

## 高等教育教師服務表現之評鑑

國立臺灣體育學院 程春美

本研究問卷在調查臺灣高等教育學校對於公私立及類別不同學校是否採用評鑑標準評估老師校內外服務表現，以及探究其使用程度，並以問卷調查方式探究其差異性，研究結果可作為提升對當前高等教育學校老師表現評估的瞭解，進而作為學校老師升等之重要參考依據。

本研究採用SPSS軟體進行各項統計分析工作，所有的數據資料以ANOVA進行變異分析。研究結果顯示校內服務表現評估以服務校系之行政工作為最主要評鑑標準，而校外（社區）服務表現評估則以提供各種訓練及研習活動為最主要評鑑標準。

此外，研究結果亦顯示私立學院(M=29.85)比國立學院(M=27.74)較常採用評鑑標準來評估老師的校內服務表現，而私立學院(M=12.08)則比私立大學(M=10.72)較常採用評鑑標準來評估老師的校外（社區）服務表現。

## An Appraisal of Faculty's Service Performance in Higher Education

Chun Mei, Cheng

National Taiwan College of Physical Education

### Abstract

This study surveyed four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan to determine if the criteria used to evaluate faculty performance in service based on the control and classification levels of institution. The finding results may be utilized to enhance the reader's knowledge of current faculty's service performance evaluation and relative to faculty promotion and salary.

In this paper, the SPSS statistic software was utilized for data analysis. ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) was conducted to examine total ratings for individual items. Analysis of the results indicated that college service performance was based primarily on department administrative duties and public service performance was based primarily on conducting training.

Besides, the criteria used to evaluate college service performance ranked higher among private four-year colleges ( $M=29.85$ ), and lower among public four-year colleges ( $M=27.74$ ). The criteria used to evaluate community service performance ranked higher among private four-year colleges ( $M=12.08$ ), and ranked lower among private four-year universities ( $M=10.72$ ).

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction

Scriven (1981) defined evaluation as "the process of determining the merit or worth or value of something, or the product of that process" (Miller, 1987, p. 53). There is a general consensus that evaluation is a complex, dynamic undertaking and that sole reliance on student ratings for evaluating classroom teaching, the single most common strategy, is insufficient. Today, the individual faculty member's overall performance is evaluated on several criteria, including student ratings of faculty performance, self-evaluation, colleague and chair evaluation, assessment of scholarly activities and research publications, and evaluation of campus-and/or noncampus-related activities with which faculty members are involved.

Performance evaluation is important. One's performance on many jobs can be evaluated directly by the outcomes of his/her position. For example, businessmen can be judged by their profit margins, and basketball players by their scoring average. Evaluating professors is much less simple, and outcome measures are much more elusive (McLean, 1987). A common theme among educational institutions seems to be that quality education is dependent on quality performance of the educator (Dottin, 1987; Euster & Weinbach, 1986).

#### The Foundation for this Study

Centra (1979) published the results of a research study that ranked several generally accepted criteria used in evaluating individual faculty members. Building upon earlier surveys by Gustad (1961) and Astin and Lee (1967), Centra's study indicated that "colleges and universities are currently relying more on systematic student ratings and, to some extent, on the content of course

syllabi and examinations" (p.9). Centra's 1979 study is the most recent among studies conducted on faculty performance at four year colleges and universities.

According to the literature on performance evaluation, several criteria that ranked highest priority in Centra's (1979) study remain very prevalent among four-year colleges and universities today. This study uses Centra's instrument to study institutions in Taiwan and focuses on the nature and extent that evaluative criteria and processes are used to measure faculty service performance in four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan.

### Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to determine if selected criteria currently used by four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan to evaluate faculty college and community service performance differ based upon the control (public or private) and classification (college and university) levels of an institution.

### Research Questions

The following research questions were set in order to analyze the problem:

1. What is the difference in criteria and the extent of their use in the evaluation of faculty college service performance at four-year colleges and universities based upon the control and classification levels of institutions?
2. What is the difference in criteria and the extent of their use in the evaluation of faculty community service performance at four-year colleges and universities, based upon the control and classification levels of institutions?

### Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses will provide the basis for statistical analysis of the data:

#### College Service Performance

H<sub>01</sub>: There are no significant differences among the criterion used to evaluate

---

faculty college service performance based on the control levels of the institutions.

Ho2: There are no significant differences among the criteria used to evaluate faculty college service performance based on the classification levels of the institutions.

Ho3: There is no significant interaction between control and classification levels of the institutions among the criteria used to evaluate faculty college service performance.

#### Community Service Performance

Ho4: There are no significant differences among the criteria used to evaluate faculty community service performance based on the control levels of the institutions.

Ho5: There are no significant differences among the criteria used to evaluate faculty community service performance based on the classification levels of the institutions.

Ho6: There is no significant interaction between control and classification levels of the institutions among the criteria used to evaluate faculty community service performance.

### Purpose of the Study

Effective evaluation of faculty performance is necessary at all institutions of higher education to enhance excellence. The primary purpose of this study was to survey four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan to examine criteria and the extent of their use to evaluate service performance. Significant variations in value accorded to identical criteria were analyzed to determine if the criteria differ based upon institutional control and classification levels.

