International Journal of Educational Management

Business students' perceptions of faculty evaluations

Mohammad Ahmadi Marilyn M. Helms Farhad Raiszadeh

# Business students' perceptions of faculty evaluations

**Mohammad Ahmadi**
College of Business Administration, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Chattanooga, USA
**Marilyn M. Helms**
Dalton State College, Dalton, USA
**Farhad Raiszadeh**
College of Business Administration, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Chattanooga, USA

**Keywords**
Students, Evaluations, Performance, Ratings, Perceptions

**Abstract**
Students are asked to evaluate faculty on a continual basis at most universities throughout the world, yet students have varying perceptions about the purpose and usefulness of these evaluations. While research has focused on the faculty issues regarding evaluations and their use in subsequent evaluation, yearly reviews, tenure decisions, and even post-tenure review, little research has been conducted to evaluate student feelings on the evaluations. In a case study format, a random sample of College of Business Administration students from freshman to EMBA levels was polled about their perceptions of the student ratings of faculty. The results provide interesting insights into their perceptions as well as constructive ideas on how better to administer the evaluations and publish the results. Results can benefit not only business schools but also other colleges in improving the evaluation process and linking the results to other rewards and faculty improvement mechanisms.



## Introduction

Students are asked to complete faculty evaluation forms for their classes at most universities and colleges throughout the world. Some evaluate faculty each semester, others only at certain times of the year. Regardless of the evaluation interval, there are many arguments both for and against the evaluations.

Some faculty finds evaluations by students to be invalid, questioning whether their students, who are not trained in the course material, can adequately judge the class or its methods. Other faculty finds that those colleagues who are known to be the easier graders, those with the best personalities, or those who teach elective courses receive higher scores from students than those in required or major courses. In addition, there are long-term issues of learning, retention, and benefit from a course that extend well beyond the immediate evaluation that are not reflected in the evaluation results.

Administrators also seem to have mixed reviews on how best to incorporate the students' evaluations in critiquing a faculty member's performance. Should they be used for yearly evaluations, tenure decisions, and post-tenure review? Questions remain. At some universities, faculty members are the only ones who see the evaluations and may share them with their department heads/chairs and deans only if they choose to do so. They may not be included as part of a faculty member's dossier or teaching notebook.

Students, too, seem confused about the purpose and value of the ratings. Some fill them out as quickly as possible believing they will not make any difference in course content, process, and faculty administration of the course. Others write numerous comments hoping they will make a difference. Often faculty believes students who either really like the course or really dislike the course fill out comment sheets while the median group of students never writes any comments. Consequently the faculty feels these comments from the silent majority would be the most valuable. Some schools use only the computerized Scantron forms with no open-ended forms for additional student feedback. Still other schools post evaluations of faculty and courses in student newspapers, on Web sites and in other publications for students.

With the mixed feelings on the faculty evaluations, the topic deserves further research in a detailed case-study methodology format. This paper evaluated the views of College of Business Administration students toward faculty evaluations at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, an AACSB accredited business program. Business majors at the undergraduate, graduate, and Executive MBA levels both on the Chattanooga campus and in the distance learning program (at Knoxville, TN) were polled randomly and asked to complete a five-page survey of their perceptions. Results will be used to aid in improving faculty evaluation instruments and suggestions will aid implementation at other business schools and universities in general.

## Literature review

Student evaluations have become routine at most colleges and universities. They are widely used for a variety of reasons, most of which focus upon faculty and administrative purposes. Faculty purports to use the student ratings for feedback concerning not only their teaching, but also for indications of strengths and weaknesses within their course and/or program. What is probably more important concerning student evaluations is their use in decision making. They are used to provide norms for faculty ratings which in turn affect decision making at the administrative level concerning faculty salary increases, retention, promotion, pre-tenure and post-tenure reviews.

The volume of studies done in this area is overwhelming. So, too, are the results, most of which are conflicting and inconclusive, to say the least. Still the research goes on, and in spite of all the criticisms leveled at student

The International Journal of Educational Management
15/1 [2001] 12–22

[ISSN 0951-354X]



The International Journal of Educational Management
15/1 [2001] 12–22



evaluations of faculty, they continue to be utilized. Baba and Ace (1989) state that there will be even more emphasis upon the use and study of student evaluations in the future for the following reasons. There is a widespread acceptance of the notion of accountability within the educational systems because of the economic factor of heavier tax burdens to support public educational institutions.

The main reason why much of the research on the usefulness of student evaluations has resulted to contradictory and inconclusive outcomes is the use of different methodologies and statistical procedures. It all centers on the main question of how one accurately measures teacher effectiveness. The researcher's viewpoint or literature basis used to measure teacher effectiveness affects the methodology and statistical procedures of the research. So, despite legitimate efforts to keep the study objective, subjectivity is a major part of measuring teacher effectiveness.

