CHAPTER-I

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

"Faculty evaluation is one of the key factors determining the health and happiness of an academic department. Indeed, it is essential for the smooth administration functioning and collegial interaction of a department that there be clear, consistent, and equitable published guidelines which faculty members can rely on to provide them with the standards and procedures by which they will be evaluated."

(Eustis 1993:5)

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Students' Evaluation of Teachers (SET) is an issue, which is being debated by the college and university teachers throughout India. The debate started with the recommendation of SET by the Rastogi Committee, and has not concluded yet, even though its implementation has been withheld, for the time being, by the University Grant Commission (UGC). The UGC is still in a dilemma regarding the implementation of this recommendation, as it is being opposed by the teachers' organization. The issue of SET is so controversial that it has also divided the teachers into two warring group.

In order to improve the quality of higher education in our country the University Grants Commission has been making efforts for the last many years some of which proved fruitful, whereas many areas still need improvement and attention. For the last three decades almost all the commissions and committees appointed to suggest reforms in Indian higher education, have recommended the regular evalua-
tion of teachers' performance and ensuring their accountability. In 1971, the Sen Committee, while recommending higher pay scales had added the need for the Code of Conduct (Professional Ethics) to be a part of it. Although, pay scales were revised, this part could not be implemented. In 1986, the National Policy of Education recommended 'Annual Performance Appraisal' of teachers of Colleges and Universities. It suggests a 360 degrees feedback, which includes evaluation by self, peers, head of institutions/ departments, students and others. In 1987, Mehrotra Committee too stressed the need for compulsory annual submission of 'performance appraisal' (an assessment of the performance of teachers, which would encourage their accountability). The Mehrotra Committee recommended three modes of evaluation. The first is the Student's Assessment of Teachers. This has been a generally accepted practice in the IIT system for a long time. The IIT governing system, appointment method, promotion rules and admission norms are in no way comparable to the university and college system. But a genuine attempt to restore the lost dignity and decorum of the profession must be in great need.

After the Mehrotra, Rastogi and Chadha Committee report many theoretical articles, for and against SET, have been published in various journals and magazines that has brought this controversial issue into focus. According to the teachers, the idea of students assessing their teachers is kind of surrendering their dignity but this is a myth, as there is no research finding or fact to defend it in our education system. The debate on SET has not yet concluded even though its implementation has not been made mandatory, but optional for educational institutions by the UGC.

In higher education, the two major players/partners are the teacher and the student. In our present system of education, there is examination for the students and we feel that there is no need of evaluation of the teacher by the taught. Some educationists describe students as the best judges of their teachers' ability as they are the ones who know better than any one else. Teachers in every classroom strive to derive the admiration, regard and affection of the students, which is the result of an informal assessment of the teacher by the student.
In western countries, students' evaluation of teachers is a regular feature and plays a vital role even in appointment and promotion of teachers. In Australia, National Union of Students around 1970 made the demand, 'We want good teaching' as most teachers had engaged in research works. The students were alert about what they receive, whereas our students seldom ask for good education and teaching. In our country, the demand for the evaluation of teachers has not come from the students but from the academicians. Can our students be trusted to assess their teachers? Are they mature enough to it? Are they fully prepared to assess their teachers? Are the teachers ready to be assessed by their taught? What is the attitude of teachers and students toward SET?. These and many questions relating to SET have been agitating the minds of teachers, educational administrators and policy makers. These questions need to be addressed by the researchers.

1.2 DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

Teacher are always evaluated, the origin of the student evaluation of teaching and teacher's self-evaluation can be traced to the time of Socrates in the West and Panini in the East in about 6th century B.C. when they were gathered informally and unsystematically. According to Marsh, Socrates has been the first teacher held accountable by evaluation, he was executed in 399 B.C. for allegedly corrupting the youth of Athens with his teaching. Teacher evaluation can be traced to AD 350 in Antioch when father dissatisfied with their sons' education filed a formal complaint against the teacher. In medieval Europe, student committee monitored the information instructors covered, reported irregularities for which instructors were fined and determined instructors' salaries by considering how many students attended their classes. By the early 1800s in America, lay committees inspected Boston schools to determine if educational objectives were met.