### Significance of the Study

The topic of performance evaluation has motivated literally thousands of

studies in America. And now more than ever before, the public at large and the young in particular pose penetrating questions about the quality of instruction in higher education (Traylor, 1992). A reasonable and manageable faculty performance evaluation program can contribute towards institutional improvement. Evaluation for professional growth and improvement also is a fundamental purpose. And although it is generally agreed that evaluative techniques are needed to measure faculty performance, more information is needed about current methods and techniques as well as the extent of their use.

Provided in this study are comparative data about the criteria currently used in four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan and about how the criteria differ based upon the classification and control levels of institutions. Research results should: (1) enhance the reader's knowledge of present day faculty performance evaluation relative to faculty tenure, promotion, and salary; and (2) provide current information and recommendations that promote the improvement of faculty evaluation procedures.

### Definition of Terms

#### Control Level

A private college or university is one that is sponsored and financed under private auspices rather than by a governmental body (Haves & Haves, 1982, p.175).

A public college or university is one that is sponsored and financed by a country, or other governmental unit rather than under private auspices (Haves & Haves, 1982, pp.179-180).

#### Classification Level

According to the Ministry of Education in Taiwan, institutions of higher education in Taiwan are grouped into two categories. These two categories are College and University. A four-year college is one offering a substantial range

of study programs leading to bachelor's degrees, normally completed in full-time study for four academic years, but which the college may offer in ways permitting completion in a fewer or greater number of years; a four-year college may also offer some graduate-degree programs.

A university is defined as an educational institution composed of at least three academic colleges. A four year college contains less than 3 academic colleges. The length of study is four years, except for certain majors which may require up to seven years of education (including internship). A bachelor's degree is awarded to those who successfully finish the education; a four-year university may also offer masters and doctoral programs.

The two categories of college and university include teachers' colleges and normal universities. All of these schools are established and operated by the government. Students are free of all educational expenses; specifically, tuition and all boarding costs are paid by the government. Admission requirements are the same as those of other universities and colleges.

#### College Service Performance

College service generally includes serving on university committees, student advisement, university functions related to general administration, recruitment and registration, development and fund raising, consulting, work with student organizations, and student services.

#### Community Service Performance

Community service comprises activities and actions directly involving the community and other persons, agencies, or organizations based outside the institution. It includes public presentations; holding local, state, or national offices; consultations; aid to other colleges, universities, or local schools in the area; involvement with cooperative extension; continuing education; workshops, seminars, and conferences; and the involvement of research on nu-

merous social and community problems. Boyer (1990) argued that those public service activities "that relate directly to the intellectual work of the professor and are carried out through consultation, technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation and the like" should be considered (p.36).

## CHAPTER TWO

### Review of Literature

When the overall professional performance of individual faculty members is being evaluated, service tends to take a "back seat" to teaching and scholarship/research. But a faculty member's commitment to outreach and public/professional service can be an important element (Traylor, 1992). Using Ohio University as an example, the "Extended Community" is part of its mission to provide educational programs and services to its public:

Ohio University serves an extended community. The public service mission of the university, expressed in such activities as public broadcasting and continuing education programs, reflects the responsibility of the University to serve the ongoing educational needs of the region. The regional campuses perform a critical role in serving this extended community....It is the purpose of these extended university programs to serve a diverse range of educational needs, from professional groups requiring continuing courses of study related to the practice of their professions, to individuals desiring occasional or special interest study. By service to the extended community, Ohio University contributes to cultural and economic development, health care, and to other human services (Toward the Third Century, 1988).

As plans are made for education in the 21st century, there remains a strong sense that colleges and universities should have a direct, effective, and on-going relationship to their external constituencies.

According to the literature (Applegate, 1981; Centra, 1979), service has two dimensions: college, internal, or professional service, and community, public, or external service.

College service generally includes serving on university committees, student advisement, university functions related to general administration, recruitment and registration, development and fund raising, consulting, work with student organizations, and student services. The service performance of faculty members is usually assessed by examining the relevant activities. According to Genova (1976),

Service may also include a teacher's relationship, attitudes, and behavior within a department. The instructor who is seen as supportive and positive.... may serve the department without spending defined periods of time in "service" activities. Service may be viewed as a willingness to carry extra work load or more of the less desirable kinds of courses in his teaching load. Therefore..., service may encompass much of a faculty member's personal behavior in the group context, and the resultant evaluation criteria could be in terms of his or her personal contribution to a more smooth functioning organization (p. 19).

Saltine (1984) asked the liberal arts deans of public and private colleges to indicate how often they "always used" each of 9 factors to assess a professor's college service performance. Saltine compared his results with a similar study that was done in 1978. He noted service on collegewide committees and academic advising were the most important factor during the 1978-1983 period.

Community service comprises activities and actions directly involving the

community and other persons, agencies, or organizations based outside the institution. It includes public presentations; holding local, state, or national offices; consultations; aid to other colleges, universities, or local schools in the area; involvement with cooperative extension; continuing education; workshops, seminars, and conferences; and the involvement of research on numerous social and community problems. Boyer (1990) argued that those public service activities "that relate directly to the intellectual work of the professor and are carried out through consultation, technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation and the like" should be considered" (p.36).

