

Effect of Faculty Evaluation on Quality Education: A Study on Higher Educational Institutions in Bangladesh

Surajit Sarbabidya* and Md. Abdur Rashid**

Quality education is considered as the prime focus of each of the higher educational institution engaged in training and development of students as human resources. Towards this journey, the well trained and developed graduates represent as power and the faculty members who mentor them act as the amplifier of this power. Here, the role of faculties is very significant because their active, sincere and excellent performance can bring positive and qualitative change in the academia. This results in groomed leadership of graduates in the national development endeavors. But such dream can never be cherished unless the respective faculty members perform with their utmost capacities, commitment and contribution. To ensure due diligence of the faculty members, the practice of their performance evaluation is prioritized in the educational institutions. From this perspective the current study is a motivational attempt to identify the influencing factors of faculty evaluation which have positive impact on the quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh through a structured questionnaire based on primary survey during the month of November 10, 2017 to December 09, 2017. The findings of the current study indicates a good number of factors including humanistic quality and morality of the faculty members, well behaved, close and sincere relationship between faculty members and students, on time class attendance and course syllabus coverage, practically enriched teaching and learning, etc., enable effective grooming of the students and thus ensure quality education of the respective higher educational institutions in Bangladesh.

Keywords: Faculty Evaluation, Quality Education, Higher Educational Institutions

Field of Study: Education

1. Introduction

In improving education quality the role of academia at tertiary level is very significant because developing leadership for the various sectors in the country is often a great challenge for the higher educational institutions. But only the government financed national, open and public universities and their affiliated colleges cannot alone mitigate such challenge. The authority of higher educational institutions in the private sector also has a lot to contribute. Such kind of challenge management will ultimately see the positive outcome once quality education is ensured. Though educational institutions

*Professor, Department of Business Administration, School of Business, Britannia University, Comilla, Bangladesh. Email: surajitsarbabidya@gmail.com

**Assistant Professor, Department of English, School of Arts & Social Science, Britannia University, Comilla, Bangladesh.

share work between the faculty members and administration together, the faculty members play main role in this qualitative development of educational system; therefore their performance should be evaluated (Ghahrani et al., 2015) so that common problems existing in teaching can be identified and necessary course of actions can be taken. In this process, the evaluators ask students about problems they experienced in their education and report these problems to the appropriate administrative officers, particularly when students are reluctant to report the problem or when they do not know who to report the issues to (Wen SH et al., 2011). Researchers agreed on the significance of faculty evaluation in promoting “efficient teaching”, improving the quality of teaching, and reducing the number of dropouts (National Survey, 2002).

The present study, in this regard, is the result of motivation to identify the performance related factors of the faculty members who play main role in ensuring quality education in the academia. Realizing the importance of developing education quality in the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh, both primary and secondary data have been collected. The current paper is distinctive because this paper not only focuses on the performance related factors of the faculty members but also examines the qualitative changes in education in the post evaluation phase. However, the current study is not free from limitations. The major limitation of the present study is that the secondary data in the literature review section did not solely focus on the assessment of the impact of performance related factors of the faculty members on quality education in the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh.

Some of the previous papers adopted various qualitative frameworks or models while others focused on individual variables relating to the effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh. None of them completely focused on this very aspect of the subject matter. So, it is clearly evident that there is a research gap and to mitigate this gap a rigorous research is yet to be attempted. Since the previous researches have not shown the actual effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh, more researches are required in this field and in this respect the findings of this study are different than those of previous researches. To fill up the knowledge gap left out by the previous researches, the present study investigates the research question: “Is there any effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh?”. Here, with relation to the appropriate answer to the set research question, the current paper is found as unique and different from the previous studies because by using the mean analysis on the individual variables this study identified positive relation between faculty evaluation and quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh. The significance of the identified variables was verified and proved through various statistical tests including reliability, validity, mean and correlation analysis.

