

# 臺灣四年制大學暨學院老師教學 表現之評估研究

國立台灣體育學院 程春美副教授

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教學表現，以及探究其使用程度。由於教學表現的評估使學校老師得以提升其專業上的成長，而且，合理而適當的教學評估對於改善高等教育的品質有極大助益，由此更能顯示出本研究之必要性及其重要性。本研究對於高等教育學校公私立制及類別不同學校使用評鑑標準情形及使用程度，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。

由五十二所四年制大學及學院中一百三十五位學校行政主管為選樣，回收率達 73.33%，問卷內容包括十三項評鑑標準，採行 Likert 方式量表的五種不同程度量化每項評鑑標準，每項評鑑標準數值愈高，表示愈常使用該項評鑑標準來評估老師之教學。

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(Analysis of Variance) 測試其結果。研究結果顯示教學表現評估以學術研究及文章發表為最主要評鑑標準，另外，結果顯示私立大學 ( $M=41.28$ ) 比公立大學 ( $M=37.79$ ) 較常採用評鑑標準來評估老師之教學表現。

未來相關研究之建議包括每五年類似研究應持續進行，以因應實際現況，探知當前學校採用評鑑標準評估老師教學表現情形；研究結果亦建議未來相關研究仍可使用相同問卷內容，唯有樣本對象可變更為學校老師。

## Evaluation of Teacher's Teaching Performance in Higher Education in Taiwan

Cheng, Chun-Mei, Associate Professor

National Taiwan College of Physical Education  
Taichung, Taiwan, R.O.C.

This study surveyed four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan to determine if the criteria used to evaluate faculty performance in teaching based on the control and classification levels of institution. Recently, evaluation of teaching performance and reasonable evaluation procedure were utilized to improve the quality of higher education. Therefore, it indicates the significance and necessity of this paper. The finding results may be utilized to enhance the reader's knowledge of current faculty's teaching performance evaluation and relative to faculty promotion and salary.

The subjects were 135 chief academic officers and deans of institutions selected from 52 four-year colleges and universities. A total of 99(73.33%) of the subjects responded to the survey. The survey instrument contained the major part focusing on the evaluation of teaching performance. The questionnaire was comprised of thirteen general criteria. Each criterion was measured by a Likert-type scale with five degrees. The higher the item was rated on the scale, the more it was utilized in the evaluation of faculty performance at respondent institutions.

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 teaching performance was based primarily on scholarly research and publication. And criteria used to evaluate teaching performance ranked higher among private four-year universities( $M=41.28$ ), and lower among public four-year universities( $M=37.79$ ).

Suggestions for further research included replicating this study every five years to remain current about the practices and procedures, also replicating this study by using the existing instrument but by changing the population to individual faculty members.

## INTRODUCTION

Faculty performance evaluation can be a useful, convenient, reliable, and valid means of self-improvement and self-supervision for the individual. It can reinforce personal growth and instructional improvement throughout one's career. For the institutional administrator, faculty performance evaluation can provide a broad base for making decisions on promotions, salaries, and tenure as well as on developmental activities(Traylor, 1992). Braskamp, Brandenburg and Ory(1984) contended that evaluation is that which "helps faculty examine their teaching for improving it and helps those with proper authority make enlightened decisions about a faculty member's promotion, tenure, annual salary adjustments, awards, and selection into special development programs"(p.19).

Miller(1987, p.17) stated that the 2 basic, well-known purposes of faculty evaluation are to improve faculty performance and to assist in making equitable and effective academic personnel decisions. Faculty evaluation can also serve "to promote expansion of the scope and quality of basic and applied faculty research, and to keep alive a sensitivity to the needs of the local, state, and national community" (Southern Regional Education Board, 1977, in Miller, 1987, p.2).

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 teaching 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 teaching performance differ based upon the control (public or private) and classification (college and university) levels of an institution.

### Research Question

The following research question was set in order to analyze the problem:

What is the difference in criteria and the extent of their use in the evaluation of faculty teaching 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:

Ho1: There are no significant differences among the criterion used to evaluate faculty teaching performance based on the control levels of the institutions.