Dressed (1976) also identified three types of public service. The first type, which he referred to as "national missions," employs the model of the land-grant universities, in which agricultural extension agents consulted with farmers. Federal legislation has extended this model to business, industry, urban affairs, and the schools, with colleges and universities using their expertise to help solve problems in all the areas. Dressel's second type of public service was providing assistance to community groups, with faculty from appropriate disciplines addressing whatever needs the groups may have. The third type, continuing education, included teaching non-degree courses, workshops, and other classes for professionals and other adults.

According to Elman and Smock (1985), public service includes those activities that draw on faculty members' professional expertise. Faculty members either apply their knowledge and skills to a problem or issue, or to public dissemination of information (Lynton & Elman, 1987). Lynton and Elman used the term professional activity instead of public service to underscore the application of faculty expertise. They saw a continuum of activities, ranging from applied research (basic research), to teaching or providing information to general audiences (for example, giving continuing education classes). Between the two

---

ends of the spectrum were contracted research, consultation, technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation, targeted briefings, and other didactic activities, such as teaching sessions for newly elected government officials.

Institutions may use a number of sources to gather information on a faculty member's contribution to college service, but according to the literature, service on collegewide committees and academic advising are the two most influential factors considered in the evaluation process. Seldin (1984, p.67) asked the liberal arts deans of public and private colleges to indicate how often they "always used" each of 9 factors to assess a professor's college service performance. Seldin compared his results with a similar study that was done in 1978 and found very little change over the 5-year period, in the frequency with which each factor was used. He noted that all of the factors except 2, willingness to teach undesirable courses and participation in campus symposia, were almost invariably the same in 1983 as they were in 1978. Service on collegewide committees and academic service on department committees and department administrative duties ranked relatively high in 1978 and increased in importance by 1983. According to this author, the professor should be willing to participate in public service, with or without pay. The professor gains insight from the experience, the public benefits, and instruction becomes increasingly relevant. "Public service is a professional responsibility; time should be assigned to it, and the service should be evaluated" (Dressel, 1976, p.367).

## CHAPTER THREE

### Methodology

A descriptive study which utilized a questionnaire to identify selected criteria and the extent of their use in the evaluation of faculty performance in service.

The questionnaire had its roots in a 1961 study by John W. Gustad. It had been used in several other studies (Austin & Lee, 1966; Centra, 1979; Seldin 1978, 1984, & 1989; Zitlow, 1988; and Traylor, 1992). The questionnaires were distributed to 135 chief academic officers and deans of four-year colleges and universities. The 135 surveys were distributed, 99 were returned with a usable rate of 73.33%.

The analysis of the data included two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) which was used to test for significant differences between the 2 dependent variables and 2 independent variables; one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) which was used to test for significant differences between the means of each of the independent variables; and means and standard deviations were used to identify the characteristics of the data.

Frequencies were indicated by using a Likert-type scale with five responses:

1=Almost Never

2=Seldom

3=Sometimes

4=Usually

5=Almost Always

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Data Analysis & Results

The chief academic officers and deans of academic colleges within four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan were the population used in this study. According to the figures from the Ministry of Education, the total number of academic colleges at the four-year colleges and universities was 135. Therefore, questionnaires were distributed to the 135 chief academic officers and academic deans of the institutions.

A total of 99 (73.33%) of the questionnaires were returned, making it possible to analyze evaluative criteria according to the control (public, private) and the classification (college, university) (see Table 1). The sources of classification consisted of 32 responses from colleges and 67 responses from universities. The sources of control consisted of 61 public institutions and 38 responses from private institutions. Overall, the levels of control and classification had a response rate of at least 62.3% or higher. Therefore, the study was generalizable to the total population of four-year college and universities.

#### Research Question 1

#### Criteria and the Extent of Their Use in the Evaluation of Colleges Service Performance

This research question addresses the respondents' estimate of the extent to which 9 general criteria were used on their campuses to evaluate faculty college service performance. Research results were analyzed to determine if the criteria differ based upon the control and classification levels of institutions. Hy

Table 1

Number and Percentage Distribution of Questionnaires Distributed and Returned Usable Based on Demographics of Respondents.

Category	Original Number Distributed	Number and Percentage of Returned Usable Questionnaires
Source of Classification:		
(1)College	35	32 91.43%
(2)University	100	67 67%
Total	135	99 73.33%

Source of Control:

Control:

(1)Public	74	61 82.43%
(2)Private	61	38 62.30%
Total	135	99 73.33%

potheses 1, 2, and 3 were tested.

After running the data by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+), the reliability coefficients of the 9 general criteria is ALPHA=.8308.

#### College Service x Control

Presented in Table 2 is the extent to which each of the 9 general criteria are used in the evaluation of college service performance, based upon control levels of institutions. Mean differences in Table 2 indicate that department administrative duties (M=3.90); service on departmental committees (M=3.68); academic advising (M=3.36); service on collegewide committees; advisor to student organizations; nonacademic student counseling; and participation in campus symposia are "sometimes used" by four-year colleges and universities, notwithstanding institutional control levels. Willingness to teach undesirable courses (M=2.68) and service as student recruiter (M=2.47) are "seldom used" by four-year colleges and universities. None of the criteria ranked in the "almost never used" category.

According to Table 2, private institutions used department administrative duties (M=4.05>M=3.80) more than did public institutions to evaluate college service performance.