Modern student evaluation programmes began in United States during the 20th century at several major universities. In 1924, Harvard students collected and printed student ratings of instructors in the Confidential Guide to Courses that inventoried student opinions of courses and professors. The modern era of evalua-
tion maybe divided into four periods (a) 1927-1960 (b) 1960s, (c)1970s and (d) 1980s to the present. During the first period, H.H. Remmers and his colleagues established the first systematic examination into student evaluations of teaching efficacy at Purdue University. During the 1960s, teaching evaluations were voluntary. However, the explosive development of SET is credited to the campus unrest of that decade, characterized by student protests concerning the Vietnam war, governmental and campus policies. Students demanded a voice in their education, either by organizing their own evaluation system or by pressuring institutions to develop evaluation instruments. The nature of the professoriate changed from the intellectual calling to a job requiring evaluations to meet the demands for public accountability. However, 1970s may be regarded a period where SET was used for formative evaluation and a number of research works had been done during this period. By the close of the decade, most institutions used student evaluations as the most important source for assessing instructional effectiveness, fulfilling higher education's administrative need for objective data for making bureaucratic decisions.

In India, in 1971 the Sen Committee while recommending higher pay scales had added the need for the Code of Conduct (Professional Ethics) to be a part of it. Although, pay scales were revised, this part could not be implemented. In 1987, Mehrotra Committee while recommending higher pay scales for teachers in university and colleges also recommended three modes of evaluation- self appraisal, student evaluation of teachers and evaluation by head. This recommendation could not be implemented due to the protest from the teaching community. Evaluation of teachers by students in higher education institutions is now catching on and as premier institutions of higher educations like the IITs, IIMs and a few eminent private college like St.Xaviers (Mumbai) have started practicing it successfully. However, in Mizoram wherein the present study has been conducted, student evaluation of teachers has been introduced on experimental
1.3 VARIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS ON EVALUATION OF TEACHER BY STUDENTS

For the last three decades, all the committees and Commissions appointed to suggest reforms in higher education, even Commission on Pay Report had recommended the regular teachers performance evaluation and ensuring their accountability.

In 1971, S.R. Sen Committee while recommending the higher pay scales had added the need for code of Professional Ethics to be made part of it. Pay scales were revised, but its recommendation on Code of Professional Ethics could not be implemented.

In 1986, National Policy and its Programme of Action (POA) recommended "Annual Performance Appraisal " of the teachers of educational institutions. In 1987, Mehrotra Committee appointed for revision of salaries of University and College teachers too stressed that teachers' students should evaluate performance and there should be compulsory annual submission of "performance appraisal".

The committee examined in detail the concept of students' assessment of teachers' performance in the light of frequent objections raised and apprehensions expressed. In this regard. The Committee came to the conclusion that limitations notwithstanding, the students' evaluation of the teacher, has to be accepted as one of the components for assessing a teachers performance. The Committee recommended that students' assessment be made a part of the evaluation procedure in all colleges and universities. A proforma has been designed to initiate the process.

In December, 1988, the UGC issued a notification regarding "Accountability in Higher Education" for all the Universities and its affiliated colleges that Self Appraisal Performance of the teacher's is to be made mandatory as a requirement of Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for the award of new pay scales and be implemented within a year.
Rastogi Committee (1997) which was set up to consider revision of pay-scale and service condition of all college and university teachers has recommended assessment of teachers by students; inclusion of code of conduct in the teachers' service contract; removal of legal restrictions of teachers' participation in elections and special facilities for women teachers. In this connection, the committee said, 'A reliable and credible system of evaluation by students of teachers' performance should be worked out carefully and meticulously and introduced gradually and selectively'.

The Chadha Pay Review Committee also pointed out the question of evaluating teachers' work and their academic accountability came up for discussion during almost all interaction between the Pay Review Committee and various stakeholders. Teachers observed that only a small percent of black sheep among them were getting them an adverse image in the eyes of the society at large about their academic accountability. They observed further that they had no objection to their performance being evaluated publicly including by students but they wanted the modes of evaluation and accountability to be transparent, unbiased, uniform and to be applied across the board to all categories of teachers – Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors and even Vice Chancellors.

After deliberating over the issue at length, the Pay Review Committee recommended that the evaluation of the teacher's work should have inputs from multiple sources—self assessment, assessment by students who have been taught a course/courses by the teacher and assessment by the academic head/heads and should be based on multiple parameters like classroom teaching, holding of tutorials, availability to students, participating in faculty meetings, guiding and carrying out research and participation in other academic and co-curricular activities of the department. The needed formal structure, based upon parameters relevant to universi-

ties and colleges respectively may be defined by the University Grants Commission (UGC) for carrying out such evaluation uniformly throughout the country.

