1990

Variance in student ratings of part-time and full-time instructor effectiveness by teaching field and function at a Midwestern community college

Martha Jane Kirker
Iowa State University

Order Number 9035086

Variance in student ratings of part-time and full-time instructor effectiveness by teaching field and function at a midwestern community college

Kirker, Martha Jane, Ph.D.

Iowa State University, 1990

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Variance in student ratings of part-time and full-time instructor effectiveness by teaching field and function at a midwestern community college

by

Martha Jane Kirker

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION

As Community colleges persist in hiring a relatively large number of part-time faculty, ways to maintain and improve the quality of instruction are paramount. About sixty per-cent of instructors in community colleges are part-time employees (AACJC, 1987) and future trends indicate that the percentage will increase. The employment of part-time faculty prompts a concern for continuity and quality in providing education for community college students. Identifying effective instructors may lead to improvements in the quality of instruction and employment practices.

Rising public, administrative, and instructor concern for effective teaching at community colleges encouraged the practice of soliciting student evaluation of instructors during the 1970s. Evaluation results often are applied to instructor self-improvement but rarely to evidence instructor effectiveness relative to student learning (Overall & Cooper, 1981).

This research describes full-time and part-time

faculty performance within community college subgroups utilizing student evaluation analysis. Research targeting specific groups such as part-time and full-time instructors in community colleges lacks consistency. Some studies indicate that full-time instructors were more effective teachers. Cagle (1978) analyzed data from 11,368 student evaluations of 117 full-time instructors and 262 part-time instructors at Tulsa Junior Community College. Full-time instructors rated significantly higher than part-time instructors. However, other research revealed no difference in the teaching skills of the two groups of faculty. Students and administrators evaluated instructors at Hagerstown Community College (Behrendt & Parson, 1983) and a Midwestern Community College (Cruise, Furst, & Klimes, 1980). No significant difference resulted in the comparison of ratings of part-time instructors with the ratings of full-time instructors.

Part-time instructors rated as well as full-time instructors in academic courses when evaluated by students at Butler County Community College (Trent, 1984). But a contradiction emerged when part-time instructors rated higher than full-time instructors on some questionnaire items.

In a review of research concerning the evaluation of teachers in higher education, four factors influenced student rating variance (Kulik & McKeachie, 1975). The factors were student characteristics, teacher characteristics, interaction effects, and teaching conditions. One student characteristic influencing student ratings of instructors was the general disposition of students toward instructors and courses. Personality, performance, and cognitive characteristics also contributed to rating differences. Student age, sex, and college year had little effect.

Another factor that influenced student rating variance was teacher characteristics. These characteristics seemed to indicate how attractive a teacher was to students. Examples of these characteristics included teaching experience, research productivity, personality, knowledge, ability, and communication.

Student characteristics interacted with teacher characteristics creating an interaction effects factor that influenced student ratings. Interaction effects referred to the response of students to instructors and their teaching method. Student characteristics interacted

with teacher characteristics to influence student ratings. Teaching conditions were course characteristics and included discipline or department designations. Other course characteristics influencing student ratings were the number of students in the class and the class status. The status of the class referred to the reason a student enrolled in the course. The student may have elected to enroll in the course or the course may have been required by a college program.

Vreeland and Bidwell (1966) studied the structural properties of departments and the effect of those properties on the values and attitudes of students. A random sample consisted of 127 faculty interviews at an Eastern university. Course goals and achievement variables appeared to be similar for courses within each department according to Vreeland and Bidwell (1966). Related aims of offerings in departments and approaches to undergraduate instruction suggested that departmental goals were technical or moral. Most science departments subscribed to technical goals, social science departments to moral goals, and the humanities departments to diverse goals.

Biglan (1973a,b) related subject matter to the

organization and output of departments through three dimensions. The dimensions were the degree to which a paradigm existed, concern with application, and concern with life systems. Faculty questionnaires and archival records of 47 departments at the Urbana campus of the University of Illinois provided data for over 100 curricula. The dimensions suggested possible units to study in cognitive investigations.

Kolb (1981) differentiated student requirements for learning in different curriculums. He identified the learning styles of 800 managers and found a correspondence between their learning style and their undergraduate major field. Students developed learning styles compatible with their personal attributes and experiences. Identification of differences in learning styles and corresponding learning environments showed that students chose fields in which they were more likely to learn. The Kolb and Biglan studies distinguished teaching fields relative to the abstract-concrete and active-reflective dimensions in experiential learning theory. The active stage represented professions and the abstract stage represented pure academic disciplines.

In the community college, research results involving

vocational technical courses or arts and sciences courses may vary because of differences found by Vreeland and Bidwell (1966) in goals, attributes, and approaches to instruction. Findings of Kolb (1981) and Biglan (1973a,b) suggest a difference in learning styles and curriculum norms in vocational technical courses and courses in arts and sciences. The two stages in the active-reflective dimension of experiential learning correspond with vocational technical and arts and sciences fields.

If the course characteristic of discipline or department influenced the variance in student ratings of teachers in research cited by Kulik and McKeachie (1975) then an appropriate analysis of part-time and full-time student ratings may include subgroups of instructors. Past research identified differences which suggest the following subgroups: Arts and sciences courses, vocational technical courses, and courses grouped by teaching field. Investigating subgroups designated by teaching field may allow for variances due to discipline, while arts and sciences and vocational technical faculty subgroups may accommodate differences in teacher orientation and working conditions.

Statement of the Problem

Research findings related to the quality of instruction provided by full-time and part-time instructors lacked consistency. Research investigated the relative quality of instruction offered by part-time and full-time faculty groups but did not examine the possible variances in the quality relative to college disciplinary subgroups. Investigations refining or expanding the research done in the past may help in solving the problem.

The problem is to identify whether variances in teaching effectiveness exist between part-time instructors and full-time instructors, and whether those differences also vary by teaching field or by arts and sciences and vocational technical groups of teaching fields. This problem poses a number of research questions.

Research Questions

Investigating the teaching effectiveness of subgroups of full-time and part-time faculty involves the following questions:

1. To what extent does the full-time versus

part-time faculty designation effect student ratings of instruction?

2. To what extent does the teaching field effect student ratings of instruction?

3. To what extent do the full-time versus part-time faculty designations and their teaching field designations interact to effect student ratings of instruction?

4. To what extent do functional distinctions of arts and sciences and vocational technical courses effect student ratings of instruction?

5. To what extent do the full-time versus part-time distinctions and the functional distinctions of arts and sciences and vocational technical courses interact to effect student ratings of instructors?