From the light of the above research question, the principal objective of this study is to examine whether faculty evaluation has any positive impact on the quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh or not so that the respective academic institutions can take appropriate measures to further improve their quality. This paper is organized with the various sections. Section 1 deals with introduction, Section 2 focuses

on the background of the study, Section 3 contains the theoretical framework; Section 4 portrays the literature review, Section 5 goes with the methodology of the study, Section 6 exhibits the analysis and findings, and Section 7 draws a constructive conclusion including uniqueness of the study, new findings, significance and implications and limitations.

2. Background of the Study

Since the primary responsibility of the faculty members to professionally develop the students, for their own professional development university professors require a system for assessing the effective performance during their careers (Aslam, 2011). Reddy (2006) encouraged to undertake faculty evaluation so that because of its convenient positive results, faculty members get active to improve their teaching process on a larger scale and create an atmosphere better education for students. This means that the performance of faculty evaluation system must transfer teachers to improve teaching methods and bring about the desired change and increase productivity by improving the weaknesses pointed out by the results (Aslam, 2011).

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Quality Education

According to Chapman and Adams (2002), the precise meaning of education quality and the path to improvement of quality are often left unexplained. However, considering the basic dimensions of quality education today, it suggests the outcomes that encompass knowledge, skills and attitudes, and are linked to national and international goals for education and positive participation in society. In addition, quality education may imply the attaining of specific targets and objectives according to the interests of educational institutions. In this respect the definitions of quality education may be kept open to change and evolution based on information, changing contexts, and new understandings of the nature of education's challenges, new researches and findings.

3.2 Faculty Evaluation

Determining the success of a faculty member on achieving educational goals can be attributed to faculty evaluation (Bazargan, 2008). According to Kamran al. (2010), faculty evaluation is a process that is applicable to promote the quality of learning and education and also in the decision-making of jobs, including selection, job stability, and promotion. Sarchami and Salmanzadeh (2005) described faculty evaluation as logically and essentially beneficial system that helps to find the positive and negative program aspects, with sensitive and precise tools.

3.3 Methods of Faculty Evaluation

Both government and private universities attempt to develop various practices and policies aimed at encouraging, rewarding, and measuring "good teaching" (Ballantyne et al., 2000). Li P et al. (2009) advocated to take feedback or evaluation of teaching from

the students, peers, and teachers themselves. Kember D and Leung DY (2011) explained faculty evaluation as the practice of evaluating teaching and courses in higher education through course and teaching evaluation questionnaires.

4. Literature Review

By developing skills and nurturing qualities of various kinds a faculty member can not only bring changes in his teaching methodology but also qualitative changes in education system. In this regard, many of attributes act as the determining factors in improving quality education. In their study Kamran et al. (2010) found that quality education can be ensured through such evaluation as it can help the faculty members to improve their communication skills, sincere relationship with students, flexibility towards student behavior, making communication continuously with students, and knowing and calling students with name. They also found that after such evaluation faculty members endeavor to teach students with fluency and depth of subject knowledge (Kamran et al., 2010). It is because they revealed that although teachers are theoretically eligible, some are likely to be negatively classified if they do not have fluency on the subject matter. In their study on faculty evaluation, Sarchami and Hoseine (2002) confirmed that a close relationship with students should be one of the essential characteristics of a teacher. Kamran et al. (2010) study has also given priority on having a sincere relationship with the students. While Moezi M (2010) found that teacher's social behavior with student has a positive effect on the student personality and manner in the classroom which increase the motivation of students about learning and thus promotes the quality of education. The survey results of Vakili et al (2011) confirmed that many of the students described that paying time to problem-solving and student's questions played important role in the teacher evaluation score. Kamran et al. (2010) found that teacher evaluation encouraged teachers to allocate enough time to deal with the students. In this regard, Sharifi(2002) and Moezi M (2010) found that faculty evaluation motivated teachers to use and provide updated study materials and behave with morality, personality, and performance. Afonso et al. (2005) gave priorities on humanistic qualities of faculty members. In their research study, Ghahrani et al. (2015) observed that after evaluation faculty members improved there on time class attendance to provide better educational activities. Raoufi et al. (2010) say being eligible to manage the class with required leadership capacity is one of the essential components of the theoretical teaching quality form. Legaspi (2015) gave stress on the inclusion of coverage of courses syllabus as one of the criterion of faculty evaluation. Ghahrani et al. (2015) found that faculty members improved their lessons with practical examples after such thorough evaluation. A number of studies revealed that such evaluation enhanced the teaching skills of the faculty members (Afonso et al., 2005; Ghorbani R, 2009; Legaspi, 2015). Ghahrani et al.(2015) found in the post evaluation phase faculty members accepted logical suggestions from the students and improved the relevance between the study subjects' contents and the questions. For educational improvement, Ghahrani et al. (2015) advocated that the faculty members should use audio-visual instruments to present the teaching subjects. Regarding the educational status Bowles T. (2000) states that in many countries educational status of faculty members is evaluated by the students.