Ho2: There are no significant differences among the criteria used to evaluate faculty teaching 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 teaching 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 teaching 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

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.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Priest(1967), "Teaching is too important to be exempted from measurement" (p.287). Current literature on the subject is voluminous and approached from a number of theoretical perspectives(McKeachie, 1979; Millman, 1981; Peterson & Walburg, 1980). Almost all colleges and universities, public and private, have some ways of determining effectiveness and efficiency of teaching performance.

### How to Evaluate Teaching Performance?

To evaluate teaching, Boyer(1990) recommended gathering at least three types of information: self-assessment, peer assessments, and student assessment. Traylor(1992) in a summary of studies which

included Gustad(1961), Astin & Lee(1966), Centra(1979), and Seldin (1984), dating to 1961 found the evaluation of teaching currently is based primarily on chair evaluation, systematic student ratings, and dean evaluation.

#### Student rating

Miller(1974) made a case for students' contribution to the teacher evaluation process, writing:

If one is forced to choose the most significant component of evaluating classroom teaching, it would be student evaluation, although the use of several components is preferable to any single one. The evidence clearly indicates that students can evaluate teaching fairly and perceptively(p.30).

Burton(1956) also pointed out that students are in a better position than colleagues or administrators to judge the quality of instruction they are receiving.

#### Colleague and chair evaluation

Colleagues and department chairs can provide evaluative information that is not available from any other source. Neither students, who lack the background and perspective, nor deans, who lack the time, can contribute the kind of information that colleagues and chairs can (Centra, 1993).

#### Course syllabi and examinations

Centra (1979) found that department heads believe that the content of course syllabi and examinations should increase in priority and be emphasized more in evaluations. Genova, Madoff, Chin, and Thomas (1976) wrote:

The examination of a course syllabus, texts, reading lists, and

student exam questions supplemented by the teacher's description of their use offer insight into the content of a course. Other faculty members in the same department, department chairmen, and others outside the department---who have experienced the use of these materials, are appropriate sources of evaluation information. The sharing of these materials among faculty members can stimulate discussion and new ideas so that this activity can foster faculty development (p.17).

#### Scholarly research and publication

Dressel(1976), explained scholarship and research as that which enhances or expands the basic disciplines:

It is essential for all in order to maintain alertness and to ensure that the implications of increasing knowledge for revision of undergraduate offerings are explored---it can provide structured opportunities for increasing one's knowledge of the discipline, instructional and evaluation techniques, course development, use of educational technology, related fields---and computer utilization.(p.360)

### METHODOLOGY

This is a descriptive study that utilized a questionnaire to identify selected criteria and the extent of their use in the evaluation of faculty performance in teaching.

The questionnaire had its roots in a 1961 study by John W. Gustad. It had been used in several other studies (Austin & Lee, 1967; Centra, 1980; 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 one dependent variable and two 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

The survey instrument is in Appendix.

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

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: What is the difference in criteria and the extent of their use in the evaluation of faculty teaching performance at four-year colleges and universities based upon the control and classification levels of institutions?

After running the data by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+), the reliability coefficients of the 13 general criteria is ALPHA = .8294.

#### Teaching Performance x Control

Presented in Table 2 is the extent to which each of the 13 general criteria are used in the evaluation of teaching performance, based upon control levels of institutions. Mean rating in Table 2 indicate that scholarly research and publication ( $M=3.72$ ); course syllabi, examinations, handouts ( $M=3.52$ ); systematic student ratings ( $M=3.33$ ); informal student opinions; student examination performance; colleague opinions; and committee evaluation are "sometimes used" by four-year colleges and universities, to evaluate teaching performance. Enrollment in elective courses; chair evaluations; long-term follow-up of students; dean evaluation; classroom visitations ( $M=2.51$ ); self-evaluations or reports ( $M=2.36$ ) are "seldom used" to evaluate teaching performance.

According to Tale 2, the private institutions more frequently used student examinations ( $M=3.55 > M=2.98$ ); enrollment in elective courses ( $M=3.08 > M=2.70$ ) and committee evaluations ( $M=3.21 > 2.97$ )

than did public institutions, to evaluate teaching performance. Scholarly research and publications ( $M=3.77$ ); course syllabi, examinations, handouts ( $M=3.39$ ); and informal student opinions ( $M=3.30$ ) are more used by public institutions than other criteria, to evaluate teaching performance. Course syllabi, examinations, handouts ( $M=3.71$ ); scholarly research and publications ( $M=3.63$ ); and student examinations ( $M=3.55$ ) are more used by four-year private institutions than other criteria, to evaluate teaching performance.

