow a focused study concentrating on each specific subscale.
3. A similar study should be conducted with institutional data individually listed.
4. Further study should be conducted to determine if this can be generalized or if it is limited to like institutions included in this study.

5. Data from this study can be tested across larger samples to determine if present systems meet the requirements of both faculty and administrators.
6. Further investigation of faculty perception of performance evaluation is suggested.
7. A study should be conducted of the 40% who indicated they were not satisfied with their faculty evaluation program. This would help to identify specific things that could be changed to improve the program.
8. Further research should be conducted to look at the participants who were satisfied versus those who were not satisfied to see where differences in perceptions exist between these two groups.

## REFERENCE LIST

## References

- Anderson, C. D., Warner, J. L., Spencer, C. C. (1984). Inflation bias in self-assessment examinations: Implications for valid employee selection. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 574-580.
- Antinello, J., Lare, D., & Waters, F. (2006, June). The value of teacher portfolios for evaluation and professional growth. *NASSP Bulletin*. 90(2).
- Arreola, R. A. (1995). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system*. Bolton MA: Anker Publishing.
- Astin, A. A., & Lee, C. B. T. (1967). Current practices in the evaluation and training of college teachers. In C. B. T. Lee (Ed.) *Improving college teaching*, Washinton, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Belanger, K. (1999). Employee interpretations and responses to performance appraisal as identity regulation. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, (UMI 14301941).
- Blackburn, R. T., & Clark, M. J. (1971). *An assessment of faculty performance : Some correlates between administrator, colleague, student, and self ratings*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Center for the study of Higher education.
- Bolden, S. H. (1981, March). The policies for the evaluation of tenured faculty in Alabama's public colleges. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Accosication for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, DC (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED203814)
- Braverman, M. T. (1996). Sources of survey error: Implications for evaluation studies. In J.L. Fitzpatrick, J.R. Sanders, & B.R. Worthen, *Program evaluation*. Alternative approaches and practical guidelines. Boston: Pearson.

- Cashin, W. (1978). *Sources of information upon which to base evaluations of college teaching*. Kansas State University: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education.
- Centra, J.A. (1977). How universities evaluate faculty performance: A survey of department heads. *Educational Testing Service*, Princeton, NJ
- Centra, J. A. (1979). *Determining faculty effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chan, K. (2001). The difficulties and dilemma of constructing a model for teacher evaluation in higher education. *Higher Education Management*. 13(1).
- Chow, A.P.Y., Wong, E.K.P., Yeung, A.S., & Mo, K.W. (2002, June) Teachers' perceptions of appraiser—appraisee relationships. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 16(2).
- Coens, T., & Jenkins, M. (1978). *Abolishing performance appraisals: Why they backfire and what to do instead*. San Francisco CA: Barrett-Koehler Publishing, Inc.
- DeNisi, A. S. & Shaw, J. B. (1977). Investigation of the uses of self-reports of abilities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 641-644.
- Donnelly, A.M. (2005, Fall). Let me show you my portfolio! Demonstrating competence through peer interviews. *Action in Teacher Education*, 27(3) 55-63.
- Eaton, Judith. (2006). *An Overview of U.S. Accreditation*. CHEA
- Elbo, R.H. (2000, December). Performance appraisal destroys teamwork. *Business World*, 1.
- Farh, J., Werbell, J., & Bedeian, A. (1988 Spring). An empirical investigation of self-appraisal-based performance evaluation. *Personnel Psychology* 41(1) 141-156.
- Fossey, R. (1999). Personnel evaluation in higher education: A mounting call for accountability. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 13(2) 115-118.

- Gage, N. L. (N.D.) Ends and Means in Appraising College Teaching.” In C. B. T. Lee (Ed), *Improving College Teaching (pp265-281). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.*
- Gustad, J.W. (1967). Evaluation of teaching performance: Issues and possibilities. In C. B. T. Lee (Ed), *Improving College Teaching (pp265-281). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.*
- Heckert, T., Latier, A., Ringwald-Burton, A., & Drazen. C. (2006 September). Relations among student effort, perceived class difficulty appropriateness, and student evaluations of teaching: Is it possible to “buy” better evaluations through lenient grading? *College Student Journal* 40(3), 588-96.
- Heilbroner, R. L. (1953). *The worldly philosophers: The lives, times and ideas of the great economic thinkers.* Simon & Schuster Adult Printing Group.
- Holland, P. (2006). The case for expanding standards for teacher evaluation to include an instructional supervision perspective. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 18, 67-77.
- Knäuper, B. & Turner, P.A. (2000). *Measuring health: Improving the validity of health assessments.* McGill University, Montreal.
- Landy, F.J., & Farr, J.L. (1980). Performance rating. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87, 72-107.
- Larson, R. (1984). Teacher performance evaluation – what are the key elements? *NASSP Bulletin*, 68(460), 13-18.
- McPherson, M.A. (2006, Winter). Determinants of how students evaluate teachers. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 37(1) 3-20.