From the findings of the reviewed literature it is seen that some of the previous studies only focused either on one or some aspects other than the complete subject matter of the current study. So, it is yet to get a concrete idea about the actual effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh. It is because the findings of the earlier research mostly exhibit the result of effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions of the other countries rather than Bangladesh.

Despite the proven success of this in other countries, relatively few studies in Bangladesh have focused on this aspect. Again some studies focused only on the few aspects of the subject matter of the current study. Due to such drawbacks of the previous studies the current paper aims to find a suitable answer to the research question: "Is there any effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh?". With this end in view, the following hypothesis has been set to exhibit the appropriate answer.

H₀: There is no effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh.

H_a: There is positive effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh.

Assuring quality education is always a matter of prime necessity to provide effective guidance to the career oriented prospect graduates and their sponsors or guardians. However, there may be any such factor(s) which may adversely or more proactively impact on the quality education of the higher educational institutions. Hence, the current study aims to test whether faculty evaluation has any positive impact on the quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh or not so that the respective academic institutions can take appropriate measures to further improve their quality.

5. Methodology of the Study

The current study is the combination of both primary and secondary data collection and their analyses in which, the secondary data have been collected from the updated research papers and articles published in the reputed journals relevant to the subject matter of the study.

Table 1: Faculty Evaluation Factors that may affect Quality Education

Code	Items	Code	Items
FE01	Communication skills	FE09	Class management capacity
FE02	Fluency and depth of knowledge	FE10	Courses and syllabus coverage
FE03	Relationship between the faculty members and students	FE11	Relating theory with practical examples and references
FE04	Behavior and manners with the students	FE12	Teaching and instructional capacity
FE05	Giving more time in counseling and grooming.	FE13	Making the course/class lectures interesting
FE06	Acting with morality	FE14	Effective use of audio-visual instruments
FE07	Seeing students' problems on humanistic approach.	FE15	Using and providing updated study materials
FE08	Attending the classes on time	FE 16	Faculty members' Educational Status

While the primary data have been collected during the month of November 10, 2017 to December 09, 2017 from the sample size of 150 respondents including 120 students and 30 administrative officials/faculty of the 10 higher educational institutions including 2 public universities, 5 private universities and 3 Honors & Masters level colleges in Dhaka, Chittagong and Comilla using random sampling method through a structured and self-administered questionnaire based extensive survey comprising of open-ended and non-forced, balanced and odd numbered non-comparative itemized questions using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Inferential statistical tools have been used for the analysis of the collected primary data. From the literature review on the impact of 16 factors of faculty evaluation on quality education have been identified as variables which are exhibited in the **Table 1** from FE01 to FE16.

6. Analysis and Findings

Based on the survey data, the following section exhibits the analysis and findings of this study.

6.1 Reliability Analysis

In the **Table 2**, the Cronbach's Alpha value of all the 17 items together is .885 which is greater than 0.7, indicating an overall higher reliability factors. Thus, it can safely be concluded by looking at **Table 2** that the reliability of this study is substantial in every perspective because the sample size and the data collected are reliable and also the reliability is shown to be good using all the 17 items.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
.885	17

Source: Field Survey Data

6.2 Validity Analysis

Table 3 exhibits that the value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure is .859 which is 'meritorious' suggesting the adequacy of the sample size for the factor analysis. From the results of the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity in Table 5 it is seen that the approximate chi-square statistics is 1015.399 with 136 degrees of freedom, which is greater than the table value. This means that the null hypothesis that the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix is rejected by Bartlett's test of Sphericity. So, the result of Bartlett's test of Sphericity is significant suggesting that the population was not an identity matrix. Therefore, the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is significant.