It can become difficult to distinctively know what is actually being evaluated by the students. Bruton and Crull (1982) considered two questions. Is it the instructor or the instruction that is being evaluated, and how much effect do non-cognitive factors have on students' evaluations? Costin *et al.* (1971) examined what constituted effective teaching by reviewing a number of studies. Characteristics of effective teaching ranged from aspects of creativity, personality and entertainment, to knowledge of and preparation of subject material. A number of studies (see, for example, Abrami *et al.*, 1980; Bruton and Crull, 1982; Buck, 1998; Costin *et al.*, 1971; Greenwald, 1997; Greenwald and Gillmore, 1997; Koon and Murray, 1995; Marsh, 1980, 1984; Marsh and Roche, 1997; Marsh *et al.*, 1975), therefore, have focused on validity of students' evaluations and their use as a measure of teaching effectiveness.

## Validity of students' evaluations

Mark Clayton (1998, p. 5) quotes William Pallett – Director of the IDEA Center at Kansas State University in Manhattan, a unit that helps colleagues analyze students' evaluations, as saying "student evaluations should not become the dominant influence in personnel decisions, but all too often they do. When that occurs, bad things do happen." Concerning the validity of students' evaluations, Clayton refers to the case of Anthony Greenwald, professor of psychology at the University of Washington at Seattle, whose students' ratings dropped from the very top in one year to the very bottom in the following year, for the same course while using the same syllabus and same teaching method, as an example.

Marsh *et al.* (1975) focused on instructional quality based on performances on standardized final examinations correlated with instructor rating. Their findings suggested that student evaluations are valid measures of instructional quality. Marsh (1984) later used the construct validation approach in evaluating student ratings as a measure of teaching effectiveness, maintaining that teaching effectiveness is multifaceted with no single criterion of effective teaching. His study emphasized the inconclusiveness of student evaluations in general, but still stated that they are useful, but should be used with caution.

Students' evaluations have also come under scrutiny for their reliability, due to a variety of reasons outside of the instructor's control. Class size, relation of the sex of the instructor to the sex of the student evaluator, prior interest in the subject-matter, administrative leniency, academic field, faculty leniency, instructor characteristics, and expected grade have been the focus of numerous studies. Grade leniency in particular has received significant attention from both opponents and proponents of students' evaluation of faculty (see, for example, Abrami *et al.*, 1980; Chacko, 1983; Holmes, 1972; Howard and Maxwell, 1980; Marsh, 1980, 1987; Marsh and Dunkin, 1992; Powell, 1977; Snyder and Clair, 1976; Vasta and Sarmiento, 1979; Worthington and Wong, 1979). Some of these studies have indicated major concerns about the effects of grades on students' ratings. In their study, Snyder and Clair (1976) manipulated student grades upward and downward and observed that student ratings were raised or lowered correspondingly. They concluded that:

> The present evidence, then, support the notion that a teacher can get a "good" rating simply by assigning "good" grades. The effect of obtained grades may bias students' evaluation of the instructor and therefore challenges the validity of ratings used on many college and university campuses (p. 81).

In a similar study, Worthington and Wong (1979) concluded that instructors who influence grades are much more likely to receive better evaluations.

A number of researchers (Abrami *et al.*, 1980; Marsh, 1980, 1987; Marsh and Dunkin, 1992) have discussed possible flaws with respect to published experiments that suggest that manipulated grades affect ratings. Greenwald (1997) surveyed the classroom experiments on the effect of grade manipulation and concluded that there was evidence that grade manipulation did affect students' ratings (as referred to in

The International Journal of Educational Management
15/1 [2001] 12–22



Greenwald (1997). A remedy, however, is suggested by Greenwald and Gillmore (1997), to remove the unwanted influence of instructors' grading leniency on ratings. They suggest to identify markers in student ratings data and use a statistical correlation technique to remove the unwanted influence of ratings, which might be produced by lenient grading.

Reliability and validity of students' evaluations have been challenged due to gender and personality effects as well. A few such studies have been done by Bachen *et al.* (1999), Basow and Silberg (1987), Dukes and Victoria (1989), Williams and Ceci (1997). The gender research is not conclusive and at times is also contradictory. In Basow and Silberg's (1987) study, male students gave female professors significantly poorer ratings on six of the evaluation measures. Moreover, the female students as well evaluated female professors lower on three of those measures.

Dukes and Victoria (1989) examined the effect of gender, status, and effective teaching on students' evaluations, using four different scenarios depicting knowledge of the subject, enthusiasm for teaching, rapport with students, and organization of the course. According to this study, the authors concluded, "although statistical interactions revealed some gender bias, effective teaching had by far the most influence on teaching evaluations" (p. 447). In their survey of 500 students, Bachen *et al.* (1999) tried to assess whether or not their ratings of their male and female professors was influenced by their perceptions of male and female faculty. They concluded that students' assessment of male and female professors are guided, to some extent, by their sex-role expectations and evaluations. Female students rated female professors especially high across five teaching dimensions. On the other hand, male students did not evaluate male and female professors significantly differently. These research findings indicate that, besides gender, there should be other factors involved in students' evaluations, for example, students' background or learning styles.