Definition of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty For the Purpose of This Research

Researchers have defined full-time faculty and part-time faculty in a number of different ways. Cagle (1978) stated that Tulsa Junior College defined part-time teachers as "teachers employed on a one-semester letter of agreement to generally teach no more than two credit

classes. These teachers are paid on an hourly rate." Full-time teachers are "employed to teach on a full-time basis with at least a nine-month contract within a fiscal year of July 1 - June 30. They are employed on a salary contract and teach an average course load of 15 credit hours per semester."

Cohen and Brawer (1977) recognized the variation in definitions of part-time instructors when they stated the following:

> There is no uniform definition. The California Education Code defined them as people employed to teach not more than 60 percent of the hours constituting a full-time assignment. Elsewhere, in contractual agreements and college policies, they may be people teaching fewer than some number of hours per week or some fraction of the average load of full-time faculty in respective departments.

Kandzer (1977) applied the following meanings for part-time and full-time instructors: "A part-time instructor is a person whose teaching assignment is considered by the local institution as part-time. A part-time instructor is one who is teaching less than the

minimum number of credit or contact hours recognized by the local institution as comprising a full-time teaching load." In his research, Trent (1984) gave the following definition for part-time teachers. "Part-time teachers are that group of instructors certified as such by the vice president of the school where the study was completed. They usually perform only teaching duties. Their rate of pay is less than that of the full-time instructor. They receive no fringe benefits such as sick leave, state retirement or insurance. There is no provision for tenure. ... The salary schedule for part-time instructors contains no provision for rank or additional compensation for experience. Generally, they will teach no more than three to six credit hours a semester."

In an examination of the costs and constraints on employment of full-time and part-time faculty, Arrington (1980) agreed that full-time and part-time distinctions were usually based on the number of hours worked. She cited the Current Population Survey as defining full-time "as 35 working hours or more per week, while part-time is less than 35 hours."

This research, which investigates the teaching effectiveness of part-time and full-time faculty in

subgroups, applies the following definitions for evaluation purposes:

1. Full-time faculty were defined by the community college as nine-month and twelve-month teaching faculty who receive notices stating that they are working full-time and have been approved to work full-time by the community college governing body.

2. Part-time faculty were classified as those instructors who receive notice stating that they are working part-time and who are not covered by other college faculty evaluation procedures.

3. A teaching field was a group of courses belonging to a specific arts and sciences area or career program such as history, business, graphic arts, or welding.

4. Arts and sciences courses were courses in the transfer programs which led to the Associate of Arts degree, in developmental mathematics and English, and in required general education.

5. Vocational technical courses was a group of courses in career programs leading to an Associate of Applied Science degree or a certificate.

6. English and mathematics courses were developmental, vocational technical, and transfer courses

taught by instructors hired with the same qualifications as all transfer course instructors.

Sources of Data

This research uses existing information and data to identify the strengths and weaknesses of faculty employed at a community college located in the central region of the United States. The community college, which was accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, offered arts and sciences, technical, and developmental courses. Programs led to the Associate of Arts degree, Associate in Applied Science degree, and Certificate of Achievement. The associate degrees required completion of programs designed for two years of courses and the certificate required programs of study with a duration of less than two years.

The community college offered courses at three campus locations and at various off-campus sites within an urban environment. The three community college campuses served a metropolitan area. During 1984-85, 13,526 students enrolled in credit courses and in 1985-86 there were 16,550 students enrolled in credit courses.

Data are from a sample of student evaluation forms used by the community college in routine assessment of instructors. Students evaluated instructors in at least one class every year. The evaluation forms used in collecting the data were a part of the annual evaluation of college faculty. The purpose, scope, general principles, and procedures for the evaluations are in the appendix with a copy of the questionnaire forms used. These entries are from the community college handbook.

A total of 12,460 student evaluation questionnaires were in subgroups that were used for data analysis. Subgroup data represented student evaluations over a two year period. Collegewide evaluation of all instructors included data for two years from 30,293 questionnaires. The college collected data during two regular quarter terms and a summer term in 1984-85 and 1985-86.

Data Analysis

The data analysis involved examination of scores from student evaluations of instructors. Students routinely evaluated instructors on a college prepared form. The evaluation form consisted of thirty items that were rated

with a multiple choice scale. The rating scale allowed items to have ratings of five different weights. An application of Cronbach's Alpha estimated the internal consistency of the evaluation items.

The nature of the research questions called for analysis of variance inferential techniques. Multiple analysis of variance determines whether subgroup sample means are significantly different from one another and whether they might be from different populations. The factorial design generates F values to tell whether means of factors differ significantly from one another and whether factors interact significantly with one another. Factors include data grouped by teaching field, arts and sciences course, vocational technical course, and overall college ratings. Following the finding of a significant F ratio in the analysis of variance, Scheffe's Test investigates the statistical significance of the differences between identified group means and combinations of means.

Assumptions

Assumptions adopted at the beginning of this research

were the following:

1. Students were able to distinguish between effective teaching skills of instructors.

2. Evaluations were given in a uniform manner.

3. Evaluations were administered according to college instructions.

4. Evaluation items described the characteristics of effective instruction.

5. The time of administration of the evaluations was not unusual.

6. The distribution of students and faculty during the years chosen for the study were typical for the community college.

7. The evaluation instrument was in use for over five years at the institution.

Delimitations

The following delimitations constrained the research:

1. The research was limited to one multicampus community college.

2. The study examined data collected from student evaluations of instructors at a community college

located in the central region of the United States.

3. Data represented evaluations of instructors teaching arts and sciences courses and vocational technical courses given for credit.

4. Data included noncredit developmental courses in English and Mathematics.

5. Data representing evaluations of full-time instructors included overload courses taught by full-time faculty.

6. Data was aggregated at the departmental level to protect the confidentiality of evaluation reports of individual instructors.

Summary

The purpose of the research was to investigate whether differences in teaching effectiveness exist between full-time instructors and part-time instructors in specific educational areas by treating teachers of subgroups of community college courses independently. Past research failed to investigate full-time and part-time teaching effectiveness and its relationship to teaching fields, arts and sciences courses, and vocational technical courses.

Identification of possible instructional strengths or weaknesses can aid in the assignment of part-time instructors to courses where they are likely to have the most impact on student learning as well as justify their continued employment at community colleges.

CHAPTER 2.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews selected literature pertaining to faculty evaluation and instructional quality. The purpose of the review was to identify factors affecting the quality of education provided by part-time and full-time instructors, student evaluations of instructors, and criteria for the evaluation of instructors. These factors, in turn, served to constrain and direct the current investigation.