Table 3: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.859
Approx. Chi-Square		1015.399
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	df	136
	Sig.	.000

6.3 Correlation Analysis

In the present study, a correlation coefficient measured the strength of a linear between the quality education and 17 factors of faculty evaluation (FE01 to FE17). The correlation between sustainable development and three components is positive and is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). The correlation between sustainable development and ten components is positive and is significant at both the 0.01 and 0.05 levels (2-tailed). The correlations **Table 4** shows the correlation between 'quality education' and its influencing factors of faculty evaluation namely Communication skills, Fluency and depth of knowledge, Relationship between the faculty members and students, behavior and manners with the students, Giving more time in counseling and grooming, Acting with morality, Seeing students' problems on humanistic approach, Attending the classes on time, Class management capacity, Courses and syllabus coverage, Relating theory with practical examples and references, Teaching and instructional capacity, Making the course/class lectures interesting, Effective use of audio-visual instruments, Using and providing updated study materials is/are .610, .498, .426, .227, .226, .391, .248, .327, .182, .221, .308, .414, .277, .355, and .301 respectively. Therefore, the study exhibits that there is positive correlation between 'faculty evaluation' and 'quality education in the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh'.

Table 4: Correlations

	FE01	FE02	FE03	FE04	FE05	FE06	FE07	FE08	FE09	FE10	FE11	FE12	FE13	FE14	FE15	FE16	QE
FE01	1	.610**	.498**	.426**	.227**	.226**	.391**	.248**	.327**	.182	.221**	.308**	.414**	.277**	.355**	.301**	.389**
FE02	.610**	1	.548**	.428**	.070	.278**	.413**	.324**	.359**	.221**	.364**	.265**	.286**	.220**	.290**	.278**	.316**
FE03	.498**	.548**	1	.457**	.075	.278**	.337**	.300	.285	.224**	.205	.190	.279	.220	.311	.278	.296
FE04	.426**	.428**	.457**	1	.263	.255	.359	.205	.378	.168	.389	.358	.411	.175	.337	.473	.429
FE05	.227**	.070	.075	.263**	1	.235	.118	.206	.164	.109	.076	.077	.317**	.263**	.170	.135	.140
FE06	.226**	.278**	.278**	.255**	.235**	1	.215**	.171	.180	.121	.038	.114	.101	.081	.181	.133	.139
FE07	.391**	.413**	.337**	.359**	.118	.215**	1	.402**	.417**	.346**	.491**	.394**	.417**	.287**	.296**	.349**	.340**
FE08	.248**	.324**	.300**	.205	.206	.171	.402**	1	.575**	.590**	.414**	.373	.273	.281	.345**	.340**	.298**
FE09	.327**	.359**	.285**	.378**	.164	.180	.417**	.575**	1	.556**	.494**	.452**	.422**	.372**	.417**	.442**	.367**
FE10	.182	.221**	.224**	.168	.109	.121	.346**	.590**	.556**	1	.380**	.329	.226**	.302**	.294**	.271**	.127
FE11	.221**	.364**	.205	.389**	.076	.038	.491**	.414**	.494**	.380**	1	.619**	.327**	.281	.418**	.490**	.384**
FE12	.308**	.265**	.190	.358**	.077	.114	.394**	.373	.452**	.329	.619**	1	.317**	.169	.440**	.458**	.660**
FE13	.414**	.286**	.279	.411	.317**	.101	.417**	.273	.422	.226**	.327**	.317	1	.521**	.393	.378	.425
FE14	.277**	.220**	.220**	.175	.263**	.081	.287**	.281	.372**	.302**	.281**	.169	.521**	1	.514**	.380**	.189
FE15	.355**	.290**	.311**	.337**	.170	.181	.296**	.345**	.417**	.294**	.418**	.440**	.393**	.514**	1	.503**	.440**
FE16	.301**	.278**	.278**	.473**	.135	.133	.349**	.340	.442**	.271**	.490**	.458**	.378**	.380**	.503**	1	.416**
QE	.389**	.316**	.296**	.429**	.140	.139	.340**	.298	.367**	.127	.384**	.660**	.425	.189	.440**	.416**	1