- Merriam, S. B. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mills, M., & Hyle, A. (1999). Faculty evaluation: A prickly pear. *Higher Education*, 38, 351-371. Retrieved March 15, 2009, from EBSCOHost database.
- Moomaw, W.E. Spring (1977). Practices and Problems in Evaluating Instruction. In J.A. Centra (Eds.) *Renewing and evaluating teaching: New directions for higher education No.1*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Miller, R. I., (1974). *Developing programs for faculty evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Murphy, K.R. & Cleveland, J.N. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal. Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Neal, John E. (1988). Faculty Evaluation: Its Purposes and Effectiveness. Retrieved March 5, 2009 from <http://ericae.net/db/edo/ED308800.htm>
- Ory, J. C. (1991). Changes in evaluating teaching in higher education. *Theory into Practice*, 30, 30-36. Retrieved July 9, 2009, from EBSCOHost database.
- Ott, J., Parkes, S., & Simpson, R. (2008). *Classic readings in organizational behavior* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson-Wadsworth.
- Painter, C. (2003). Ten steps for improved appraisals. *Supervision*, 64(10), 12-14. Retrieved July 7, 2009 from Business Full Text database.
- Patten, T. H., Jr. (1977). *PAY: Employee compensation and incentive plans*. Free Press, London.
- Peterson, K., Kelly, P., & Caskey, M. (2002). Ethical considerations for teachers in the evaluation of other teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 16(4) 317-324.
- Seldin, P. (1975). *How to evaluate professors: Current policies and practices in evaluating classroom teaching performance in Liberal Arts Colleges*. New York: Blythe-Pennington.

- Seldin, P. (1984). *Changing practices in faculty evaluation: A critical assessment and recommendations for improvement*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Seldin, P. (1989). How colleges evaluate professors: 1988 vs. 1983. *AAHE Bulletin*, pp. 3-7.
- Shelley, S. (1999). Diversity of appraisal and performance-related pay practices in higher education. *Personnel Review*, 28(5/6), 439-442.
- Shrauger, J.S., & Osberg, T.M. (1981). The relative accuracy of self-predictions and judgments by others of psychological assessment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90, 322-351.
- Simmons, A. (2003). When performance reviews fail. *T+D*, 57(9), 47-51. Retrieved July 7, 2009, from Business Full Text database.
- Szeto, W. F. (1994, November). *Perceptions of faculty performance evaluation among faculty across academic disciplines at a selected university*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Nashville, TN.
- Szeto, W. F., & Wright, P. C. (2003). Searching for an ideal: A cross disciplinary study of university faculty performance evaluation. *Equal Opportunities International*; 2003, 22, 8.
- Torrington, D. & Hall, L. (1991). *Human resource management*. Great Britain: Prentice Hall Europe.
- Tucker, P.D., Stronge, J.H., & Gareis, C.R. (2002). *Handbook on teacher portfolios for evaluation and professional development*. Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education.
- Turner, C.B. (1986). Performance evaluation of faculty in public junior colleges in Alabama (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47, 2364.
- Waugh, S. (2002). Delivering Solid Performance Reviews. *Supervision*, 63(8), 16-17. Retrieved 7 July 2009, from Business Full Text database.

Webb, L. D., Montello, P. A., & Norton, M. S. (1994). *Human resource administration* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).  
New York: Macmillan College Publishing Company.

Webb, W. B. & Nolan, C. Y. (1955). Student, supervisor, and self-ratings of instructional  
proficiency. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 46, 42-46.

Whitman, N., & Weiss, E. (1982). *Faculty evaluations: The use of explicit criteria for  
promotion, retention, and tenure*. (AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 2).  
(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED221148)

Young, I. P., Delli, D. A., & Johnson, L. (1999). Student evaluation of faculty: Effects of  
purpose on pattern. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 13(2) 179-190.