Data on the means and standard deviations for college service performance by institutional control levels are depicted in Table 3. As presented in Table 3, the distribution of responses by public (M=29.10) and private institutions (M=29.34) indicated that the 9 general criteria are college service performance is "sometimes used" the 9 general criteria in the assessment of faculty performance.

Table 2  
Criteria and the Extent of Their Use in the Evaluation of College Service Performance Based Upon Control Level

Level of Control	Mean(M <sup>**</sup> )		All Institutions (N=99) Average M
	Public Institutions (N <sup>*</sup> =61)	Private Institutions (N=38)	
<u>Criteria</u>			
Service on Collegewide committee	3.31	3.39	3.34
Service on department committee	3.75	3.55	3.68
Department administrative duties	3.80	4.05	3.90
Academic advising	3.43	3.26	3.36
Advisor to student organizations	3.28	3.39	3.32
Participation in campus symposia	3.18	3.21	3.19
Nonacademic student counseling	3.23	3.26	3.24
Willingness to teach undesirable courses	2.69	2.66	2.68
Service as student recruiter	2.43	2.55	2.47

\* N=Sample size

\*\*M=5:Almost always used

4≤M<5:Usually used

3≤M<4:Sometimes used

2≤M<3:Seldom used

1≤M<2:Almost never used

**Table 3**  
**Means and Standard Deviations of the Evaluation of College Service Performance by Institutional Control Level**

Variable	n*	Percent of Response (%)	M**	SD
Level of Control				
Private Institutions	38	62.3	29.34	5.82
Public Institutions	61	82.4	29.10	6.38

\* n=Number of respondent

\*\*M=45:Almost always used

36≤M<45:Usully used

27≤M<36:Somtims used

18≤M<27:Seldom used

9≤M<18:Almost never used

#### College Service x Classification

Presented in Table 4 is the extent to which each of the 9 general criteria are used in the evaluation of college service performance, based upon the institutional classification. As shown in "Average Mean" column of Table 4, department administrative duties ( $M=3.90$ ); service on department committees ( $M=3.68$ ); and academic advising ( $M=3.36$ ) are more used than other criteria by four-year colleges and universities, to evaluate colleges and universities, to evaluate college service performance, regardless of the classification levels of institutions. Willingness to teach undesirable courses ( $M=2.68$ ) and service as student recruiter ( $M=2.47$ ) are "seldom used" to evaluate college service performance. And department administrative duties ( $M=4.03 > M=3.84$ ) are used more by colleges than universities, to evaluate college service performance.

Data on the means and standard deviations for college service performance based upon the institutional classification are presented in Table 5. As presented in Table 5, mean rating between levels of classification indicate that universities (Mean=29.48) and colleges ( $M=28.59$ ) "sometimes used" the overall 9 general criteria to evaluate college service performance.

#### College Service x Control and Classification

The data on the means and standard deviations for college service performance by the control and classification levels of institutions are charted in Figure 1. As presented in Figure 1, the grand mean rating of responses by public and private institutions versus the 2 levels of classification ( $GM=29.19$ ), indicate that college service is "sometimes used" in the assessment of faculty performance at four-year colleges and universities, regardless of the control or classification levels of institutions. Figure 1 reveals that college service performance ranked slightly higher among private four-year colleges ( $M=29.85$

Table 4  
Criteria and the Extent of Their Use in the Evaluation of College Service Performance Based Upon Institutional Classification

Level of Classification	Mean(M**)		All Institutions (N=99) Average Mean
	College (N=32)	University (N=67)	
Criteria			
Service on Collegewde committee	3.16	3.43	3.34
Service on department committee	3.41	3.81	3.68
Department administrative	4.03	3.84	3.90
Academic advising	3.06	3.51	3.36
Advisor to student organizations	3.41	3.28	3.32
Participation in campus symposia	3.28	3.15	3.19
Nonacademic student counseling	3.22	3.25	3.24
Willingness to teach undesirable courses	2.53	2.75	2.68
Service as student recruiter	2.50	2.46	2.47

\* N=Sample size

\*\*M=5:Almost always used

4 ≤ M < 4: sully used

3 ≤ M < 4: Sometimes used

2 ≤ M < 3: Seldom used

1 ≤ M < 2: Almost never used

Table 5  
Means and Standard Deviations of the Evaluation of College Service Performance by Institutional Classification

Variable	n*	Percent of Response (%)	M**	SD
Level of Classification				
University	67	67	29.48	6.59
College	32	91.43	28.59	5.13

\* n=Number of respondent

\*\*M=45:Almost always used

36≤M<45:Usully used

27≤M<36:Sometimes used

18≤M<27:Seldom used

9≤M<18:Almost never used

) and slightly lower among public four-year colleges ( $M=27.74$ ).

### Test of Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences among the criteria used to evaluate faculty college service performance based on the control levels of institutions.

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences among the criteria used to evaluate faculty college service performance based on the classification levels of institutions.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant interaction between control and classification levels of institutions among the criteria used to evaluate faculty college service performance.

The results of the two-way analysis of variance for Variable 1, evaluation of college service performance by control and classification levels of institutions, are presented in Table 6. According to Table 6, there was no significant interaction ( $F=1.015$ ,  $p=.316$ ) at the .01 level, therefore hypothesis 3 was not rejected. There were also no significant main effects for control ( $F=.045$ ,  $p=.833$ ) or classification ( $F=.45$ ,  $p=.504$ ) at the .01 level. Therefore, hypothesis 1 and 2 were not rejected.