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
 **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

6.4 Mean Scores of Faculty Evaluation Factors that Affect Quality Education

Table 5: Faculty Evaluation Factors that Affect Quality Education

Code	Items	Mean values
FE01	Communication skills	3.4631
FE02	Fluency and depth of knowledge	3.4966
FE03	Relationship between the faculty members and students	3.4899
FE04	Behavior and manners with the students	3.1342
FE05	Giving more time in counseling and grooming.	3.1879
FE06	Acting with morality	3.4631
FE07	Seeing students' problems on humanistic approach.	3.4497
FE08	Attending the classes on time	3.3758
FE09	Class management capacity	3.5235
FE10	Courses and syllabus coverage	3.4832
FE11	Relating theory with practical examples and references	3.5436
FE12	Teaching and instructional capacity	3.5705
FE13	Making the course/class lectures interesting	3.4765
FE14	Effective use of audio-visual instruments	3.1007
FE15	Using and providing updated study materials	3.4497
FE16	Faculty members' Educational Status	3.4497

It can be concluded from the Table 5 data that the mean values among the respondents were higher (means ranging from 3.1007 to 3.5705), which all exceeded midpoint 3 suggesting that the sample had a tendency to agree that sufficient items have given adequate perception among the respondents. This suggests that respondents really have higher perceptions in terms of quality education as positive outcome of faculty evaluation.

So, the positive correlation and higher mean values exceeding the midpoint 3 out of Likert scale 5 reject the null hypothesis (H_0) that 'There is no effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh' and prove or accept the alternative hypothesis (H_a) that 'There is positive effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh'.

7. Conclusion

Faculty evaluation in higher educational institutions is a routine work. In this respect Institutions complete the task of Faculty evaluation in their own way. In some cases it is seen that only education, subject knowledge and performance related variables are taken into consideration. However considering the context of higher educational institutions in Bangladesh, the current study has included some more variables to make the study more successful, like faculty members' cordial relationship with the fellow colleagues and students, behavior and manner with the students, students' counseling and grooming, and humanistic approaches in seeing students' problem etc.

The present paper is unique for its compliance with the reliability and validity test criterion. The results of this study indicate sixteen (16) aspects of faculty evaluation which have significant effect on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh. Among them teaching and instructional capacity, relating theory with practical examples and references, class management capacity, fluency and depth of knowledge, relationship between the faculty members and students, courses and syllabus coverage and making the course/class lectures interesting are noteworthy. So, the present study revealed that there is necessity to include the identified sixteen aspects of faculty evaluation in an integrated manner so that quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh can be ensured.

The present study has been found very much significant from the results of higher reliability and validity scores. Moreover, from the findings of the correlation analysis and mean test it is evident that faculty evaluation is positive to the improvement of quality education and this has already been reflected through the positive correlation result and higher than average mean values. These values reject the null hypothesis (H_0) that 'There is no effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh' and prove or accept the alternative hypothesis (H_a) that 'There is positive effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh'.

However, this is a primary research regarding the context of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh. To ensure quality education more researches are required in

this field including some more variables. It is also expected that the current paper may contribute in the research and academic development relating to the positive effect of faculty evaluation on quality education of the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh through a systematic process of extensive literature review followed by the primary survey findings and analysis together with conclusive implications. Thus, the paper will enable the concerned higher educational institutions with necessary course of actions and new models which will enable the academia in developing its theory based on proven practice faculty evaluation for quality education.