## Usefulness of students' evaluations

Consequent to validity concerns, students' evaluations of faculty have been extensively debated for their usefulness. Buck (1998) challenges the use of students' evaluations as being synonymous with teaching effectiveness as it is referred to in the literature. Instead of the present format of students' evaluations, he suggests evaluations should be made on the amount of learning that has taken place during the semester in light of the course objectives. He feels:

> Having instructors publicly report their teaching effectiveness in this manner has many positive implications. Students might base their registration decisions on which instructors are more successful at getting students to reach their desired goals rather than which instructors give "easy As" (p. 1225).

Armstrong (1998) raises questions about usefulness of students' evaluations. He maintains that students' ratings of teachers are intended to change the behavior of teachers. However, he found no evidence that the use of these evaluations improves learning in the long run; therefore, he believes that the resulting behavioral changes of students' rating are not likely to contribute to learning. He expressed concern that:

> Faculty members might tailor the class to try to appeal to the least common denominator to avoid having dissatisfied students. At many schools, most teachers are rated "above average" (about four on a five-point scale). Rating of "1" by disgruntled students can drag a teacher's average substantially. Teachers may make their classes less challenging and ... They may give higher grades in the belief that this improves rating (p. 1223).

Many other researchers have attributed the recent grade inflation phenomena (Benbrow and Stanley, 1996; Cahn, 1986; Goldman, 1985; Greenwald and Gillmore, 1997; Redding, 1998; Tabachnick *et al.*, 1991) to the use, or misuse, of students' evaluations. Goldman (1985) concludes that students' evaluations fuel inflation, something that Redding (1998) considers to be "a primary contributor to declining academic standards and 'dumbing-down' of the curriculum" (p. 1227).

Although there is research support for the validity of students' evaluations and, consequently, for their usefulness (Abrami *et al.*, 1980; Marsh, 1980, 1987; Marsh and Dunkin, 1992), there is an emerging view that students' evaluations are a weak measure of teaching effectiveness and should not be the sole source of faculty evaluations by their administrators. Recognizing their overall validity, Koon and Murray (1995) conclude, "in general, however, evidence of unknown validity, specially without comparative information on other faculty members, should be used with caution and should not be assigned much weight in promotion decisions" (p. 77). Simpson (1995), acknowledging that students' evaluations possess a positive relationship with student learning, complains that "in some cases, however, they have been taken to such extremes that their original values have been diminished. There are still a lot of lessons to be learned how to merge student evaluations with other sources of information" (p. 5).

Cashin (1989) believes that most student evaluation forms are mainly concerned with the delivery of instruction. Other two areas

The International Journal of Educational Management
15/1 [2001] 12–22



of evaluation deal with instructor's grading and availability, i.e. contacts with students outside the class. He maintains that a comprehensive teaching evaluation should contain other areas such as curriculum development, course design, and subject-matter mastery. He recognizes, however, that these are areas that students are not qualified to evaluate. In his 1990 paper, Cashin suggests that a more comprehensive approach to evaluating teaching effectiveness is needed. He offers several recommendations in five distinct categories, i.e. general consideration, the overall system, the student rating form itself, its administration, and its interpretation. One particular recommendation that he believes may help improve the process is to develop a student rating system that is flexible as instructional goals may vary widely from course to course. Therefore, he suggests using a cafeteria-type system that provides a pool of items and give instructors the flexibility to select only items that fit their course. This, according to Cashin (1990), will be a tremendous improvement over many rating methods that apply a form containing a single set of items. Such methods "assume that there is a single, correct way, to teach and that every instructor in every class should do all of the things listed" (p. 5).

In contrast to innumerable studies on effectiveness of students' evaluations from the instructor's point of view, very little study has been conducted concerning students' opinions about the value of student evaluations. In a past study, Costin *et al.* (1971) indicated that students felt their ratings would affect a teacher's future classroom performance, but not their status or advancement. They generally had a positive perception and utilized independence in their ratings. Also, no significant correlations were found between the responses of the students with GPA and college year. More research is needed in the area of student evaluations as there remain many unanswered questions. The focus of the present study, however, is to develop an insight into students' perception of the present student evaluation system.

## Methodology

A questionnaire was developed based on a review of the literature on student evaluations of faculty (see Appendix). The survey polled students on the frequency of completion of the forms, time to complete, and other general demographic questions including classification, major, overall grade-point-average, gender, and ethnicity. The form also allowed for general comments in addition to a series of five-point Likert-scaled questions on their perceptions of the value of the evaluations and their level of satisfaction with the process. Business classes in the fall of 1999 were sampled, as UT-Chattanooga only requires evaluations of all courses during the fall semesters. Only new courses and/or new faculty are evaluated in the spring semester or summer semesters unless a faculty member makes a special request to be evaluated from the Office of Institutional Research. Typically only faculty under consideration for tenure decisions or post-tenure review made these requests.