Data on the means and standard deviations for teaching performance by institutional control levels are depicted in Table 3. As presented in Table 3, responses by private institutions indicated that teaching performance is "sometimes used" ( $M=40.47$ ) in the assessment of faculty performance, responses by public institutions indicate that teaching performance is "seldom used" ( $M=37.87$ ) in the assessment of faculty performance at four-year colleges and universities. According to Table 3, private institutions reported slightly greater ( $M=40.47 > M=37.87$ ) use of the criteria to appraise teaching performance, than did public universities.

#### Teaching Performance x Classification

Presented in Table 4 is the extent to which each of the 13 general criteria are used in the evaluation of faculty teaching performance based upon the institutional classification, colleges and universities. Mean ratings in Table 4 indicate that scholarly research and publications ( $M=3.85$ ); course syllabi, examinations, handouts ( $M=3.45$ ); and systematic student ratings ( $M=3.42$ ) are more used by four-year universities than other criteria to evaluate faculty teaching performance. Course syllabi, examination, handouts ( $M=3.66$ ); scholarly research and publications ( $M=3.44$ ); and student examination perfor-

mance ( $M=3.28$ ) are more used by four-year colleges than other criteria to evaluate faculty teaching performance.

Data on the means and standard deviations for teaching performance by institutional classification are depicted in Table 5. As presented in Table 5, mean ratings between levels of classification indicate that universities "sometimes used" ( $M=39.09$ ) the 13 general criteria and that colleges "seldom used" ( $M=38.41$ ) the 13 general criteria to evaluate faculty teaching performance.

#### Teaching Performance x Control and Classification

The data on the means and standard deviations for teaching 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 ( $GM=38.87$ ), indicate that teaching is "seldom used" in the assessment of faculty performance at four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan, regardless of the control of classification levels of institutions. Figure 1 it reveals that teaching performance ranked slightly higher among private four-year universities ( $M=41.28$ ) and slightly lower among public four-year universities ( $M=37.79$ ).

The results of the two-way analysis of variance for evaluation of faculty teaching performance by control and classification levels of institutions, are presented in Table 6. According to Table 6, there was no significant interaction ( $F=.408$ ,  $p=.525$ ) at the .01 level, therefore hypothesis 3 was not rejected. There were also no significant main effects for control ( $F=1.851$ ,  $p=.177$ ) or classification ( $F=.147$ ,  $p=.702$ ) at the .01 level. Therefore, hypotheses 1 and 2 were not rejected.

## CONCLUSION

This study endeavored to determine if the criteria and the extent of their use by four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan to evaluate faculty teaching performance differ, based upon institutional control level(public, private) and the institutional classification of colleges and universities.

### Findings on the Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Performance

Research Question 1 was designed to determine the differences in criteria and the extent of their use in the evaluation of faculty teaching performance. Thirteen general criteria were evaluated and analyzed at the .01 level of significance. An analysis of variance procedure, performed on the 2 levels of control and the 2 levels of institutional classification, found no significant differences in the criteria and the extent of their use in the evaluation of faculty teaching performance.

Based on 5-point likert-type scale, data on each criterion found that scholarly research and publications ( $M=3.72$ ) and course syllabi, examinations, and handouts ( $M=3.52$ ) ranked highest among the 13 general criteria, indicating that they are "sometimes used" by four-year colleges and universities, to evaluate teaching performance, irrespective of institutional control or classification level. Enrollment in elective courses; chair evaluation; long-term follow-up of students; dean evaluation; classroom visitation; self-evaluation or report are "seldom used" to evaluate teaching performance.

Universities reported that the overall 13 general criteria are "sometimes uses" and colleges reported that the 13 general criteria are "seldom used" in the assessment of faculty teaching performance. And private institutions "sometimes used" and public institutions

"seldom used" the 13 general criteria in the assessment of faculty teaching performance.

The data indicated that public institutions less frequently use committee evaluation; student examination performance; enrollment in elective courses than do private institutions, to evaluate faculty teaching performance.