References

- Aghamolaei T, Javadpour S and Abedini, S. 2010, 'Attitude of Bandar-Abbas medical university faculty members about their assessment by the scholars', *Journal of Hormozgan Medical Science*, Vol. 14, Pp. 234–40.
- Aslam, H 2011, 'Performance evaluation of teachers in universities: Contemporary issues and challenges in Pakistan', *Proceedings of the 2011 International Conference on Teaching, Learning and Change*, International Association for Teaching and Learning (IATEL), Pp. 339-362
- Ballantyne, R, Borthwick, J & Packer, J 2000, 'Beyond student evaluation of teaching: identifying and addressing academic staff development', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Volume 25, Number 3, Pp. 221 – 236.
- Boretz, E 2004, 'Grade Inflation and the Myth of Student Consumerism', *College Teaching*, Volume 25, Number 4, P. 24
- Bowles, T 2000, 'The evaluation of teaching', *Med Teach*. Vol. 22, Pp. 221–224.
- Chapman, D and Adams, D 2002, 'The Quality Education: Dimensions and Strategies', *Education in Developing Asia*, Vol. 5, P. 8
- Ghahrani, N, Siamian, H, Balaghafari, A, Aligolbandi, K, and Vahedi, M 2015, 'The Opinion of Students and Faculty Members about the Effect of the Faculty Performance Evaluation', *Mater Sociomed*, Volume 27, Number 4, Pp. 267–271
- Kamran, A, Zibaei, M, Mirkaimi, K and Shahnazi, H 2012, 'Designing and evaluation of the teaching quality assessment form from the point of view of the Lorestan University of Medical Sciences students – 2010', *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*, Volume 1, P. 43.
- Kember D and Leung, DY 2011, 'Disciplinary differences in student ratings of teaching quality', *Res High Educ.*, Volume 52, Pp. 278–99
- Legaspi, KP 2015, 'Performance Evaluation of Permanent and Part-Time Faculty in the University of Eastern Philippines', *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies*, Volume 12, Number 2, Pp. 518-524.
- Li, P, Wang, ZW, Wang, ZQ and Wang Y. 2009, 'Present Situation and Trend of Teaching Supervision at Colleges and Universities in China', *Northwest Medical Education*, Volume 2, Pp. 211–2
- Moezi, M, Shirzad, HA, Zamanzad, B and Roohi, H 2010, 'Evaluation process in viewpoints of academic staff and students in Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences', *Journal of Shahrekord University Medical Science*, Volume 11, Pp. 63–75
- National survey 2002, 'National survey seeks to improve retention, graduation rates', *Black Issues in Higher Education*, Volume 19, Number 14, P. 18.

Sarbabidya & Rashid

- Nelia, M, Afonso, MD, Lavoisier, J, Cardozo, MD, Oswald, AJ, Mascarenhas, PhD, Anil, NF, Aranha, PhD and Chirag, SMD 2005, 'Are Anonymous Evaluations a Better Assessment of Faculty Teaching Performance? A Comparative Analysis of Open and Anonymous Evaluation Processes', *Family Medicine, Volume 37, Number 1, Pp. 43-7*
- Raoufi, SH, Ebrahimzade, F, Tarahi, MJ and Ahmadi, P 2010, 'Designing a novel sheet to evaluate theoretical teaching quality of faculty members based on viewpoints of stakeholders and Charles E. Glassick's scholarship principles', *Journal of Hormozgan Medical Science, Volume 14, Pp.167-76*
- Reddy, K 2006, *University Administration*, 1st Edition, Omega Publications, New Dehli
- Sarchami, R and Hoseini, M 2002, 'Students viewpoints about priorities in teacher evaluation', *Iranian Journal of Medical Education, Volume 2, P. 49*
- Sarchami, R and Salmanzadeh, H2005, 'The opinions of faculty on the efficiency of student rating scheme on teachers' performance in Iran University of Medical Sciences', *Journal of Qazvin University Medical Science Health Service, Vol. 34, Pp. 71-6*
- Sharifi, M, Jorabchi, Z and Alipour, M 2002, 'Influence of faculties on faculty evaluation by students', *Journal of Ghazvin Medical University Science, Volume 22, Pp. 81-7*
- Vakili, A, Hajaghajani, S, Rashidy-Pour, A and Ghorbani, R 2011, 'An investigation of factors influencing student evaluation of teacher performance: A comprehensive study in Semnan University of Medical Sciences', *Koomesh, Volume 12, Pp. 93-103*.
- WenSh, H, Song, Xu, J, Carline, JD, Zhong, F, Zhong, YJ and Shen, ShJ 2011, 'Effects of a teaching evaluation system: A case Study', *International Journal of Medical Education, Volume 2, Pp.18-23*.