The first research studies reviewed were those studies that examined criteria for quality of instruction. The studies identified criteria for good teaching and indicated appraisal items commonly used on student evaluation instruments. The next group of studies sought to substantiate the use of student evaluations of instructors as estimates of classroom teaching effectiveness and student learning. After discussion of student evaluations and their validity, studies investigated subgroups of instructors as an appropriate analysis unit when studying cognitive outcomes.

The subsequent research presented investigations of

full-time and part-time faculty effectiveness. The first research examined instructors in all instructional fields within the college studied. The second group of research studies targeted instructors within specific instructional fields. The instructional fields for the various studies were limited to the following: Teachers of arts and sciences courses, sophomore arts and sciences courses, or sections of a single English course.

Several researchers in the review attempted to determine whether part-time faculty provided classroom instruction comparable to the instruction offered by full-time faculty. The purpose of the investigations was to determine if colleges neglected student learning by hiring large numbers of part-time instructors who are not performing as well as full-time instructors. Another purpose was to determine if the employment of part-time instructors affected the quality of education offered by institutions.

Criteria for Quality Education

Quality of education refers to the result of instruction provided by full-time faculty and part-time faculty. The term quality held many meanings in the Educational Resources Information Center community college

literature. Palmer (1983) reviewed literature about quality in community colleges. The five determinants of quality which he discussed were institutional resources, instructional and management processes, student outcomes, value-added impact on students, and curricular structure and emphasis. Institutional resources included course offerings, faculty, students, and funding. The number of course offerings, quantity of funds, and student preparation were measures of institutional resource quality. Faculty quality assessments were comparisons of faculty with four-year institution faculty or evaluations of faculty in the two-year college teaching environment.

Instructional and management processes referred to college organization and the way instructors taught students. Quality instruction equated with a search for improved teaching. Student outcomes pertained to whether students found employment or transferred to a four-year college. Value-added impacts on students refered to what students learned in the community college, but the absence of measurement methods prevented assessment of student learning as a determinant of quality education.

Curriculur structure and emphasis discussions involved two issues: college parallel programs and the comprehensive curriculum. The question, How do liberal arts and vocational training courses contribute to quality?

had no answer. A significant aspect was that administrators and instructors had control of the curriculum while they had little or no control of some of the other determinants of quality. Palmer (1983) found few methods for measuring quality. He classified quality measurements as outcome and value-added measures. A profile of how quality should be measured included the results of a survey of administrators. The survey asked what data were appropriate in making decisions. Palmer (1983) concluded that there was "little quantitative research into the quality of community college education". There was much discussion about quality but emperical evidence was not the basis for judgments.

Another Educational Resources Information Center search in 1979 found no comparisons of the quality of part-time faculty with full-time faculty. In this search, Landers (1979) described part-time faculty effectiveness in terms of the types of courses they taught. The frequency of quoted employment in the literature determined effectiveness. Part-time faculty provided the flexibility required for colleges to accommodate changes in enrollment and course offerings, in teaching adult and extension courses, and in furnishing specialized knowledge. Landers concluded that part-time evaluation was subjective and provided no decisive results.

Wilson (Wilson, Gaff, Dienst, Wood & Bavry, 1975) investigated how good teaching and learning take place. Self-reports of faculty and senior students at eight colleges and universities, colleague interpretations, and measured changes in students provided data for this study. When colleagues and students nominated stimulating and contributive teachers, similarities appeared. The similarities in teachers who were chosen by both students and teachers designated characteristics of effective teachers. The characteristics included commitment to undergraduate teaching, striving to make course presentations interesting, talking with students about contemporary issues, and interacting with students outside of class. Characteristics associated with actions of teachers rather than with how they think. The implication of the characteristics being associated with actions was that students could observe characteristics in the classroom. Also, actions influenced teaching effectiveness which made it possible to vary effectiveness by influencing teacher actions (Wilson, 1986).

Validity of Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Kulik and McKeachie (1975) concluded that students

were good judges of teaching effectiveness and that evaluations generally contained similar teaching dimensions developed through research. They reviewed research on the evaluation of teachers in higher education and sought to identify dimensions of instructor evaluation. They summarized eleven studies which applied factor analysis to ratings of instructors. They categorized similarities in the results into four dimensions of good teaching which were suitable for evaluating instructors. The categories were skill, rapport, structure, and overload. Skill was a general factor pertaining to course value and instructor teaching ability. The skill factor appeared to be more important because of the large number of evaluation items pertaining to that category. Rapport included empathy, interaction, accessibility, and affective merit. Structure referred to organization, control, cognitive merit, and planning. Difficulty, academic emphasis, stress, and demanding represented overload.

Student characteristics, teaching conditions, teacher characteristics, and interaction effects were possible variations in ratings. The following summary described the variations stated by Kulik and McKeachie:

Summary of Determinants of Variation in Student Ratings of Instruction

I. Student Variables. The student's general disposition toward instructors and instruction is the most important influence on within-class differences in rating. Sex, age, grades, and major are of trivial importance.

II. Teaching Conditions. Factors that influence class ratings include class size, and discipline or department of course. While subject matter differences in class ratings within departments have not been demonstrated, this is a likely further source of variation in class ratings. For example, the teacher of the modern novel may enjoy an advantage over the medievalist.

III. Teacher Characteristics. There is probably a weak positive correlation between experience or academic rank and student ratings, although the size and direction of this relation may differ at different types of schools. Research productivity shows a similar weak positive relation to student ratings. To both peers and students, highly rated instructors seem to be cultured and sophisticated and especially articulate in classroom presentations.

IV. Interaction Effects. If the instructor

> teaches for the bright students, he will be approved by them and there will be a positive correlation between ratings and grades; If he teaches for the weaker students, he will be disapproved by the bright students and a negative coefficient will be obtained. There is some evidence that college students with different personality traits respond differently to highly structured and less structured teaching styles.

In reviewing research concerning the reliability of student ratings, Kulik and McKeachie (1975) concluded that students rate their teachers reliably on the commonly used rating forms. Individual student ratings were reliable according to studies of the magnitude of internal consistency and stability over time. The reliability of composite ratings of instructors was high. The reliability became lower when subdivided according to courses, disciplines, or sections of a course.

Comparisons of student ratings with faculty colleague and college administrator ratings showed similar results in a number of investigations. In the review by Kulik and McKeachie (1975), studies of colleague ratings revealed agreement with student ratings. The review stated that administrative ratings of instructors were

"interchangeable" with colleague ratings. "In a program of multiple indicators, student ratings will provide the best information about the teachers' classroom presentations. Research findings suggest that no single method is entirely adequate in evaluation of teaching skill" because, "student ratings are influenced by factors other than teaching skill".