## Research Question 2

### Criteria and the Extent of Their Use in the Evaluation of Community Service Performance

This research question addresses the respondents' estimate of the extent to which 4 general criteria were used on their campuses to evaluate community service performance. Research results were analyzed to determine if the criteria differ based upon the control and classification levels of institution. Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 were tested.

After running the data by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+), the reliability coefficients of the 4 general criteria is  $ALPHA=.9053$ .

Classification	Public	Private	Average
College	M=27.74	M=29.85	M=28.59
	SD=5.68	SD=4.10	SD=5.13
	n=19	n=13	n=32
University	M=29.71	M=29.08	M=29.48
	SD=6.65	SD=6.60	SD=6.59
	n=42	n=25	n=67
Average	M=29.10	M=29.34	M=29.19
	SD=6.38	SD=5.82	SD=6.14
	n=61	n=38	n=99
			(Grand Mean)
Legend:	M=45: Almost always used		
	36 ≤ M < 45: Usually used		
	27 ≤ M < 36: Sometimes used		
	18 ≤ M < 27: Seldom used		
	9 ≤ M < 18: Almost never used		
	n ≤ Number of respondent		

Figure 1. Means and Standard Deviations of the Evaluation of College Service Performance by Institutional Control and Classification

Table 6  
Summary of Analysis of Variance of the Evaluation of College Service Performance by Institutional Control and Classification

Variable	Level	df	Ms	F	P
Faculty Teaching Performance	Control and Classification				
	<u>Main Effects</u>	2	9.32	.243	.785
	Control	1	1.72	.045	.833
	Classification	1	17.25	.450	.504
	<u>2-way Interaction</u>				
	Cont x Class	1	38.93	1.015	.316
Explained		3	19.19	.501	.683
Residual					
Total		95	38.34		
		98	37.75		

\*Significant at the .01 level.

#### Community Service x Control

Presented in Table 7 is the extent to which each of the 4 general criteria are used in the evaluation of community service performance, based upon control levels of institutions. Mean ratings in Table 7 indicate that conducting training or development programs (credit or non-credit courses) ( $M=3.05$ ) are used more often than other criteria, by four-year colleges and universities, to evaluate community service. Providing technical or management advice to outside organizations or business ( $M=2.83$ ) and volunteer service on committees, boards and community organizations ( $M=2.72$ ) was followed by conducting training or development programs. Community presentations ( $M=2.58$ ) is the least frequently used criterion to evaluate community service performance.

Data on the means and standard deviations for community service performance by institutional control level are summarized in Table 8. As presented in Table 8, the overall distribution of responses by public and private institutions indicate that community service performance is "seldom used," by private institutions ( $M=11.18$ ) and by public institutions ( $M=11.16$ ), in the assessment of faculty performance.

#### Community Service x Classification

Presented in Table 9 is the extent to which each of the 4 general criteria are used in the evaluation of community service performance, based upon the institutional classification, colleges and universities. As shown in the "Average Mean" column of Table 9, conducting training or development programs (credit or non-credit courses) ( $M=3.05$ ) is used to a greater extent than other criteria, to evaluate community service performance. Four-year colleges ( $M=3.25$ ) use conducting training or development programs (credit or non-credit courses) more frequently than do four-year universities ( $M=2.96$ ), to evaluate community service. Both classes of institutions less frequently use community

---

Table 7  
Criteria and the Extent of Their Use in the Evaluation of Community Service Performance Based Upon Control Level

Level of Control	Mean(M <sup>**</sup> )		All Institutions (N=99) Average Mean
	Public Institutions (N <sup>*</sup> =61)	Private Institutions (N=38)	
<u>Criteria</u>			
Community presentations	2.57	2.58	2.58
Conducting training or development programs (credit or non-credit courses)	3.08	3.00	3.05
Providing technical or management advice to outside organizations or businesses	2.75	2.95	2.83
Volunteer service on committees, boards and community organizations	2.75	2.66	2.72

\* N=Sample size

\*\*M=5:Almost always used

4≤M<5:Usully used

3≤M<4:Sometimes used

2≤M<3:Seldom used

1≤M<2:Almost never used

Table 8  
Means and Standard Deviations of the Evaluation of Community Service Performance by Institutional Control Level

Variable	n*	Percent of Response (%)	M**	SD
Level of Control				
Private Institutions	38	62.3	11.18	4.15
Public Institutions	61	82.4	11.16	3.87

\* n=Number of respondent

\*\*M=20:Almost always used

16≤M<20:Usully used

12≤M<16:Sometimes used

8≤M<12:Seldom used

4≤M<8:Almost never used

Table 9  
Criteria and the Extent of Their Use in the Evaluation of Community Service Performance Based Upon Institutional Classification

Level of Classification	Mean(M**)		All Institutions (N=99) Average Mean
	College (N*=32)	University (N=67)	
<u>Criteria</u>			
Community presentations	2.50	2.61	2.58
Conducting training or development programs (credit or non-credit courses)	3.25	2.96	3.05
Porviding technical or management advice to outside organization or businesses	2.87	2.81	2.83
Volunteer Service on Committees, boards and community organizations	2.81	2.67	2.72

\* N=Sample size

\*\*M=5:Almost always used

4≤M<5:Usully used

3≤M<4:Sometimes used

2≤M<3:Seldom used

1≤M<2:Almost never used

presentations to evaluate community service than other criteria.