## The sample

It was decided to select a sample size that at a 95 percent confidence level would result in a sampling error of less than 5 percent. The sample size was estimated to be 385 responses. Not knowing the usable response rate, it was decided to distribute 500 questionnaires in order to compensate for the unusable response issues. Fortunately, all of the 500 responses were usable, thus reducing the sampling error to less than 4.4 percent. The sample size of 500 out of possible 1,735 business majors in the three programs represents 28.8 percent of the population surveyed. Professors and graduate assistants visited classes during the end of class during the last four weeks of the semester to administer the questionnaire. It was explained to the students that they should not write their names or make any identifying marks on the questionnaire to assure confidentiality. Furthermore, they were assured that their responses would be analyzed collectively. The questionnaire was validated (face validity) by four tenured professors representing business strategy, marketing research, statistics, and operations research. The questionnaire also went through four iterations of modification and testing on a focus group of students (not included in the final sample). The reviewers were asked to evaluate the questionnaire for its clarity and appropriateness of questions to ensure the questionnaire was easy to complete and that questions were both clear and relevant. A random sample of classes and mix of day and night and weekend classes was selected from the published list of business classes for the semester.

## Results

### Completing the evaluation forms

Students sampled had completed evaluations at least three times while at

UTC, accounting for three years of study (22.2 percent had completed one evaluation, 21.5 percent had completed two evaluations, 21.3 percent completed three, and 34.3 had completed four. Only 0.6 percent had completed five or more). However, students commented that on average, the purpose of the student evaluation forms had been explained to them less than twice (1.9659 with a standard deviation of 1.06 and the largest percentage 44.8 percent reporting an explanation was given only once) by the proctor or administrator. Often faculty members choose a student in the class to administer the forms. While instructions are provided in the evaluation packet, it appears they are not read each time that the evaluations are completed.

When asked about the time it takes to complete the evaluation form, students on average reported a mean time of 2.23 minutes. The evaluation form consists of two parts – a scantron computer form of 35 questions about the instructor's effectiveness and six questions regarding the characteristics of the responding students. The second part of the form is an open-ended sheet for students to handwrite their comments. Students were asked if they were given adequate time to complete the survey, and 55.3 percent indicated that they were always given ample time. To verify the time needed, students were asked how much time they thought it should take to complete the survey and the mean response was 2.56 minutes, so it appears that students may be rushing through the survey without paying as much attention to the details or comments.

## Student perceptions of benefits and results of evaluating faculty

The next series of questions polled students on their objectivity in answering the evaluation forms. A five-point Likert-scale ranging from "Strongly Agree"– 1, through "Strongly Disagree"– 5, was used. Students agreed they were objective (79.4 percent reported strongly agree or agree) and serious (89.6 percent reported strongly agree or agree) when completing the forms. In addition they agreed the results of the student evaluations were important to the faculty members.

Interestingly they disagreed (87.6 percent reporting disagree or strongly disagree) to the question regarding rating a faculty member higher than she/he deserves because they are afraid it could affect their grade in the current course and in future courses taken from the same instructor. (Faculty at UTC receives the student evaluation results the following semester. A printout of the computer results is provided along with copies of the actual open-ended student comments.)

To assess whether easy courses fared better in student evaluations, students were asked if they rate a faculty member who give little or no homework with a higher rating. Results showed they disagreed with this statement as 77 percent "disagreed" to "strongly disagreed" with this statement. They also disagreed that they gave higher ratings for faculty with easy exams. However, they agreed (63.1 percent) that they tend to give higher evaluations to faculty members with a good sense of humor. Responses ranged between neutral and disagreement about rating a faculty member higher who is known for giving better grades.

They also disagreed (87.8 percent) that they gave higher ratings to faculty members of the same gender as the student and disagreed (86.7 percent) that they gave higher ratings to faculty members of the opposite gender, so it appears that the sample did not exhibit gender biases in the evaluations. They disagreed (72.3 percent) that they give a higher rating to faculty members teaching a course in their major versus an elective or non-major course.

The next questions concerned the implementation of the results of the evaluations. Students polled were neutral about whether the faculty member's future teaching performance will improve based on the results of the student evaluations. But they agreed (82.6 percent) that the future teaching performance *should* improve based on the results. They disagreed (60.5 percent) that a faculty member's salary will be affected by the student evaluations but were neutral (less disagreement) that their salary *should* be affected by the results. When asked about faculty advancement, the students were neutral as to whether advancement of the faculty will be affected by the student evaluations but agreed (68.3 percent) that it *should* be affected. This is an interesting finding since many courses discuss performance-based outcomes and metrics tied to performance. It seems students are moving in the direction of more accountability.

Students did agree (81.1 percent) that faculty evaluations are important and necessary as a process. Students varied in their responses about whether they discussed opinions of the professor with other classmates before the evaluations. Answers ranged from 26.9 percent who never discuss the professor, to 25.3 percent who seldom discuss the professor, to 33.9 percent who sometimes discuss the professor with their classmates. Only 9.8 percent often discuss the professor and only 4.2 percent always do.