Studies of independent groups of students found that the groups agreed when identifying the best and worst instructors. At Davis campus of the University of California, 338 students and 119 faculty identified the best and worst instructors. They also answered questions about the performance of the teachers. One hundred sixty-two faculty recorded their own activities. Items identified as describing effective teaching provided a means for characterizing effective teaching. Factor analysis of the characteristics produced four components. The components were Analytic/Synthetic Approach, Organization/Clarity, Instructor-Group Interaction, and Instructor-Individual Student Interaction. These components described highly effective university instructors.

Validation included 1000 students in 51 classes. The research attempted to "identify and describe effective teaching so that instructors could be helped to improve,

and to find more valid, reliable, and effective means of incorporating the evaluation of teaching into advancement procedures". Results indicated agreement of student selections of best and worst instructors with a number of other evaluators. Student choices of effective teachers agreed with choices of an independent group of students. Student and colleague descriptions of observed instructor teaching effectiveness differed little.

Drucker and Remmers (Kulik & McKeachie, 1975) analyzed the results of the Purdue Rating Scale for Instruction and found that the average of alumni ratings of instructors agree with student ratings taken in the classroom. Centra mentioned three studies which showed agreement when students and alumni rated teacher effectiveness (Trent, 1984). When trained classroom observers rated instructors, Touq, Feldhusen, and Halstead found that the ratings were similar to ratings made by students. Two trained observers and 488 students evaluated 18 instructors.

Hayes (Piercy, 1974) studied the relationship between effective teaching and research activities at Carnegie-Mellon University. Data represented academic rank, teaching assignment, publications, grants, and a question from student evaluations of faculty. Measurements for each facet involved from 177 to 334 faculty. The research concluded that "Teachers who rate well with

department heads also rate well with students even though different criteria may be used as a basis for the rating".

Research at Colorado State College in Greely, Colorado investigated the effects of student and instructor characteristics on student evaluations (Rayder, 1968). The population included all students and faculty in the School of Education during one quarter. The student characteristics were sex, age, major, level of education, grade point average, and previous course grades received from the instructor while instructor characteristics were sex, age, faculty rank, degree held, major area, and length of teaching experience. Teacher characteristics affected student ratings more than student characteristics. Rayder concluded that student ratings were unbiased and suggested that ratings in his research differed in departments within the School of Education.

Marsh (1982) studied student evaluation data from 8,277 classes in 35 academic departments of the University of Southern California to determine whether background variables accounted for differences in student ratings. The ratings represented instructors teaching the same course at two different times. The results indicated that background characteristics do not bias student evaluations. The more "highly rated offering correlated with higher levels of Workload/Difficulty, higher Expected Grades, and

the instructor having taught the course at least once before".

Published studies provided Feldman (1977) a basis for analyzing consistency of student ratings of teachers and c ourss. Student ratings were reliable when averaged. Classes of 20 to 25 students produced "substantial reliabilities" under the assumption that students were "independent replicates". Composite scores were "dependable" but consistency was restricted for individual student ratings. Peer influence, student experiences, and characteristics were interpretation considerations. When the purpose of student ratings was to evaluate instructors, the variance was due to "genuine influences" of student characteristics and experiences. The variance was not systematic error but resulted partially from true variance. When the purpose of student ratings was to describe teachers and courses, the characteristics and experiences of students biased the resulting data.

Interrater reliability for composite ratings was substantial in evaluating teachers and courses. This information suggested the suitability of student ratings to the evaluation of faculty groups within a community college.

Costin, Greenough and Menges (1972) reviewed previous research related to the reliability and validity of student

ratings. They investigated the feelings of students relevant to having their ratings used to evaluate instructors. The results agreed with previous studies. Researchers concluded that students can recognize effective teaching and want to help instructors improve. The researchers also concluded that student evaluations aid in identifying strengths and weaknesses of instructors.

Sulivan and Skanes (1974) studied the relationship between student achievement and student evaluation ratings. Memorial University students evaluated instructors in ten courses. A board-marked common examination provided an achievement measure. Correlations between mean instructor ratings and mean final exam marks showed a "Modest, but significant relationship between student evaluation of instructor and student achievement". A difference in commitment to teaching and amount of experience contributed to the difference in the validity of ratings for full-time and part-time instructors. Valid ratings were more common for experienced full-time instructors.

Analysis Units for Student Learning

Studies investigated subgroups of instructors as an appropriate analysis unit when studying cognitive outcomes. Assessment of academic achievement is more appropriate at

department levels than on a college wide basis according to Hartnett and Centra (1977). They measured student achievement by comparing results of standardized test entrance scores with Graduate Record Examination and Undergraduate Program of Educational Testing Service field test results. Approximately 85 institutions participated. A significant difference in student achievement resulted between departments but there was little difference in achievement between specialties within departments. Further grouping within departments afforded little additional information.

At a state university in California, 1,374 students evaluated instructors at the end of a course and again one year later. Marsh and Overall (1981) studied the influence of instructor, course type, and course level on student evaluations of instructors. The effect of the instructor was large and stable over time. Accounting, economics, and finance represented course types and produced a small but significant effect. Graduate and undergraduate level effects were not significant. These results supported the "contention that the particular subject matter of a course has little effect on student ratings" and the same instructor will receive similar ratings in different courses.

Judgments of 168 scholars at the University of

Illinois and 54 scholars at a western college formed a basis for classifying subject matter into three dimensions (Biglan, 1973a,b). The dimensions included the degree to which a paradigm exists, the degree of concern with application, and concern with life systems. They corresponded to the structure and output of departments. The differing dimensions made generalizations about studies of subject matter in one dimension inappropriate for subject matter in other dimensions. Aggregated data analysis for an institutionwide study may not provide an accurate assessment.

Easton and Guskey (1983) examined the effects of college, department, course, and teacher on student achievement in an urban community college system. Of the institutional effects studied, teachers and the individual college influences accounted for about two-thirds of the variance in students completing a course. The teacher effect exceeded the college effect. There was more variability among teachers teaching the same subject at the same college than there was among the three colleges studied. The small differences in low and high level courses suggested that the differences were attributable to individual instructors. The two levels of courses represented an introductory level course and one higher level course. The variability among teachers in the same

subject suggested the need to identify differences in the teachers and their instruction. Differences between departments also provoked a recommendation for further research on variability among departments.