Appendix

SURVEY ON EFFECT OF FACULTY EVALUATION ON QUALITY EDUCATION

PART A: Effect of Faculty Evaluation on Quality Education

The following is a list of faculty evaluation criteria which may influence quality education of the higher educational institutes.

Please **ENCIRCLE** the most appropriate number at the right side of each criterion in the **Table 1** and **Table 2** on a scale of 1 to 5 to indicate how closely each of these criteria is related to the quality education of the higher institutions where currently you are studying or serving. The meaning of the numbers is as follows which is also specified in the short form at the top of each column.

[1 = Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 = Disagree (D), 3 = Neutral (N), 4 = Agree (A) and 5 = Strongly Agree (SA)]

Table 1: Faculty Evaluation Criterion

Cod e	After evaluation of the faculty members of your department/university, their	1 =	2 = D	3 = N	4 = A	5 =
FE01	Communication skills have been improved.	1	2	3	4	5
FE02	Fluency and depth of knowledge have been enhanced.	1	2	3	4	5
FE03	Relationship among the faculty members and students is increased.	1	2	3	4	5
FE04	Behavior and manners of the faculty members with the students have been improved.	1	2	3	4	5
FE05	Faculty members give more time for students' counseling and grooming.	1	2	3	4	5
FE06	Faculty members act with morality e.g., no more favoritism, nepotism, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
FE07	Faculty members see students' problems on humanistic approach .	1	2	3	4	5
FE08	Faculty members attend the classes on time .	1	2	3	4	5
FE09	Class management capacity of the faculty members is improved.	1	2	3	4	5
FE10	Courses and syllabus coverage of the faculty members is improved.	1	2	3	4	5
FE11	Faculty members relate theory with practical examples and references .	1	2	3	4	5
FE12	Teaching and instructional capacity of the faculty members have been improved.	1	2	3	4	5
FE13	Faculty members make the course/class lectures interesting .	1	2	3	4	5
FE14	Faculty members effectively use audio-visual instruments .	1	2	3	4	5
FE15	Faculty members use and provide updated study materials .	1	2	3	4	5
FE 16	Faculty members try to develop their Educational Status	1	2	3	4	5

Table 2: Quality Education through Faculty Evaluation Criterion

Code	Quality Education through Faculty Evaluation Criterion	1 =	2 = D	3 = N	4 = A	5 =
FE16	On the basis of the information on faculty evaluation in the Table 1, you can say that quality education in your institution is increased or improved.	1	2	3	4	5

PART B: Demographic Profile

1. Are you _____? (Choose one response only)

1. Male
2. Female

2. Are you _____? (Choose one response only)

1. Student
2. Faculty/Administrative Official

3. Which of the following categories includes your age? (Choose one response only)

1. Less than 18 years
2. 18 – 24 years
3. 25 – 29 years
4. 30 – 34 years
5. 35 – 39 years
6. 40 – 44 years
7. 45 – 49 years
8. 50 years or above

4. Which of the following academic institution do you serve or study in? (Choose one response only)

1. University of Chittagong (CU)
2. Comilla University (CoU)
3. Britannia University (BU)
4. Bangladesh Army International University of Science & Technology (BAIUST)
5. BGC Trust University Bangladesh
6. University of Science & Technology Chittagong (USTC)
7. University of Liberal Arts Bangladesh (ULAB)
8. Comilla Victoria College
9. Chittagong College
10. Dhaka College

5. How long have you been studying in or serving this institution? (Choose one response only)

1. 1-4 years
2. 4-8years
3. 8-12years
4. 12 years and above

Thank you for taking your valuable time to complete the survey questionnaire.