As to the format of the evaluations, students felt the questions were somewhat appropriate

(45.3 percent) yet multiple faculty committees are working to devise a new form. Student Rating of Faculty Instruction Committee is a standing committee and work on the revision and modification of the evaluation instrument every year. Students only sometimes (38.7 percent) admitted to writing comments on the open ended comment sheet (supplementary sheet) and felt they did not do so because of time constraints (38.9 percent), fear of responses not being anonymous (14.7 percent), the belief that the form is useless (28.7 percent), and indifference (17.7 percent). Under other comments (18.4 percent), the most frequent response was "I do not have anything to say," followed by "I do not think my comments make any difference," and "I write comments when something is exceptionally good or exceptionally bad".

When asked to rate each part of the form, students felt the handwritten comments were most valuables (79.7 percent) and also the most effective (76.5 percent). Faculty in the College of Business also agree that written comments offer more actionable feedback than responses to the question "Was this instructor an effective teacher?" Most faculty score in the high range on this question making responses and generalizations difficult.

## Administration of the evaluations and posting the results

Traditionally the forms are administered at the end of class at one of the course's last class meetings. When asked about the best time for an evaluation, students were mixed in their responses. Forty percent felt the beginning of class was best, while 34.5 percent felt the end was superior, and 25.5 percent felt it did not matter. When asked about publishing the results (as some other universities do) 66.5 percent of the students wanted the results published, while 19.0 percent did not, and another 14.5 percent were not sure. Students reported places of publication possibilities in an open-ended response question. Their preferences, in order of frequency, are listed in Table I.

The student newspaper was mentioned by over half the students (54.9 percent), while the Web was the second choice (16.4 percent). Other sources included posting in the library, in the student handbook, in the hallways, in the student class schedule, on the Internet, in the student center, and with the department head.

Some 86.6 percent of the students agreed that each course should be evaluated and 84.7 percent indicated that each course should be evaluated each semester in which the course is offered (including spring, any of the seven summer semesters, and fall) instead of once per year as is currently the norm.

UTC, as part of the University of Tennessee system, implemented post-tenure review in 1999 and is concerned about other metrics of faculty evaluation. Students were asked if other methods of evaluation should be used in addition to the student evaluations. Fifty-one percent of the students favored other methods while 24.4 percent did not, and 24.8 percent remained neutral in the use of other methods. Options provided included: survey of local employees of College of Business Administration graduates (favored by 21.2 percent), evaluations by the Dean or Department Heads (36.9 percent), results of certification exams (like the CPA pass rates) (19.2 percent), survey of alumni (17.0 percent), evaluation by other faculty members (34.4 percent) and other methods (6.4 percent).

UTC currently does not have formal means to evaluate courses other then the student evaluations. Peer review is optional at the faculty's request but few if any faculty in the COBA had used this review.

## Sample demographics

Table II provides the general demographic of the sample. The characteristics of the sample such as classifications, majors, gender, and ethnicity were very close to the characteristics of the population of students, indicating the sample was indeed representative of the population.

Freshmen typically do not declare a major and few are in COBA courses until they complete their general education requirements. The other classification includes audit and unclassified students. EMBA and MBA students were both reported as graduate students. The majority of the respondents were Caucasians (83 percent); also the majority were juniors (31.3 percent), which are both the true characteristics of the population.

## Conclusions and discussion

The majority of research on the topic of student evaluation of professors has dealt with the use of student evaluations for decision making – decisions made by the administration for evaluation of faculty's performance, hence affecting professors' pay increases, retention, and promotion. A number of studies have focused on the validity of students' evaluations and their use as a measure of teaching effectiveness. Limited research has focused on the student side of the evaluation process, that is, looking at what students consider important

and how they perceived the evaluation process works. In this study, the focus has been placed on the attitudes and beliefs of students regarding the evaluation. Attention has been placed on issues such as students' objectivity and seriousness when answering questions. A set of questions was designed to determine what makes a teacher get a higher rating. Other issues included the perception of students regarding the importance of the evaluation process for the purposes of salary increases and the advancement of the faculty. Finally, some questions dealt with the type of evaluation questions students perceived to be more valuable and more effective.

A large majority of the students attest that they are objective and serious when answering the questions, which implies that students actually are interested in having their opinions heard. The majority felt that the faculty's advancement and salary increases should be affected by the results of the student evaluation, but they did not perceive that the results will actually have any effect. Most of the students indicated that they do not rate the faculty any higher than the faculty deserves due to fear of having their grades affected in the current course or future courses taken from the same faculty. Courses with no homework and instructors known for giving easier exams did not get a better rating, but instructors with a better sense of humor were rated higher. Results showed that students did not have any gender bias, as a very large majority did not give a higher rating to the faculty just because the gender of the faculty was the same as or different from the gender of the student.

Regarding the faculty's future teaching performance, it was felt that the future teaching performance of the faculty should improve based on the results of the student evaluations. The student evaluations were perceived to be very important and definitely necessary and should be done every semester for every course. The students' written comments were considered to be much more valuable and effective than the standard questions on the questionnaire.