Evaluation of all Instructors at a College

Cagle (1978) analyzed the results of 11,368 student evaluations to compare the teaching effectiveness of student evaluations of full-time faculty and part-time faculty. The evaluations at Tulsa Junior Community College, rated 117 full-time instructors and 262 part-time instructors on 14 items. College personnel developed the instrument. Analysis of data found that full-time instructors rated higher than part-time instructors when evaluated by the entire student population. Community college students rated all of the instructors in all types of courses. The four-year degree students, who planned to transfer, comprised a subgroup of students which rated part-time instructors higher than students not pursuing a four-degree. The subgroup results suggest that part-time instructors may provide more effective instruction in academic transfer courses than in other courses.

Application of the Mann-Whitney U test and Kruskan-Wallis one-way Analysis of Variance produced a

significant difference in the total mean-scores when comparing full-time instructor ratings with part-time instructor ratings. A significant difference resulted for eight of fourteen items. "These items were: prepared, knowledge, communicates, organized, materials, consultation, methods, and defined evaluation." The full-time instructors rated higher on total scores and on eleven of the fourteen items tested. Part-time instructors rated slightly higher than full-time instructors on the three remaining items. The student characteristics, student sex and age, affected full-time evaluations more than part-time evaluations. Females rated instructors higher than males while older students gave instructors higher ratings. The distinctions of full-time student and part-time student, total hours completed, program, degree objective, and whether the course was required or elected produced little effect in instructor ratings.

Hagerstown Junior College (Behrendt & Parson, 1983) began evaluating part-time instructors in 1974. This Maryland community college assessed instructors with a 15 item student evaluation questionnaire and an eleven item supervisor evaluation questionnaire which community college personnel developed. Evaluation was a routine event for all instructors. Evaluation occurred in the first course which was taught by a part-time instructor and again in

alternate courses taught by that instructor. Frequencies and percentages summarized the evaluation data for part-time instructors and for full-time instructors. No significant difference emerged for the two groups.

During the third year after instituting an evaluation program for full-time and part-time instructors, Hagerstown Community College adopted the Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment system to evaluate instructors. When the Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment summary was compared with the college evaluation results of previous in house evaluations, no significant differences were found. A comparison of the results utilizing the Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment resulted in no significant difference in the effectiveness of full-time instructors and part-time instructors.

Measuring teaching effectiveness of full-time and part-time instructors at a Midwestern Community College included the administration of three evaluation instruments: A student evaluation of teachers, a teacher self-evaluation, and an administrator evaluation (Cruise, Furst & Klimes, 1980). The community college designed the student evaluation form and the researchers constructed the remaining two evaluation forms. The forms assessed teaching in courses for "academically and vocationally

oriented students". Eighty percent of the teachers filled the self-evaluation form and administrators evaluated 79 percent of the teachers. Frequencies and percentages summarized all items on each type of evaluation. Application of the Mann-Whitney U Test to mean scores for each item for full-time and part-time instructors resulted in some differences on individual items. No significant differences resulted in the comparison of full-time and part-time instructors. This study included a comparison of the cost of full-time instructors versus part-time instructors. After making appropriate adjustments for the nonteaching duties of full-time instructors, part-time instructors were lower in cost.

Friedlander (1980) investigated the teaching experience of full-time faculty and part-time faculty. He made three comparisons by examining results of national surveys taken in 1975, 1977, and 1978 by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges. One comparison looked at the length of time instructors taught at their current institution and their involvement in professional development activities. Other comparisons made by Friedlander included three groups of teachers: Humanities, science, and social science faculty. Teachers considered in these comparisons differed. Full-time teachers participated in a greater number of activities and more

often than part-time teachers. Full-time teachers had more teaching experience. Friedlander concluded that full-time instructors were better teachers.

Evaluation of Instructors within Instructional Fields

Evaluation of Instructors in Arts and Sciences Courses

Trent (1984) attempted to determine whether there was a significant difference in the quality of instruction provided by full-time instructors and part-instructors in general education courses. The courses were academic transfer courses or courses taken to fulfill general education requirements for an associate of arts degree. Students at Butler County Community College in El Dorado, Kansas evaluated the quality of instruction. The students rated instructors who taught college parallel general education courses on a ten item instrument developed at the community college. The items on the evaluation instrument related to "specific instruction skills on behaviors valued by professional educators". The items were rated on a five level Likert style scale. Data included ratings of 29 full-time instructors by 525 students and ratings of 37 part-time instructors by 453 students. The data analysis applied N-way ANOVA techniques.

Full-time instructors did not rate significantly higher than part-time instructors on any of the items on the student questionnaire. Significant differences were not evident across the departmental lines of English/Speech, Social Science, Math/Science, or Humanities. Although students gave a high rating to both full-time and part-time instructors, part-time instructors rated significantly higher on four items. The items were "using a fair grading system, having presentations that were clear and understandable, asking pertinent examination questions, and returning results of written assignments within a reasonable length of time". Trent found no significant difference in the way males and females rated part-time or full-time instructors.

Evaluation of Instructors in Arts and Sciences Courses Taken by Sophomore Students

The student assessment of teaching effectiveness of full-time and part-time faculty at four community colleges in Florida provided data for another study of full-time and part-time instructors (Kandzer, 1977). Faculty and student participants were volunteers. Seven hundred fifty-nine sophomore students evaluated their instructors. The students rated eleven part-time instructors with 0-2 years of experience, eleven full-time instructors with 0-2 years

of teaching experience, eleven part-time instructors with 4-6 years of teaching experience, and eleven full-time instructors with 4-6 years of teaching experience. The instructors taught sophomore level general education courses in the Associate of Arts degree program. The experience of the teachers provided classifications for a stratified sample. The data analysis applied univariate and multivariate analysis of variance and Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation.

No statistically significant differences in the student ratings of full-time and part-time instructors appeared in the analysis of all data. Results indicated no difference in personality characteristics, student-faculty interaction, teaching methods, course organization, or a comparison of the instructor being evaluated to all previous instructors. Of the four demographic characteristics considered; location, building, teacher status, and teacher experience only location appeared as significant. Experienced teachers did not rate significantly higher than less experienced teachers.

Evaluation of Instructors of One Arts and Sciences Course

At Miami-Dade Community College (Davis, Belcher & McKitterick, 1986), the achievement of 1,075 students in English 1101 was used as an indicator of instructional

skills of part-time and full-time instructors. The students were in 19 sections taught by part-time instructors and in 19 sections taught by full-time instructors. The study used three measures of student achievement: the Comparative Guidance and Placement Test, the College Level Academic Skills Test, and grades in two levels of English courses. The Comparative Guidance and Placement Test provided a measure of basic skills of students entering the course. The analysis compared Guidance and Placement Test scores with the results of the College Level Academic Skills Test. Students took the College Level Academic Skills Test before graduation. Grades in English 1101 and the next English course were indicators of subsequent achievement after taking an introductory course with part-time or full-time instructors. Pass and fail scores on the College Level Academic Skills Test provided one comparison while mean scores on the Reading, Writing, and Essay sections gave another comparison. Chi-square analysis found no significant relationship between status of the instructors and Reading, Writing, or Essay.