The grand mean rating of responses by public and private institution versus the 2 levels of classification ( $GM=38.87$ ) indicated that teaching is "seldom used" in the assessment of faculty performance at four-year colleges and universities in Taiwan, regardless of the control or classification levels of institutions.

And criteria used to evaluate teaching performance ranked higher among private four-year universities ( $M=41.28$ ), and lower among public four-year universities ( $M=37.79$ ).

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 as 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 recently, faculty evaluation that 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 in adopting West-

ern methods of faculty evaluation gradually.

### **Recommendations for Further Study**

1. It is recommended that a replication of this study be conducted about every 5 years to encourage four-year colleges and universities to facilitate greater consistency, and to remain current about the practices and procedures of evaluation.
2. It is recommended that a replication of this study be conducted by using an interview method and by changing the population to individual faculty members. Since the faculty member is affected directly by the evaluation process, he/she could presumably give an account of the evaluation process from a different perspective than the chief academic officers and deans.

## References

- Austin, A.W. & Lee, C.B.T. (1966). Current Practices in the evaluation and training of college teachers. *Educational Record*, 47, 361-65.
- Braskapm, L., Brandenburg, D., & Ory, J. (1984). *Evaluating teaching effectiveness*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Centra, J.A. (1979). *Determini. Determining faculty effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Centra, J.A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dressel, P.L. (1976). *Handbook of academic evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 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.
- Gustad, J.W. (1961). Policies and practices in faculty evaluation. *Educational Record*, 42(3), 194-211.
- McKeachie, W.J. (1979). Student ratings of faculty: A reprise. *Academe*, 65, 384-397.
- Miller, R.I. (1974). *Developing programs for faculty evaluation: A sourcebook for higher education*. 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.
- Peterson, P.L., & Walberg, H.J.(Eds.)(1980). *Research on teaching: Concepts, findings and implications*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Priest, B.J.(1967). *Classrooms: Castles or learning laboratories*. In

- C.B.T.Lee (Ed), *Improving college teaching* (pp.286-288). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Seldin, P.(1984). *Changing practices in faculty in faculty evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Traylor, 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.
- Zitolw, E.M.(1988). *Faculty evaluation procedures used in two-year postsecondary educational institutions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, Athens.

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:			
(1)Public	74	61	82.43%
(2)Private	61	38	62.3%
Total	135	99	73.33%

Table 2.

Criteria and the Extent of Their Use in the Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Performance Based upon Control Level 2

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>			
Systematic student ratings	3.23	3.50	3.33
Chair evaluation	2.70	2.92	2.79
Dean evaluation	2.46	2.82	2.60
Self-evaluation or report	2.38	2.34	2.36
Course syllabi, examinations, handouts	3.39	3.71	3.52
Scholarly research and publication	3.77	3.63	3.72
Committee evaluation	2.97	3.21	3.06
Colleague opinions	3.11	3.05	3.09
Classroom visitation	2.31	2.82	2.51
Informal student opinions	3.30	3.13	3.23
Student Examination performance	2.98	3.55	3.20
Long-term follow-up of students	2.56	2.71	2.62
Enrollment in elective courses	2.70	3.08	2.85

\* N = Sample size

\*\* M = 5 : Almost always used

4 ≤ M < 5 : Usually used

2 ≤ M < 3 : Seldom used

3 ≤ M < 4 : Sometimes used

1 ≤ M < 2 : Almost never used

Table 3.

Means and Standard Deviations of the Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Performance by Institutional Control Level

Variable	n*	Percent of Response (%)	M**	SD
Level of Control				
Private Institutions	38	62.3	40.47	9.32
Public Institutions	61	82.4	37.87	9.24

\* n = Number of respondent

\*\* M = 65 : Almost always used

52 ≤ M < 65 : Usually used

39 ≤ M < 52 : Sometimes used

26 ≤ M < 39 : Seldom used

13 ≤ M < 26 : Almost never used

Table 4.