Data on the means and standard deviations for community service performance based upon the institutional classification are summarized in Table 10. As presented in Table 10, 99 respondents from four-year colleges and universities surveyed indicated that colleges ( $M=11.44$ ) and universities ( $M=11.04$ ) "seldom used" the 4 general criteria to evaluate service performance.

As shown in Table 10, 2 classes of four-year colleges and universities reported overall that the 4 general criteria are "seldom used" in the assessment of community service performance; four-year colleges reported slightly greater use of the criteria to appraise Variable 2, community service, than four-year universities.

#### Community service x control and classification

The data on the means and standard deviations for community service performance by the control and classification levels of institutions are charted in Figure 2. The grand mean rating of responses by public and private institutions versus the 2 levels of classification ( $GM=11.17$ ), indicates that community service is "seldom used" in the assessment of faculty performance at four-year colleges and universities, regardless of the control or classification levels of institutions. Figure 2 reveals that community service performance ranked slightly higher among private four-year colleges ( $M=12.08$ ) and slightly lower among private four-year universities ( $M=10.72$ ).

#### Test of Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6

Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences among the criteria used to evaluate community service performance based on the control levels of institutions.

Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences among the criteria used to evaluate community service performance based on the

**Table 10**  
**Means and Standard Deviations of the Evaluations of Community Service Performance by Institutional Classification**

Variable	n*	Percent of Response (%)	M**	SD
Level of Classification				
College	32	91.43	11.44	3.85
University	67	67	11.04	4.03

\* n=Number of respondent

\*\*M=20:Almost always used

16≤M<20:Usully used

12≤M<16:Sometimes used

8≤M<12:Seldom used

4≤M<8:Almost never used

Classification	Public	Private	Average
College	M=11.00	M=12.08	M=11.44
	SD=3.16	SD=4.75	SD=3.85
	n=19	n=13	n=32
University	M=11.24	M=10.72	M=11.04
	SD=4.18	SD=3.82	SD=4.03
	n=42	n=25	n=67
Average	M=11.16	M=11.18	M=11.17
	SD=3.87	SD=4.15	SD=3.96
	n=61	n=38	n=99
			(Grand Mean)

Legend: M=20: Almost always used  
 $16 \leq M < 20$ : Usually used  
 $12 \leq M < 16$ : Sometimes used  
 $8 \leq M < 12$ : Seldom used  
 $4 \leq M < 8$ : Almost never used  
 n ≤ Number of respondent

Figure 2 Means and Standard Deviations of the Evaluation of Community Service Performance by Institutional Control and Classification

classification levels of institutions.

Hypothesis 6: there is no significant interaction between control and classification levels of institutions among the criteria used to evaluate faculty community service performance.

The results of the two-way analysis of variance for Variable 2, evaluation of community service performance by control and classification levels of institutions, are presented in Table 11. According to Table 11, there was no significant interaction ( $F=.823, p=.367$ ) at the .01 level, therefore hypothesis 6 was not rejected. There were also no significant main effects for control ( $F=.00, p=.992$ ) or classification ( $F=.208, p=.649$ ) at the .01 level. Therefore, hypothesis 4 and 5 were not rejected.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Findings and Conclusions

#### Summary of Major Findings

This study focused on the criteria and the extent of their use by four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan to evaluate faculty college and community service performance. The following major findings were:

1. Based on the control or classification level of the institution, there are no significant differences between the general criteria used by four year colleges and universities in Taiwan to evaluate faculty college service and community service performance.
2. Data indicated that self-evaluation, service as student recruiter, volunteer service on committees, boards and community organizations, and competing job offers were not used frequently by any of the institutions in Taiwan.

Table II  
 Summary of Analysis of Variance of the Evaluation of Community Service  
 Performance by Institutional Control and Classification

Variable	Level	df	MS	F	P
Community Service Performance	Control and Classification				
	<u>Main Effects</u>	2	1.67	.104	.901
	Control	1	.00	.000	.992
	Classification	1	3.33	.208	.649
	<u>2-way Interaction</u>				
	Cont x Class	1	13.16	.823	.367
Explained		3	5.50	.344	.794
Residual					
Total		95	16.00		
		98	15.67		

\*Significant at the .01 level.

3. Data on college service performance indicated that department administrative duties; service on departmental committees; and academic advising are the 3 primary factors of assessment used by four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan to measure faculty college service performance.
4. Data on community service performance indicated that conducting training; providing technical or management advice to outside organizations or businesses; and volunteer service on committees, boards and community organizations are the 3 primary factors of assessment used by four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan to measure faculty community service performance.

#### Conclusion

The results of this study indicated that faculty evaluation is not utilized as much in Taiwan as in American institutions. Traylor (1992) found that faculty evaluation is extensive in the U.S., but in Taiwan it is "seldom" used or "sometimes" used.