No significant differences in achievement resulted from the comparisons of grades or skills. However, the researchers raised several questions. "Are disciplines other than English more sensitive to the apparent

disadvantages under which part-time faculty typically operate? Or perhaps the crucial factor is not the discipline but the demands of the particular course being taught." The limiting factor of considering only one discipline suggested the additional investigation of the influence of part-time instructors in other courses at community colleges.

Summary

Past research employed several types of instructor evaluation to compare full-time faculty with part-time faculty. Student ratings of instructors were the most popular measure of teaching effectiveness. Research investigations found that student assessments of teaching effectiveness agree closely with those made by other students, faculty, colleagues, college administrators (Kulik & McKeachie, 1975), department heads (Trent, 1984), alumni (Kulik & McKeachie, 1975), and trained observers (Trent, 1984)

Student ratings were reliable and valid sources of information concerning teaching effectiveness in past research (Kulik & McKeachie, 1975). Analysis of evaluation forms identified basic components of effective teaching which individual items commonly measure. Students were

suitable evaluators when there was only one type of rater because student ratings were legitimate assessments in past research and they paralleled closely the results of ratings provided by other types of qualified evaluators.

Full-time and part-time instructor populations varied in previous research. Several studies cited here evaluated all instructors at the colleges selected for study. Research resulting from collegewide studies by Cagle (1978), Hagerstown Junior College, and Friedlander conflict. Cagle found that full-time instructors rated higher than part-time instructors. Analysis of Hagerstown full-time instructors and part-time instructor evaluations indicated no significant difference in teaching effectiveness (Behrendt & Parson, 1983). Friedlander (1980) considered full-time instructors to be more effective when he studied the activities and experience of instructors. These investigations included populations of all instructors at a community college.

Additional studies discussed in the review, chose instructors from a subgroup of classes or limited the instructors to classes representing only one course. Trent (1984) analyzed data from student evaluations of instructors teaching college parallel general education courses and found that full-time instructors did not rate significantly higher than part-time instructors. No

statistically significant difference in the student ratings of full-time and part-time instructors appeared in a study by Kandzer (1977). Analysis of individual items provided no significant difference in the items on the questionnaire. The demographic characteristic, teacher with experience, did not rate significantly higher than less experienced instructors which contradicted Friedlander's (1980) assumption that experience signifies a better teacher. Student achievement was an indicator of instructional effectiveness in English courses at Miami Dade Community College (Davis, Belcher & McKitterick, 1986). No significant difference appeared in the achievement of students relative to the full-time or part-time status of their instructors. Several questions raised by the investigators suggested that the study be replicated for other courses to determine the influence of instructor status on student learning.

By considering the variations in the populations evaluated in past research, some alternative approaches for investigating the quality of instruction offered by full-time faculty and part-time faculty may appear. Possible variables to study may begin to emerge when considering previously evaluated populations and the differences found in the results.

CHAPTER 3.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The general purpose of this study was to determine whether student ratings of full-time and part-time instructors at a community college differed within community college organizational subgroups. This chapter describes the research design and methodology used to conduct this study. Data consisted of the results from a thirty-item student evaluation of instructor form used at one community college. The plan called for studying the validity and reliability associated with the form ratings. Multiple analysis of variance established whether there was a difference in the means of the subgroup ratings. Application of the Scheffe test identified which subgroups differed when a difference existed. The results provided evidence concerning the hypotheses related to the five research questions.

Evaluation Instrument

The instrument employed in the collection of data for this research was a survey form administered by the

selected community college for annual student evaluation of faculty. The evaluation instrument consisted of thirty items which pertained to instructional skills and course characteristics given priority by the community college. The community college selected the instrument and revised it when changes were needed. The administration and faculty revised the items on the form during the early years of evaluation of instructors at the community college. The form used to collect data for this study was in use for over five years.

The instrument utilized a scale with a choice of five responses for each item. The possible response choices were poor to excellent on a scale of one to five. Five represented the Excellent response while one corresponded to the Poor response. The appendix contains a copy of the evaluation instrument.

Sampling Technique

Community college procedures in effect at the time of the evaluation governed the administration of the student evaluation of instructor forms. The student evaluation of instructors was an annual process established by college policies. The standard college survey form and procedures established consistent conditions for evaluations. The

college handbook stated the purpose, scope, general principles, and procedures for evaluations. See Appendix.

The community college handbook states that "The purpose of the faculty and support staff evaluation is to provide a consistent methodology for evaluating performance, enhancing self-improvement, and encouraging professional development of faculty and support staff". The evaluation procedure applied to all full-time instructors. The handbook stated that the part-time faculty evaluation procedures "provided a consistent methodology for evaluating performance and improving the teaching effectiveness of part-time faculty". The general principles for full-time and part-time faculty were "to provide a system for measuring and evaluating faculty ... performance, to provide faculty ... with knowledge of evaluation criteria, and to provide a climate for ongoing communications concerning performance between faculty members and the supervisor". Three more general principles varied in wording for part-time faculty. The principle, "to provide a conducive environment for faculty ... self-improvement" was altered to "an environment for improving part-time faculty teaching skills". "To provide an evaluation process which allows for input from staff members, the supervisor and students, as applicable" changed to "allows for input from students and the

part-time faculty member's supervisor". Another full-time faculty principle was "to provide documentation as required for administrative purposes" while the part-time faculty counterpart was "to provide documentation for purposes of retention".

Students evaluated full-time and part-time instructors. For evaluation purposes, full-time faculty included nine-month and twelve-month teaching faculty who were issued annual notices of appointment as full-time faculty. Part-time faculty were classified as those instructors who were issued notices of part-time assignment and who were not covered by other college faculty evaluation procedures.

Instructors taught at night as well as during the day. They taught at all college locations including the three campuses and various off campus sites. The instructors taught credit courses and developmental courses in English and mathematics. Full-time and part-time students participated in the evaluation. These students enrolled in credit courses, developmental English, or developmental mathematics courses.