Regarding the publication of the results of the student evaluations, the majority felt that the results should be published. The student newspaper was the number one choice followed by placing the results on the World Wide Web.

**Table I**
Sources of possible publication for student ratings of faculty

| | % |
|---|---|
| **Student newspaper** | 54.9 |
| **On the Web** | 16.4 |
| **In the hallways** | 4.9 |
| **In the library** | 4.5 |
| **In the student handbook** | 3.0 |
| **In the Department Head's office** | 3.4 |
| **In the student class schedule book** | 4.5 |
| **In the university/student center** | 3.7 |
| **In the class** | 1.5 |
| **Via the mail in report form** | 2.3 |
| **In the local paper** | 1.1 |
| **Everywhere** | 0.7 |
| **In the Bursar's office** | 0.4 |

**Table II**
Demographics of the sample

| | Percentage |
|---|---|
| **Gender** | |
| **Female** | 44.1 |
| **Male** | 55.9 |
| **Ethnicity** | |
| **African-American** | 15.8 |
| **Caucasian** | 83.0 |
| **Other** | 1.2 |
| **Classification** | |
| **Freshman** | 4.0 |
| **Sophomore** | 16.3 |
| **Junior** | 31.3 |
| **Senior** | 26.1 |
| **Graduate** | 21.1 |
| **Other** | 1.2 |
| **Majors** | |
| **General management** | 16.8 |
| **Industrial management** | 4.4 |
| **Accounting** | 19.0 |
| **Marketing** | 19.6 |
| **Entrepreneurship** | 1.6 |
| **Finance** | 12.6 |
| **Human resource management** | 4.8 |
| **Other** | 7.2 |
| **MBA general** | 13.8 |
| **Grade point average** | |
| **Less than 2.0** | 1.4 |
| **2.1 to 2.59** | 12.0 |
| **2.6 to 3.0** | 29.9 |
| **3.1 to 3.59** | 34.3 |
| **3.6 to 4.0** | 22.3 |

## References and further reading

Abrami, P.C. *et al.* (1980), "Do teacher standards for assigning grades affect student evaluations of instruction?", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 72, pp. 107-18.

Armstrong, J.S. (1998), "Are student ratings of instruction useful?", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 53 No. 11, pp. 1223-4.

Baba, V.V. and Ace, M.E. (1989), "Serendipity in leadership, initiating structure and consideration in the classroom", *Human Relations*, Vol. 42, pp. 509-25.

The International Journal of Educational Management
15/1 [2001] 12–22



Bachen, C.M. *et al.* (1999), "Assessing the role of gender in college students' evaluations of faculty", *Communication Education*, Vol. 48, pp. 193-210.

Basow, S.A. and Silberg, N.T. (1987), "Student evaluation of college professors: are female and male professors rated differently?", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 79 No. 3, pp. 308-14.

Benbrow, C.P. and Stanley, J.C. (1996), "Inequity in equity: how 'equity' can lead to inequity for high-potential students", *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, Vol. 2, pp. 249-92.

Bruton, B.T. and Crull, S.R. (1982), "Causes and consequences of student evaluation of instruction", *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 17, pp. 195-206.

Buck, D. (1998), "Student evaluation of teaching measure the intervention, not the effect", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 53 No. 11, pp. 1224-6.

Cahn, S.M. (1986), *Saints and Scamps: Ethics in Academia*, Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.

Cashin, W.E. (1989), *Defining and Evaluating College Teaching*, IDEA Paper No. 21, pp. 3-6.

Cashin, W.E. (1990), *Student Ratings of Teaching: Recommendations for Use*, IDEA Paper No. 22, pp. 3-7.

Chacko, T.I. (1983), "Student ratings of instruction: a function of grading standards", *Educational Research Quarterly*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 19-25.

Clayton, M. (1998), "Give me an 'A' professor – I'll give you one, too: do student evaluations prompt better teaching or 'pander pollution'?", *The Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 6-8.

Costin, F. *et al.* (1971), "Student ratings of college teaching: reliability, validity and usefulness", *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 41 No. 5, pp. 511-32.

d'Apollonia, S. and Abrami, P.C. (1997), "Navigating student ratings of construction", *American Psychology*, Vol. 52 No. 11, pp. 1198-206.

Dukes, R.L. and Victoria, G. (1989), "The effects of gender, status and effective teaching on the evaluation of college instruction", *Teaching Sociology*, Vol. 17, pp. 447-57.

Goldman, L. (1985), "The betrayal of the gatekeepers: grade inflation", *The Journal of General Education*, Vol. 37, pp. 97-121.

Greenwald, A.G. (1997), "Validity concerns and usefulness of student ratings of instruction", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 52 No. 11, pp. 1182-6.

Greenwald, A.G. and Gillmore, G.M. (1997), "Grading leniency is a removable contaminant of student ratings", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 52 No. 11, pp. 1209-17.

Greenwald, A.G. and Gillmore, G.M. (1998), "How useful are student ratings? Reactions to comments on the current issues section", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 53 No. 11, pp. 1228-9.