In conclusion, it appears that Taiwanese institutions do not use faculty evaluation to the extent that institutions do in the United States. There could be several reasons to explain this. In fact, faculty evaluation in Taiwanese higher education is at the beginning stage. Because the Ministry of Education empowered the institutions to change and improve their quality in 1993, faculty evaluation which is one way to enhance the quality of the institutions only started being an issue recently. Also, some faculty members believe that faculty performance can not be evaluated fairly and faculty evaluation damages the relationship between colleagues. For these reasons, Taiwanese institutions of higher education may be slow in adopting Western methods of faculty evaluation.

## References

- Applegate, M. (1981). Faculty evaluation in higher education. New York, NY: National League for Nursing.
- Arreola, R.A. (1983). Establishing successful faculty evaluation and development programs. In A. Smith (Ed.), Evaluating faculty and staff: New directions for community colleges (pp.83-93). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A.W. & Lee, C.B.T. (1966). Current Practices in the evaluation and training of college teachers. In C.B.T. (Ed.), Improving college teaching (pp. 369-311). Washington, D.C: American Council on Education.
- Astin, A.W. & Lee, C.B.T. (1967). Current Practices in the evaluation and training of college teachers. In C.B.T. Lee (Ed.), Improving college teaching (pp.369-311). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Austin, A.W. & Lee, C.B.T. (1966). Current Practices in the evaluation and training of college teachers. Educational Record, 47, 361-65.
- Baldrige, J.V. (1985, April). A faculty perspective on achieving excellence: Faculty unionism and increased collegiality. In J.M. Douglas (Ed.), Unionization and academic excellenc (pp.23-25). City University of New York: National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professionals.
- Begin, J.P. & Lee, B.A. (1985). Collective bargaining in higher education: A look ahead. The Journal of The College and University Personnel Association, 36 (2), 6-14.
- Bennett, J.B. (Ed.) (1990). Editor's note. The Department Advisor, 5(4), 1.
- Bennett, J.B. & Peltason, J.W. (1985). Contemporary issues in higher education. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

- Boice, R. (1989, Winter). How chairs deal with faculty's teaching evaluations. The Department Advisor, 4(3), 5-6.
- Bowen, H.R. & Schuster, J.H. (1986). American professors, A national resource imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bowers, J.K. (1989, December). Issues in developing a faculty evaluation system. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 3(1), 31-38.
- Braskamp, L., Brandenburg, D., & Ory, J. (1984). Evaluating teaching effectiveness. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Centra, J.A. (1977a). How universities evaluate faculty performance: A survey of department heads. GREB Research Report, no. 75-56R. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service.
- Centra, J.A. (1979). Determining faculty effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Centra, J.A. (1990, Winter). Evaluating college teaching: Some reflections. The Department Advisor, 5(4), 1-5.
- Centra, J.A. (1993). Reflective faculty evaluation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Centra, J.A., Froh, R.C., Gray, P.J., & Lamber, L.M. (1987). A guide to evaluating teaching for promotion and tenure. Acton, Mass.: Copley Publishing Group.
- Chen, C.F. (1993). Research on higher education. Taipei, Taiwan: Normal University.
- Cheydleur, F.D. (1945). Criteria of effective teaching in basic French courses at the University of Wisconsin. Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin. August. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.
- Clark, M.J. (1983). Evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
-

- Cohen, P.A. (1980). Using student rating feedback for improving college instruction: A meta-analysis of findings. Research in Higher Education, 1, 3, 321-341.
- Creal, R.C., Miller, J.P. & Toller, J.M. (1987). Administrative compensation survey. Washington, D.C.: College and University Personnel Association.
- Dottin, E.S. (1987). Faculty evaluation: Toward a humanistic model for appraising performance. San Diego: University of California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 290734)
- Dressel, P.L. (1976). Handbook of academic evaluation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Elman, S.E. & Smock, S.M. (1985). Professional Service and faculty rewards: Toward an integrated structure. Washinton, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Euster, G.L. & Weinback, R.W. (1986, Fall). Dean's quality assessment of faculty publications for tenure/promotio decisions. Journal of Social Work Education, 3, 79-84.
- Evertson, C.M. & Holley, F.M. (1981). Classroom observation. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation (pp.90109). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Feldman, K.A. (1989). Instructional effectiveness of college teachers as judged by teachers themselves, current and former students, colleagues, administrator and external observers. Reserch in Higher Education, 30, 137-189.
- Genova, W.J., Madoff, M.K., Chin, R., & Thomas, G.B. (1976). Mutual benefit evaluation of faculty and administrators in higher education. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.