The college maintained a policy of evaluating each instructor every year. Students evaluated instructors on a quarterly basis. The supervisor selected the courses for evaluation during each quarter. The handbook maintained

that the student evaluation form was "anonymous, self-explanatory and easily administered". A student, who was appointed by the instructor, gave the forms to the students in a course. The appointed student delivered a sealed envelope containing the completed forms to an administrative office. The Computer Services office compiled the data which supervisors then placed on file for two years. Instructors, supervisors, and anyone designated by the college president had access to the evaluation data. The supervisor reviewed the data report with the instructors during an evaluation conference and included the report in the supervisory evaluation. The students evaluated the instructor by responding to thirty items on the rating form. Administration of all evaluations followed current college procedures in effect at the time for student evaluations of instructors.

Past investigations in the literature review established that students were reliable sources of information concerning the teaching effectiveness of instructors. Kulik and McKeachie (1975) identified skill, rapport, structure, and overload dimensions as appropriate dimensions for evaluating teaching in higher education when they analyzed existing research.

The dimensions identified by Kulik and McKeachie provided a beginning point for investigating the validity

of the instrument used by the community college in its routine annual evaluation of faculty. Inspection of the evaluation form revealed a relationship between the evaluation items and the four dimensions established in previous research. The form items appeared to relate to components of the four dimensions established in past research. The first dimension, skill, was a general factor of course value and instructor teaching ability. Seven items related to skill. The following items represented course value:

1. Would recommend this instructor to other students.
2. Can relate course materials to real-life situations.

The following items represented teaching ability:

1. Is well prepared for each class.
2. Uses methods that help students learn.
3. Makes the subject matter clear.
4. Uses examples to explain the material.
5. Has a clear understanding of his subject matter.

Six more items related to a combination of skill and the other three dimensions. They were the following:

1. Answers student questions and comments.
2. Encourages student participation in class.
3. Offers help to students when they need help.
4. Gives fair and reasonable test and assignments.

5. Talks so students can understand him.

6. Provides class outline at beginning of course describing requirements, objectives, and evaluation procedures.

Empathy, interaction, accessibility, and affective merit characterized rapport. Evaluation items classified as rapport were the following:

1. Shows respect for student opinion and concerns.
2. Welcomes student questions and discussions.
3. Answers student questions and comments.
4. Is willing to help students outside of class time.
5. Encourages student participation in class.
6. Offers help to students when they need help.
7. Helps students to develop creative abilities.
8. Talks so students can understand him.
9. Is excited about teaching the subject.
10. Is open to different viewpoints from students.

Structure referred to organization, control, cognitive merit and planning. Structure items were the following:

1. Starts class on time.
2. Returns tests and assignments promptly.
3. Ends class on time.
4. Would recommend the course to other students.
5. I would rate this course.
6. Provides class outline at beginning of course

describing requirements, objectives and evaluation procedures.

Difficulty, academic emphasis, stress, and demanding described overload. Difficulty items were the following:

1. Gives tests and assignments about the material taught in class.

2. Gives fair and reasonable tests and assignments.

3. Helps students to develop creative abilities.

Classifying items in the research instrument with items in previous research intended for the sampling of a similar population contributed to the establishment of the validity.

Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha estimated the reliability of the instrument used by the community college for instructor evaluation. Application of Cronbach's Alpha (Cronbach, 1951) estimated the internal consistency of tests by producing a coefficient of equivalence and homogeneity. Alpha provided a reliability coefficient which substituted for a coefficient requiring split-half and parallel test analyses. Alpha gave an estimate of the reliability of test items without necessitating additional testing with different test forms or time spans. The reliability coefficient alpha was 0.9959 for 29,662 cases for the first twenty-three items. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha tested the reliability of the evaluation instrument

relative to the equivalence of two measurements of the same trait (Cronback, Gleser, Nanda, & Rajaratnam, 1972).

Inspection of the alpha coefficient revealed the consistency of the form for assessing the effectiveness of teachers and for providing interpretable data. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha was suitable for multiple choice tests including items that have several possible answers, each of which was given a different weight (Borg & Gall, 1983).

Data Collection Methodology

There were 15,923 evaluation surveys providing data for two years. Evaluation results provided data aggregated in collegewide full-time instructor and collegewide part-time instructor groups, for 1984-85 and 1985-86. Aggregation of data was by teaching field as well as collegewide. The two years included full-time and part-time instructor evaluation data for two quarter terms and a summer term in 1984-85 and 1985-86. The 1984-85 data represented the Spring, Summer, and Winter terms. In 1985-86, Summer, Fall, and Winter terms provided data. There were 6,860 evaluation surveys in courses taught by full-time faculty and 9,063 surveys in courses taught by part-time faculty.

The evaluation instrument included four items that did

not relate directly to instructional skill or were not under exclusive control of the instructor. Even though students evaluated instructors by responding to thirty items on the evaluation form, the analysis plan did not include items 24, 25, 27, or 29. These items were the following: Course offered at a good time, Equipment is Available, Facilities help learning, and Course offered at convenient campus.

Data Computerization Process

The community college summarized the data by a computerized evaluation scoring procedure. Primary data for analysis consisted of summated ratings for all instructors in each teaching field. The college computing center provided the summated ratings for individual items in each teaching field. The computerized summary aggregated the data by teaching field which permitted the use of data in the teaching field differences. Because the research involved only aggregated ratings by teaching fields, analysis of differences among individual instructors was not possible. The college maintained the confidentiality of instructor ratings by not disclosing instructor identities and by aggregating the data.

The data consisted of twenty-six evaluations of

instructor item ratings which depicted students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness. There were twenty-five teaching fields with part-time and full-time instructors represented by the data for 1984-85 and 1985-86. The eight teaching fields in the arts and sciences group were mathematics, marketing, management, finance, accounting, English, sociology, and psychology. Photography, graphic arts, art, commercial art, air conditioning-heat-refrigeration, architectural drafting, human services, law enforcement, child care, culinary arts, ornamental horticulture, computer programing, auto body, auto mechanics, electronics, dental assisting, and secretarial science comprised the group of seventeen vocational technical courses. The total number of forms which represented both full-time and part-time instructors in the same courses was 12,460. The number of student surveys in each teaching field is in Table 1.

Preparation of the data for analysis included coding and entry into the Statistical Analysis System at Iowa State University Computer Center. Coding of the data accounted for classification of the ratings according to the twenty-six items, eight arts and sciences teaching fields, seventeen vocational technical teaching fields, and whether the instructor status was part-time or full-time for 1984-85 and 1985-86.