Holmes, D.S. (1972), "Effects of grades and disconfirmed grade expectancies on students' evaluations of their instructor", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 63, pp. 130-3.

Howard, G.S. and Maxwell, S.E. (1980), "Correlation between student satisfaction and grades: a case of mistaken causation?", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 72, pp. 810-20.

Koon, J. and Murray H.G. (1995), "Using multiple outcomes to validate student ratings of overall teacher effectiveness", *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 66 No. 1, pp. 61-81.

Marchese, T. (1997), "Student evaluations of teaching", *Change*, Vol. 29 No. 5, p. 4.

Marsh, H.W. (1980), "The influence of student, course and instructor characteristics on evaluations of university teaching", *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 17, pp. 219-37.

Marsh, H.W. (1984), "Students' evaluations of university teaching: dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases and utility", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 76, pp. 707-54.

Marsh, H.W. (1987), "Students' evaluations of university teaching: research findings, methodological issues and directions for future research", *International Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. II (Whole Issue No. 3).

Marsh, H.W. and Dunkin, M.J. (1992), "Students' evaluations of university teaching: a multidimensional perspective", in Smart, J.C. (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, Vol. 8, Agathon Press, New York, NY, pp. 143-233.

Marsh, H.W. and Roche, L.A. (1997), "Making students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective: the critical issues of validity, bias and utility", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 52 No. 11, pp. 1187-97.

Marsh, H.W. *et al.* (1975), "Validity and usefulness of student evaluations of instructional quality", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 67 No. 6, pp. 833-9.

Powell, R.W. (1977), "Grades, learning and student evaluation of instruction", *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 7, pp. 193-205.

Redding, R.E. (1998), "Students' evaluations of reaching fuel grade inflation", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 53 No. 11, pp. 1227-8.

Simpson, R.D. (1995), "Uses and misuses of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness", *Innovative Higher Education*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 3-5.

Snyder, C.R. and Clair, M. (1976), "Effects of expected and obtained grades on teacher evaluation and attribution of performance", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 68, pp. 75-82.

Tabachnick *et al.* (1991), "Ethics of teaching: beliefs and behaviors of psychologists as educators", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 46, pp. 506-15.

Vasta, R. and Sarmiento, R.F. (1979), "Liberal grading improves evaluations but not performance", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 71, pp. 207-11.

Williams, W.M. and Ceci, S.J. (1997), "'How'm I doing?': problems with student ratings of instructors and courses", *Change*, Vol. 29 No. 5, pp. 13-24.

Worthington, A.G. and Wong, P.T.P. (1979), "Effects of earned and assigned grades on student evaluations of an instructor", *Journal of Educational Psychology*.

The International Journal of Educational Management
15/1 [2001] 12–22



## Appendix. COBA students' perceptions of faculty evaluations

This short survey is designed to gather information from you, the UTC College of Business student, about your perceptions of the student evaluations of faculty. Your responses are completely confidential and will only be reported as overall aggregate totals. Please check or circle the appropriate response for each question.

1. Approximately how many student evaluation forms have you completed at UTC?

____Less than 5 ____5-9 ____10-15 ____More than 15

2. Before you are presented the evaluation form, approximately how many times has the purpose(s) of student evaluation form been explained to you? (Instructions were read to you by the proctor)

____Less than 5 times ____5-9 times ____10-15 times ____More than 15 times

3. On the average, how many minutes does it usually take you to complete the evaluation form?

____Less than 3 minutes ____3-5 minutes ____6-8 minutes ____More than 8 minutes

4. Do you feel you are given adequate time to complete the evaluation?

____Always ____Often ____Sometimes ____Seldom ____Never

5. How many minutes do you think you would need to complete the evaluation?

____Less than 3 minutes ____3-5 minutes ____6-8 minutes ____More than 8 minutes

6. I am objective when completing the evaluation of faculty.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

7. I am serious when completing the evaluation of faculty.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

8. I think the results of the student evaluations are important to the faculty members.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

9. I generally rate a faculty member higher than she/he deserves, since I am afraid that it could affect my grade in the current course.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

10. I generally rate a faculty member higher than she/he deserves, since I am afraid that it may affect my grade in any future course that I may take from the same faculty member.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

11. I generally rate a faculty member who gives little or no homework with a higher rating.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

12. I generally rate a faculty member who gives easy exams with a higher rating.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

13. I generally rate a faculty member with a good sense of humor with a higher rating.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

14. I generally rate a faculty member who is known for giving better grades with a higher rating.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

15. I give a higher rating to faculty members whose gender is the same as mine.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

16. I give a higher rating to faculty members whose gender is different from mine.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

17. I give a higher rating to faculty members teaching courses in my major.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

18. I think the faculty member's future teaching performance *will* improve based on the results of the student evaluations.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

19. I think the faculty member's future teaching performance *should* improve based on the results of the student evaluations.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

20. I think the faculty member's salary *will* be affected by the student evaluations.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