- Goodwin, H.I. & Smith, E.R. (1985). Faculty and administrator evaluation: Constructing the instruments. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Printing Services.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gustad, J.W. (1961). Policies and practices in faculty evaluation. Educational Record, 42(3), 194-211.
- Gustad, J.W. (1967). Evaluation of teaching performance: Issues and possibilities. In C.B.T. Lee (Ed.), Improving college teaching (pp.265-281). Washinton, D.C: American Council on Education.
- Haves, G.R. & Haves, L.S. (1982). The concise dictionary of education. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold company.
- Hillestad, M. (1977). Research: Process and product. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Delta Pi Epsilon.
- Hodgkinson, H.L. (1971). Institutions in transition: A profile of change in higher education. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hodgkinson, H.L., Hurst, J. & Levine, H. (1975). Improving and assessing performance: Evaluation in higher education. Berkeley, CA: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
- Hofman, J.E. & Kremer, L. (1980). Attitudes toward higher education and course evaluation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 72, 610-617.
- Jauch, L.R. (1976). Relationships of research and teaching: Implication for faculty evaluation. Research in Higher Education, 5, 1-13.
- Lewis, J., Jr. (1973). Appraising teaching performance. West Nyack, NY; Parker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Long, T., Convey, J., & Chwale, A. (1985). Completing dissertations in the behavioral sciences and education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
-

- Lynton, E.A. & Elman, S.E. (1987) New priorities for the university. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McKeachie, W.J. (1979). Student ratings of faculty: A reprise. Academe, 65, 384-397.
- McLean, J.E. (1987). A useful university departmental evaluation. Boston, MA: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 296 661)
- McReynolds, P. (1975). Historical antecedents of personality assessment. In P. McReynolds (Ed.), Advances in psychological assessment (Vol. 3). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, A.C. & Serzan, S.L. (1984). Criteria for identifying a refereed journal. Journal of Higher Education, 55, 673-699.
- Miller, R.I. (1972). Evaluating faculty performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, R.I. (1974). Developing programs for faculty evaluation: A sourcebook for higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, R.I. (1979). The assessment of college performance: A handbook of techniques and measures for institutional self-evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, R.I. (1987). Evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Millman, J. (Ed.). (1981). Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Millman, J. (Ed.). (1984). Introduction. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation (pp.12-13). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Outcalt, D.L. (Ed.). (1980). Report of the task force on teaching evaluation. Berkely: University of California Press, 1980.
-

- Peterson, D.R. & Fishman, D.B. (1987). Assessment for decision. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Rees, A. & Smith, S.P. Faculty retirement in the arts and sciences. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Seldin, P. (1980). Successful faculty evaluation programs: A guide to improve faculty performance and promotion/tenure decisions. Crugers, NY: Coventry.
- Seldin, P. (1984). Changing practices in faculty in faculty evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seldin, P. (1989). How colleges evaluate professors: 1988 vs. 1983. AAHE Bulletin, pp.3-7.
- Stecklein, J.E. (1974). Approaches to measuring workload over the past two decades. In J.I. Doi (Ed.), New directions for higher education: Assessing faculty effort, 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stroup, K.M. (1983). Faculty evaluation. In J.W. Fuller (Ed.), New directions for higher education: Issues in faculty personnel policies. No.41. (pp.47-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, C.F. (1992). A comparative analysis of selected criteria used in four-year colleges and universities to evaluate teaching, scholarship, service, and faculty overall performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, Athens.
- Toward the third century: Issues and choices for Ohio University. (1988). Athens, OH: Ohio University Publications.
- Winkler, A.M. ( 1992, July/August ) The faculty workload question. Change, 36-41.
- Zitlow, E.M. (1988). Faculty evaluation procedures used in two-year postsecondary educational institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, Athens.

## NATIONAL SURVEY OF FACULTY SERVICE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

This study examines the frequency utilization of criteria used by four-year colleges and universities to evaluate faculty performance in service. These data can help establish a current national perspective on these matters. I hope that you will take a few minutes of your time to complete this important survey. Your answers will be included only in statistical summaries and no institution or individual will be identified in any way. Thank you very much. Cheng Chun-Mei, Associate Professor, National Taiwan College of Physical Education.

### Part I - DEMOGRAPHICS

Please check the appropriate blank under each heading.

#### 1. Type of Control

a. public  \_\_\_\_\_

b. private \_\_\_\_\_

#### 2. Classification of Institution

a. College \_\_\_\_\_

b. University \_\_\_\_\_

#### 3. Size of Institution: Number of students \_\_\_\_\_

### Part II - EVALUATION OF COLLEGE SERVICE PERFORMANCE

Please indicate the frequency with which each of the following factors is used in your college in evaluating a faculty member's college service performance.

---

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always
4. Academic advising				1	2 3 4 5
5. Advisor to student organizations				1	2 3 4 5
6. Department administrative duties				1	2 3 4 5
7. Nonacademic student counseling				1	2 3 4 5
8. Participation in campus symposia				1	2 3 4 5
9. Service as student recruiter				1	2 3 4 5
10. Service on collegewide committee				1	2 3 4 5
11. Service on departmental committee				1	2 3 4 5
12. Willingness to teach undesirable course				1	2 3 4 5

### Part III - EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY SERVICE PERFORMANCE

Please indicate the frequency with each of the following factors is used in your college in evaluating a faculty member's community service performance.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Almost Always
13. Community presentations				1	2 3 4 5
14. Conducting training or development programs				1	2 3 4 5
15. Providing technical or management				1	2 3 4 5

advice to outside organizations or

businesses 1 2 3 4 5

16. Volunteer service on committees,

boards and community organizations 1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for your time and assistance. And please indicate if you wish a summary of the results by checking the appropriate blank.

a. Yes, I would like a summary of the result \_\_\_\_\_

b. No, I would not like a summary of the result \_\_\_\_\_

Your Position: Chief Academic Officer

Dean \_\_\_\_\_ Name of Academic College \_\_\_\_\_

Other \_\_\_\_\_