## APPENDICES

Appendix A

Survey Instrument

| <b>FACULTY EVALUATION PROGRAM SURVEY</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Rate each statement based on its importance in the evaluation process at your institution</b> |   |   |   |   |   |
| I am a member of the faculty at:   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> College/University  |   |   |   |   |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> College/University  |   |   |   |   |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> College/University  |   |   |   |   |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> College/University  |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>A. Purposes of Evaluation</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1=Always, 2=Frequently, 3=Seldom, 4=Never  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | To improve faculty performance  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2  | To recognize and reward good performance  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3  | To identify areas for improvement   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4  | For tenure  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5  | For promotion   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6  | For merit pay   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7  | For transfers   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8  | For disciplinary action   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9  | To meet board policy  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10   | To meet accreditation requirements  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11   | To evaluate college goal attainment by identifying faculty performance which contributes to those goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <b>B. Criteria of Faculty Evaluation</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1=Always, 2=Frequently, 3=Seldom, 4=Never  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12   | Classroom teaching  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13   | Number of publications  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14   | Quality of publications   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15   | Research and/or creative activity (independent of publications)   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16   | Supervision of student research, including serving on master and doctoral committees                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17   | Student advising  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18   | Campus committee work, service to college   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19   | Activity in professional societies (hold office, edit journal, etc)                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20   | Public or community service   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21   | Consultation (government, business, etc)  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22   | Personality factors   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 23   | Personal qualifications (Academic degrees, professional experience, etc)                                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

| <b>C. Approaches of Evaluation-Faculty's Teaching Performance</b>                |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1=Always, 2=Frequently, 3=Seldom, 4=Never  |  |   |   |   |   |
| 24   | Student questionnaire                                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25   | Opinions of former students still attending the college  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 26   | Long-term follow up of graduate                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 27   | Chairman evaluation                                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 28   | Dean evaluation  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 29   | Committee evaluation                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 30   | Administrative review of teaching materials              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 31   | Review of videotape of class by dean with faculty member | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 32   | Student examination performance                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 33   | Final grades distribution in courses                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 34   | Popularity of elective courses (e.g. enrollment)         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 35   | Classroom visit by colleague                             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 36   | Colleague review of teaching materials                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 37   | Self evaluation or report                                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  |   |   |   |   |
| <b>D. Approaches of Evaluation-Faculty's Scholarship or Research Performance</b> |  |   |   |   |   |
| 1=Always, 2=Frequently, 3=Seldom, 4=Never  |  |   |   |   |   |
| 38   | Publication in all professional journals                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 39   | Articles in quality journals                             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 40   | Unpublished papers or reports                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 41   | Papers at professional meetings                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 42   | Citations to published materials                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 43   | Books a sole or senior author                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 44   | Books as junior author or editor                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 45   | Monographs or chapters in books                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 46   | Grants or funding received                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 47   | Referee or editor of professional journal                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 48   | Honors or awards from professional journal               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 49   | Honors or awards from profession                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

| <b>E. Use of Faculty Evaluation</b><br>1=Always, 2=Frequently, 3=Seldom, 4=Never |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 50   | As a means of identifying outstanding faculty members   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 51   | As a means towards improving instructional methods and techniques   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 52   | As a means to improve the student advising function of faculty members  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 53   | As a foundation for developing faculty professional development programs  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 54   | Granting tenure   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 55   | Promotion (Rank)  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 56   | Promotion to administrative position  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 57   | Merit pay increases   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 58   | Disciplinary action   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 59   | To satisfy legal requirements of governing agencies   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 60   | To give student a sense of involvement  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 61   | To provide evidence of faculty accountability to the local community  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <b>F. General</b><br>1=Always, 2=Frequently, 3=Seldom, 4=Never                   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 62   | In general, performance evaluation at this university accurately measures the faculty members overall performance   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 63   | More than one source should be used to obtain information for the performance evaluation process  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 64   | Faculty should participate in the development of the performance evaluation process   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 65   | Classroom teaching should be the most important determinant in evaluating faculty members   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 66   | In general, how satisfied are you with the present process of evaluating faculty performance at your department/institution. Please use the scale: 1=Very Satisfied, 2=Somewhat Satisfied, 3=Somewhat Dissatisfied, 4=Very Dissatisfied | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

## Appendix B

### IRB Approval (University of Tennessee at Chattanooga)



Institutional Review Board  
Dept. 4905  
615 McCallie Avenue  
Chattanooga, TN 37403-2598  
Phone: (423) 425-4443

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: Jeff Rector  
Dr. Valerie Rutledge **IRB # 09-107**

FROM: Lindsay Pardue, Director of Research Integrity  
M. D. Roblyer, IRB Committee Chair

DATE: August 3, 2009

SUBJECT: IRB Application # 09-107: The Nature and Functioning of Performance Appraisal Systems for Full-Time Faculty at Selected Private Colleges in the Georgia-Cumberland Region.