21. I think the faculty member's salary *should* be affected by the student evaluations.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

22. I think the faculty member's advancement *will* be affected by the student evaluations.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

23. I think the faculty member's advancement *should* be affected by the student evaluations.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

24. Overall I think the evaluations of faculty members are important and necessary.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

25. Before completing the student evaluations, do you discuss opinions of the professor with your classmates?

____Never ____Seldom ____Sometimes ____Often ____Always

26. How appropriate are the questions in the evaluation form?

____Extremely Appropriate ____Very Appropriate ____Somewhat Appropriate ____Appropriate ____Not at all Appropriate

27. Do you usually write comments on the supplementary sheet?

____Always ____Often ____Sometimes ____Seldom ____Never

28. If you do not always write comments on the supplementary sheet, check all the reasons why you do not.

____Time constraints ____Do not care

____Fear of response not being anonymous ____Other, (please specify)_____

____Believe it is useless

29. Which one of the evaluation forms is more valuable in evaluating your professors?

____Green computer form ____White sheet for handwritten comments

30. Which one of the evaluation forms is more effective in evaluating your professors?

____Green computer form ____White sheet for handwritten comments

31. When do you think is the best time to fill out a student evaluation?

____Beginning of scheduled class period ____End of scheduled class period ____Does not matter

32. Would you like the faculty evaluation results to be published?

____Yes ____No ____Not sure

If Yes, published where?_ _____ If No, why not publish?_____

33. I feel evaluations should be done for every course.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

34. I feel evaluations of a course should be done each semester in which the course is offered instead of once per year.

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

35. Should other methods of faculty evaluations be used in addition to student evaluations?

____Yes ____No ___Not sure

If yes which ones (Check all that apply):

____Survey of local employees of COBA graduates ____Survey of Alumni

____Evaluations by Dean or Department Head ____Evaluations by other faculty members

____Results of certification exams (like CPA pass rates) ____Other, (please specify)_____

36. Your classification:

____Freshman ____Sophomore ____Junior ____Senior ____Graduate student ____Other

37. Your major:

____General Management ____Marketing ____Human Resource Management

____Industrial Management ____Entrepreneurship ____Other_____

____Accounting ____Finance ____MBA, (please list concentration)_____

38. Your current overall GPA is

____ Less than 2.0

____ 2.00 - 2.59

____ 2.60 - 3.00

____ 3.01 - 3.59

____ 3.60 - 4.00

39. Your gender is: ____Male ____Female

40. Your ethnicity (race) is: _____

We would appreciate any comments or suggestions concerning the student evaluation forms and the current evaluation process. Please write them below

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU, WE GREATLY APPRECIATE YOUR TIME IN ANSWERING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

**This article has been cited by:**


1. Jonathan Bassett, Amanda Cleveland, Deborah Acorn, Marie Nix, Timothy Snyder. 2015. Are they paying attention? Students' lack of motivation and attention potentially threaten the utility of course evaluations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 1-12. [CrossRef]
2. Sanjiv Mittal, Rajat Gera, Dharminder Kumar Batra. 2015. Evaluating the validity of Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SET) in India. *Education + Training* **57**:6, 623-638. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]
3. 2014. An Evaluation of Course Evaluations. *ScienceOpen Research* . [CrossRef]
4. Ding Hooi Ting, Christina Kwai Choi Lee. 2012. Understanding students' choice of electives and its implications. *Studies in Higher Education* **37**, 309-325. [CrossRef]
5. Stephen Wilkins, Alun Epps. 2011. Student evaluation web sites as potential sources of consumer information in the United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Educational Management* **25**:5, 410-422. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]
6. Ann Mitsis, Patrick Foley. 2009. Culturally-anchored values and university education experience perception. *International Journal of Educational Management* **23**:6, 484-504. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]
7. Shivanand Balram, Suzana Dragićević. 2008. Collaborative spaces for GIS-based multimedia cartography in blended environments. *Computers & Education* **50**, 371-385. [CrossRef]
8. Ahmad Al-Issa, Hana Sulieman. 2007. Student evaluations of teaching: perceptions and biasing factors. *Quality Assurance in Education* **15**:3, 302-317. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]
9. 2005. A Study on Controlling the External Effect in Student Evaluation of Teaching. *Communications of the Korean statistical society* **12**, 589-601. [CrossRef]
10. Jeannette Kindred, Shaheed N. Mohammed. 2005. "He Will Crush You Like an Academic Ninja!": Exploring Teacher Ratings on Ratemyprofessors.com. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* **10**, 00-00. [CrossRef]
11. M.L. Emiliani. 2004. Improving business school courses by applying lean principles and practices. *Quality Assurance in Education* **12**:4, 175-187. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]
12. Paul M. Mason, Jeffrey W. Steagall, Michael M. Fabritius. 2003. The changing quality of business education. *Economics of Education Review* **22**, 603-609. [CrossRef]
13. YINING CHEN, LEON B. HOSHOWER. 2003. Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: An assessment of student perception and motivation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* **28**, 71-88. [CrossRef]