Such evaluation should be made once a year and it should be communicated to the teacher concerned. It should also be made available to the selection committee at the time of promotion of the teacher.

National Knowledge Commission (2006-2009) Government of India in its full Report to the Nation also clearly mentioned - Measures taken to evaluate a teacher's performance and to promote the effectiveness of his/her teaching merit. Feedback information is intended to broadly serve the following purposes (i) To enable the teacher to know his/her strengths and deficiencies and use feedback information to improve his teaching and (ii) To give to the Head of the Department and the authorities of the Institute an indication of what the students feel about the performance of the faculty member as a teacher. If further added that in spite of inherent deficiencies, the exercise of student feedback and evaluation is an important and necessary one.²

In spite of all these recommendations and suggestions by different committees and commissions, teachers pay were revised but teachers are not being evaluated properly for their work, leave aside the evaluation of teachers by students, and accountability on the pretext of this or that. Whatever teachers' evaluation in the name of annual confidential report or through self appraisal is being done these days is just an eye wash and is not serving the very purpose of introducing the concept of teacher evaluation. Many times, teachers are strongly opposed to teacher evaluation by students on the pretext that students of our country are not matured enough to evaluate a teacher. In most of the advanced countries, SET becomes a part of higher education. In India also evaluation of teachers by students in higher education institutions is now catching on and as premier institutions of higher edu-

---

² Anil Kumar. Ensuring Teachers' Accountability through Performance Evaluation.
cation like the IITs and IIM and some eminent private colleges like St. Xaviers College, Mumbai; Nirma Institute of Technology under the Nirma University, Gandhi Nagar; VJTI, Mumbai are few such examples who allow their students to evaluate their teachers on regular basis.

1.4 MODES OF EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

The National Policy of Education (1986) recommended 'Annual Performance Appraisal' of teachers of Colleges and Universities. It suggested a 360 degrees feedback, which includes evaluation from self, peers, head of institutions, departments, students. All these four modes of evaluation have 90 degrees each, which all together is 360 degree. A brief description of these four modes of evaluation of teachers is as follows:

A. Self appraisal by teachers

The Mehrotra Committee recommended the immediate introduction of self appraisal in all institutions of higher learning". It was also suggested that the self-assessment report should included "factual information about the total workload, the average number of period spent by the teacher per day in the institution, the number of periods for which he/she conducted actual teaching/ practical/tutorials: and the number of days for which leave of any kind was availed of, etc".

However, except in a few cases, the State Governments/Universities did not evolve a system or frame regulations so as to ensure assessment and accountability of teachers. The UGC did some follow-up work by bringing forth a self-appraisal proforma and code of professional ethics for university and college teachers with the help of AIFUCTO. The overall impact in both cases has been far from noticeable.

4. Ibid.
The Committee reiterates that the self-appraisal proforma as in force (with modifications) should be made an annual feature of the review of teachers' performance as also an essential component for the grant of any type of incentive or upward movement in the career of a teacher. The Committee recommended that the appraisal form by each individual teacher be submitted annually. Universities/colleges should lay down a definite time-schedule for the submission of appraisal forms, their review and communication of comments, as and when required. Non-Submission of appraisal forms has to be viewed seriously and considered as a lapse that should invite action as per rules, to be framed in an appropriate manner. There should be a provision for review of the appraisal form by a committee constituted by the Executive Council/Synidicate/Board of Management, as the case may be.

In December, 1988, the UGC issued a notification regarding 'Accountability in Higher Education' for all universities and its affiliated colleges that Self Appraisal Performance of the teachers as a mandatory requirement of Career Advancement Scheme (CAS). However, this mode of evaluation did not reach the expected lines and this teacher evaluation in the name of annual confidential report or through self-appraisal which is being done these days is just as an eye wash and is not serving the very purpose of introducing the concept of teacher evaluation.