The IRB Committee Chair has reviewed and approved your application and assigned you the IRB number listed above. You must include the following approval statement on research materials seen by participants and used in research reports:

***The Institutional Review Board of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (FWA00004149) has approved this research project # 09-107.***

Since your project has been deemed exempt, there is no further action needed on this proposal unless there is a significant change in the project that would require a new review. Changes that affect risk to human subjects would necessitate a new application to the IRB committee immediately.

Please remember to contact the IRB Committee immediately and submit a new project proposal for review if significant changes occur in your research design or in any instruments used in conducting the study. You should also contact the IRB Committee immediately if you encounter any adverse effects during your project that pose a risk to your subjects.

For any additional information, please consult our web page <http://www.utc.edu/irb> or email us at: [instrb@utc.edu](mailto:instrb@utc.edu).

Best wishes for a successful research project.

## Appendix C

### Letter/Directions to Participants

Dear Faculty Member:

I am a student under the direction of Dr. Valerie Rutledge in the College of Health, Education and Professional Studies at The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. I am conducting a research study to evaluate teachers' perceptions of the faculty evaluation program of their institution.

I am requesting your participation, which will involve completing an online survey answering questions about your faculty evaluation program. I also hope to gather information showing those things you perceive as valuable within your evaluation program. Your input will be helpful in helping higher education institutions just like yours strengthen it's faculty evaluation program. This survey contains 66 items and should take approximately 15-20 minutes of your time. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. The online survey is anonymous. The results of the study will be shared with each participating institution, however, your name will not be known as all responses will be kept anonymous.

The survey is located at <http://performanceappraisal.speedsurvey.com>  
Completion of the online survey will be considered your consent to participate.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please call me Jeff Rector at (423) 493-4224 or e-mail me at [jeff-rector@ut.edu](mailto:jeff-rector@ut.edu) or Dr. Valerie Rutledge at (423) 425 -5374 or email her at [valerie-rutledge@utc.edu](mailto:valerie-rutledge@utc.edu)

This research has been approved by the UTC Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have any questions concerning the UTC IRB policies or procedures or your rights as a human subject, please contact Dr. M. D. Roblyer, IRB Committee Chair, at (423) 425-5567 or email instrb@utc.edu.

Return of a completed survey will be considered your consent to participate.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeff Rector

Doctoral Candidate

## Appendix D

### List of Suggestions for a Successful Faculty-Performance Appraisal Program

Developed from Conceptual Framework (Arreola, 1995)

1. Appraisal program should be related to the organization's strategic plan (Shelley, 1999; Elbo, 2000).
2. The appraisal program should be based on specific values relative to the culture of the institution.
3. Involve the faculty in the development of the appraisal program.
4. Develop a system of measurement/rating system to be used to measure performance.
5. Realize that true objectivity cannot be attained; develop a way to control the subjectivity.
6. The appraisal program must serve two purposes: assisting with faculty development and assisting with making personnel decisions
7. Use several sources for the evaluation process; remember that all sources have strengths and weaknesses.

## VITA

Jeffrey L. Rector

### EDUCATION

- 2009      Doctorate in Education, Learning and Leadership  
University of Tennessee, Chattanooga, Tennessee
- 1993      Master of Education, Secondary Education  
University of Tennessee, Chattanooga, Tennessee
- 1990      Bachelor of Arts, Pastoral Studies  
Tennessee Temple University, Chattanooga, Tennessee

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- 2009-Present   Chief Operations Officer  
Tennessee Temple University, Chattanooga, Tennessee
- 2007-2009     Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Operations  
Tennessee Temple University, Chattanooga, Tennessee
- 2006-2007     Assistant to the Vice-President of Academic Services  
Tennessee Temple University, Chattanooga, Tennessee
- 2004-2006     National Education Director, American Association of Christian  
Schools Chattanooga, Tennessee
- 2001-2004     Assistant National Education Director, American Association of Christian  
Schools Chattanooga, Tennessee
- 1996-2001     Administrator, Temple Christian School  
Connersville, Indiana
- 1994-1996     Classroom Teacher, Temple Christian School  
Connersville, Indiana
- 1989-1994     Women's Basketball Coach/Faculty Member, Tennessee Temple  
University, Chattanooga, Tennessee