Criteria and the Extent of Their Use in the Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Performance Based Upon Institutional Classification

Level of Classification	Mean(M <sup>**</sup> )		All Institutions (N = 99) Average M
	College (N* = 32)	University (N = 67)	
<u>Criteria</u>			
Systematic student ratings	3.16	3.42	3.33
Chair evaluation	2.75	2.81	2.79
Dean evaluation	2.87	2.46	2.60
Self-evaluation or report	2.34	2.37	2.36
Course syllabi, examinations, handouts	3.66	3.45	3.52
Scholarly research and publication	3.44	3.85	3.72
Committee evaluation	3.00	3.09	3.06
Colleague opinions	3.06	3.10	3.09
Classroom visitation	2.59	2.46	2.51
Informal student opinions	3.06	3.31	3.23
Student Examination performance	3.28	3.16	3.20
Long-term follow-up of students	2.56	2.64	2.62
Enrollment in elective courses	2.62	2.96	2.85

\* 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 5.

Means and Standard Deviations of the Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Performance by Institutional Classification

Variable	n*	Percent of Response(%)	M**	SD
Level of Classification				
University	67	67	39.09	10.02
College	32	91.43	38.41	7.75

\* n = Number of respondent

\*\* M = 65 : Almost always used

52 ≤ M < 65 : Usually used

39 ≤ M < 52 : Sometimes used

26 ≤ M < 39 : Seldom used

• 13 ≤ M < 26 : Almost never used

Table 6.

Summary of analysis of Variance of the Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Performance by Institutional Control and Classification

Variable	Level	df	MS	F	P
Faculty Teaching *Performance	Control and Classification				
	Main Effects	2	85.85	.984	.378
	Control	1	161.60	1.851	.177
	Classification	1	12.84	.147	.702
	2-way				
	Interaction	1	35.60	.408	.525
	Cont x Class	1	35.60	.408	.525
Explained		3	69.10	.792	.501
Residual		95	87.28		
Total		98	86.73		

\* Significant at the .01 level.

Figure 1.

Means and Standard Deviations of the Evaluation of Teaching Performance by Institutional Control and Classification

Classification	Public	Private	Average
College	M=38.05 SD=8.32 n=19	M=38.92 SD=7.12 n=13	M=38.41 SD=7.75 n=32
University	M=37.79 SD=9.72 n=42	M=41.28 SD=10.33 n=25	M=39.09 SD=10.02 n=67
Average	M=37.87 SD=9.24 n=61	M=40.47 SD=9.33 n=38	M=38.87 SD=9.31 n=99 (Grand Mean)

Legend M = 65 : Almost always used  
 52 ≤ M < 65 : Usually used  
 39 ≤ M < 52 : Sometimes used  
 26 ≤ M < 39 : Seldom used  
 13 ≤ M < 26 : Almost never used  
 n = Number of respondent

## Appendix

### Survey Instrument

#### NATIONAL SURVEY OF TEACHER'S TEACHING PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

This study examines the frequency utilization of criteria used by four-year colleges and universities to evaluate faculty performance in teaching. Results will be tallied and comparisons will be made based on institutional control and classification. 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. Also, we would like to send you a summary of the results if you wish. Thank you. Cheng Chun-Mei, National Taiwan College of Physical Education.

#### Part I - DEMOGRAPHICS

Please check the appropriate blank under each heading.

##### 01. Type of Control

- a. Public \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Private \_\_\_\_\_

02. Classification of institution

- a. College \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. University \_\_\_\_\_

03. Size of Institution: Number of students

\_\_\_\_\_

Part II -EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Please indicate the frequency with which each of the following factors is used in your college in evaluating a faculty member's teaching performance. (Please circle ONE answer in each row.)

	(1) Almost Never	(2) Seldom	(3) Sometimes	(4) Usually	(5) Almost Always
04. Chair evaluation	1	2	3	4	5
05. Classroom visitation	1	2	3	4	5
06. Colleague opinions	1	2	3	4	5
07. Committee evaluation	1	2	3	4	5
08. Course syllabus, examinations, handouts	1	2	3	4	5
09. Dean evaluation	1	2	3	4	5
10. Enrollment in elective courses	1	2	3	4	5
11. Informant student opinions	1	2	3	4	5
12. Long-term follow-up of students	1	2	3	4	5
13. Self-evaluation report	1	2	3	4	5
14. Scholarly research and publication	1	2	3	4	5
15. Student examination performance	1	2	3	4	5
16. Systematic student rating	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 \_\_\_\_\_