B. Evaluation by Peers

Peer evaluation is a process in which teachers use their own knowledge and experience to examine and judge the merit and value of another teacher. Peer evaluation is not so popular in our country. Teachers are familiar with institution goals, values, and problems. They know the subject-matter, curriculum, instructional materials. They are also aware of the actual demands, limitations, and opportunities that the classroom practitioners face. Teacher can also give highly specific feedback. It removes teacher-teacher isolation and can learn from each other effectively. It also promotes critical thinking, although the reliability of peer evaluation or assessment has been challenged from the perspective of subjectivity and
reciprocity effect. In comparison to the student evaluation, teacher grade their collegeau much higher which question its reliability and its validity. In Mehrotra and Rastogi Committee pay revision report, peer evaluation is not specifically mentioned and in India, this type of formal evaluating teacher is not common at all.

C. Evaluation by Head of the institution

This is the common assessment technique used in our country and in almost all the commissions and committee this mode of evaluation had been mentioned. In 2008 again, UGC's latest Pay Review Committee recommended "Multi-source evaluation—self assessment, assessment by students who have been taught a course by the teacher and assessment by the academic head/s". The National Knowledge Commission (2006-2009) also recommended that the feeling of the students on the teachers should be informed to the Head of the department and the authority of the institute to incorporate in the evaluation of the teachers. But, like self appraisal, this mode of evaluation is used being to wash our hands and only in name sake, and is not serving the purpose of introducing the concept of teacher evaluation. Research also suggests that many principals have difficult time in evaluating teachers, for reasons ranging from lack of knowledge of the subject being taught to disinclination to upset working relationship.6

D. Evaluation of the teachers by students

For the last three decades all the committees and commissions appointed to suggest reforms in higher education had recommended the regular evaluation of teachers' performance and ensuring their accountability.

In 1987, Mehrotra Committee appointed for revision of salaries had stressed that teacher performance should be evaluated by students. The pay revision part was accepted and due to the opposition from the teacher organizations this new mode of evaluation of teachers was dropped.

Rastogi Committee (1997) which was set up to consider revision of pay-scale and service conditions of all college and university teachers recommended assessment of teachers by students but in this pay revision also the pay hike was accepted and introduction of SET was dropped again.

In 2008, again UGC's latest Pay Review committee also recommended multi-source evaluation-self assessment, assessment by students who had been taught a course by the teacher and assessment by the academic head/s. In all these SET was not accepted due to the pressure from the teacher organizations.

1.5 PURPOSES OF STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Seldin (1984) state that the main purpose of the Student Evaluation of Teachers is to improve teaching by moving towards excellence. He further, explains that "The cornerstone of every faculty evaluation program is its purpose: the purpose influences the kinds of questions asked, sources of data, depth of data analysis, and dissemination of findings." Modern Student Evaluation of Teachers practices are originally designed as a benign tool to be used formatively in support of faculty development and self improvement.

Today, in advanced countries higher education administrators depend on SET information to appraise the elusive idea of instructional quality in a quantitative, concrete and reportable method. They use the SET process because it generally accessible, apparently quantitative and offer an equivalent basis of information collection among institutions.

Faculty performance evaluation is essential to substan a high standard of excellence, effectiveness and accountability. According to Zelly, the fundamental purpose was to provide information that could be beneficial to students and faculty. While, Seldin pointed that the purposes of student evaluations are to improve per-

formance and provide rationale for rationale for administrative decisions on tenure, promotion and retention. Other purposes served by evaluation are (a) aiding student choice of courses and instructors, (b) measuring the quality of the course for curriculum development, (c) providing process description for research on teaching (d) clarifying future performance expectation of the faculty and administrators, and (e) maintaining communication between faculty and administration.

1.6 RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

Student evaluation of teachers (SET) has assumed great significance after its recommendation Rastogi and Mehrotra. It is still being debated by college and university teachers as well as students throughout the country. The debate started with the recommendations of SET by Mehrotra and Rastogi committee and has not concluded yet. The debate has thrown many research questions for which there are no readymade answers.

A review of related literature on SET reveals that although this area has been thoroughly investigated by the researchers abroad, the same field in India except few theoretical articles for and against SET and empirical studies looks dry and virgin. Further, a perusal of entries in the four 'Surveys of Research in Education' also reveals that not even a single study on students evaluation of teachers was conducted in India till 1988, which is sheer neglect of this area by Indian researchers. The most important reason for not undertaking research in this area was the absence of SET in our institutions of higher learning, barring a few pace setting institutions like IITs and IIMs. After the Mehrotra and Rastogi Commission' reports many theoretical articles for and against SET were published in many journals which brought this area into limelight. The authors of these articles, no doubt have logically express their own opinion various issues related to SET, but have failed to reflect the views of students and teachers who will ultimately determine the success or failure of this innovation. Besides, there are many questions relating to SET

---

that have been agitating the minds of people in the field of education. Some of these questions are - what is the attitude of students towards SET? Do students think themselves fit for the evaluation of their teachers? Will they be able to evaluate their teachers objectively? Will the rating of teachers by students be consistent over years? Will the introduction of SET will lead to the lowering of status of teachers? Do the introduction of SET will create tensions between students and teachers? These and many more questions relating to the evaluation of teachers by their students need to be investigated by Indian researchers. Hence, the present study on the attitude of students towards SET that will address some of the aforesaid questions

1.7 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of the present study has been stated as follows:

"A Study of Attitude of Mizo Students towards Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET)"

1.8 OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

(i) To construct an attitude scale towards Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET).

(ii) To study the attitude of students towards Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET).

(iii) To compare the attitude of Science, Arts and Commerce students towards Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET), and to find out the significant differences if any.

(iv) To compare the attitude of male and female students towards Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET) and to find out the significant difference if any.

(v) To compare the attitude of under graduate and post graduate students and find out the significant differences if any.

(vi) To do the content analysis of the attitude of students towards Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET).
1.9 HYPOTHESES
The study shall be undertaken to test and verify the following hypotheses:
(i) Students have an indifferent attitude towards Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET).
(ii) The academic stream does not have a significant influence on the attitude of students towards Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET).
(iii) There is no significant difference between the attitude of Male and Female students towards Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET).
(iv) There is no significant difference between the attitude of Undergraduate students and Post Graduate students towards Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET).

1.10 OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF THE TERMS USED
The key terms used in the title of the study carry some specific meaning. The operational definition of these terms is discussed as follows:-

**Attitude**
'Attitude' is an acquired or learned tendency to react towards or against something or somebody. It is a positive or negative value, respectively for the subject viewpoints.

**Mizo Students**
'The term Mizo Students in this study refers to the students belonging to Mizo community that were studying in the Mizoram University and its affiliated colleges at the time of data collection.

**Students Evaluation of Teachers**
The term Students Evaluation of Teachers in this study refers to the formal and systematic assessment of teacher performance by their students.
1.11 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

(i) Students evaluation of teachers in this study is restricted only to the teaching effectiveness of teacher.

(ii) The present study is delimited to Mizo students studying in the Mizoram University and its affiliated colleges at the time of data collection.

(iii) The study is restricted to college and university students only in Mizoram.

1.12 ORGANISATION OF THE REPORT

The report of the present study has been organized in the following seven (7) chapters.

CHAPTER-I : CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The first chapter is conceptual framework which begins with the introduction of Students' Evaluation of Teachers (SET), development of Students' Evaluation of Teachers (SET), various recommendations on Evaluation of Teachers by Students and modes of Evaluation and Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET). In addition, the chapter deals with rationale of the study, statement of the problem, objective and hypotheses of the study. Operational definition of the term used and delimitations of the study have been included in this chapter.

CHAPTER-II : REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents a gist studies reviewed relating to SET, studies related to SET, studies related to the attitude of teachers towards SET and Studies related to students attitude towards SET. This chapter also deals with relevance of the present study in relation to the studies already conducted.
CHAPTER-III: METHODOLOGY

The third chapter describes the method and procedure adopted for the present study. The method of study, population, sample and sampling design, construction of tools, collection and tabulation of data and statistical techniques for data analyses have been discussed in this chapter.

CHAPTER-IV: ATTITUDE TOWARDS STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

This chapter deals with the steps and procedures followed for the construction and standardization of the attitude scale, scoring and interpretation of Attitude Scale. This chapter also describes attitude of respondents towards Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET) in relation to their gender, academics stream and level of education. The analyses of data relating to the significance of differences with respect to the previously mentioned independent variables have also been included in this chapter.

CHAPTER-V: CONTENT ANALYSIS OF STUDENT’ ATTITUDE TOWARDS SET

This chapter describes the content analysis of the attitude of students towards Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET).

CHAPTER-VI: MAJOR FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This chapter is the concluding chapter, which is devoted to summary of findings, discussions, recommendations and suggestions for further studies.