Table 1. Arts and sciences and vocational technical teaching fields

TEACHING FIELDS	NUMBER OF SURVEYS	INSTRUCTORS	
		PART-TIME	FULL-TIME
ARTS AND SCIENCES			
Psychology	371	96	275
Finance	122	80	42
Accounting	1469	1000	469
Sociology	210	60	150
Marketing	115	62	53
English	1383	607	776
Mathematics	1477	966	511
Management	1550	1151	399
VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL			
Architectural Drafting	102	63	39
Culinary Arts	327	43	284
Human Services	239	152	87
Air Conditioning, Heat & Refrigeration	291	136	155
Commercial Art	101	43	58
Graphic Arts	168	48	120
Art	207	112	95
Child Care	107	43	64
Law Enforcement	180	76	104
Photography	309	155	154
Dental Assisting	141	39	102
Ornamental Horticulture	139	100	39
Computer Science	1323	1132	191
Secretarial Science	1276	683	593
Automotive	356	189	167
Auto Body	180	94	86
Electronics	317	180	137

Statistical Analysis Model To Be Used

The purpose of the research was to investigate whether the effectiveness of part-time instructors varied from the effectiveness of full-time instructors as judged by students and whether those differences also varied by teaching field. The primary hypothesis concerned the possible variance in the overall teaching effectiveness of full-time and part-time instructors as perceived by students. The primary hypothesis was the following:

> There is no difference in the extent that full-time versus part-time instructor status is distinguished by students.

The analysis of variance design applied the fixed effects model with unequal sample sizes. Partitioning of the data by teaching status and groups of courses produced a nested design. Student evaluation of instructor item ratings nested within teaching fields. Teaching fields nested within arts and sciences and vocational technical groups. Arts and sciences and vocational technical groups nested within the collegewide group. These four factors crossed with the part-time employment status and full-time employment status of instructors in the analysis of variance statistical plan. A significant F value indicated that at least one contrast was not equal to all of the

other contrasts. The Scheffe test identified which of the contrasts were significant when contrasts differed. Comparisons among the treatment effects provided a basis for concluding whether differences existed between the full-time teaching effect and the part-time teaching effect.

The results of the analysis of variance technique also provided contrasts for the following secondary hypotheses:

1. There is no difference in the extent that the teaching field effects student ratings of instruction.

2. There is no difference in the extent that full-time versus part-time faculty designations and their teaching field designations interact to effect student ratings of instruction.

3. There is no difference in the extent that functional distinctions of arts and sciences and vocational technical courses effect student ratings of instruction.

4. There is no difference in the extent that full-time versus part-time distinctions and the functional distinctions of arts and sciences and vocational technical courses interact to effect student ratings of instruction.

Summary

This research design described the collection of data

representing teaching effectiveness within a community college and subgroups of the data. The subgroups of part-time instructor data and full-time instructor data are teaching fields and functional classifications of arts and sciences and vocational technical disciplines. To identify possible variances in teaching effectiveness of part-time instructors from full-time instructors within subgroups, the plan called for the application of analysis of variance techniques followed by the Scheffe test. Investigation of possible variances in teaching effectiveness, provides results to support decisions concerning the five hypotheses under investigation.

CHAPTER 4.

DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS

The results of the data analysis which applied the Statistical Analysis System linear model provided information leading to the rejection or acceptance of the hypotheses under consideration. The data were student ratings of their instructors in twenty-five teaching fields. The instructors held part-time or full-time employment status.

Analysis of variance techniques tested for a difference in the variances of student ratings of part-time and full-time instructors for each of the hypotheses under investigation. When the analysis indicated a significant difference in the group means, the Scheffe test followed. All analysis applied an alpha level of .05.

Primary Hypothesis

The primary hypothesis was the following: There is no difference in the extent that full-time versus part-time instructor status is distinguished by students. The

Statistical Analysis System general linear model procedure analyzed the results of 12,460 surveys. The surveys were student evaluations of instructors in twenty-five teaching fields. The procedure applied analysis of variance at two levels of instructor employment; full-time employment and part-time employment. The summary statistics are in Table 2. The means for each group of data analyzed in this study are in Table 3.

Table 2. ANOVA Summary for 25 teaching fields and two employment levels

Source	DF	Mean Square	F Value	Proba-bility
Employment Status	1	3.1173	4.75	0.0293
Teaching Field	24	211.2328	13.42	0.0001
Teaching Field * Status	24	62.6773	3.98	0.0001

The results indicated a significant difference in the student ratings of full-time instructors and part-time instructors when tested at the .05 alpha level. The dependent variable was the average survey score. These findings supported rejection of the hypothesis of no difference in the extent that full-time and part-time instructor status is distinguished by students.

Table 3. Means for data groups

TEACHING FIELDS	MEANS	
	PART-TIME	FULL-TIME
ARTS AND SCIENCES		
Psychology	4.2317	4.5222
Finance	4.4970	3.6570
Accounting	4.2473	4.2118
Sociology	4.5873	4.4027
Marketing	4.2110	4.0762
English	4.4165	4.3250
Mathematics	4.5008	4.4205
Management	4.3315	4.1910
VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL		
Architectural Drafting	4.0848	4.0441
Culinary Arts	4.3888	4.1259
Human Services	4.5703	4.4480
Air Conditioning, Heat & Refrigeration	4.3288	4.3554
Commercial Art	3.8279	3.7586
Graphic Arts	4.1330	4.5680
Art	4.1357	4.5305
Child Care	4.5581	4.5613

Table 3. (Continued)

TEACHING FIELDS	MEANS	
	PART-TIME	FULL-TIME
Law Enforcement	4.5189	4.6831
Photography	4.3719	4.0153
Dental Assisting	4.4626	4.4246
Ornamental Horticulture	4.4904	4.3621
Computer Science	4.2289	4.1466
Secretarial Science	4.4712	4.4451
Automotive	4.3903	4.3928
Auto Body	4.5204	4.5791
Electronics	4.2496	4.0426
VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL	4.3359	4.3297
ARTS AND SCIENCES	4.3670	4.3126
ALL VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL	4.3332	
ALL ARTS AND SCIENCES	4.3452	
COLLEGEWIDE	4.3397	

Secondary Hypotheses

The first secondary hypothesis was the following: There is no difference in the extent that the teaching field effects student ratings of instruction. The Statistical Analysis System general linear model compared the student ratings of instructors for the 25 teaching fields. The number of student surveys in each teaching field is in Table 1. There were 12,460 student evaluation surveys in the data set. The analysis of variance summary data for the 25 teaching fields is in Table 2.

When the student evaluation of instructor scores were compared, the analysis produced 23 pairs of fields in which ratings of instructors differed significantly. Each teaching field was contrasted with all of the other 24 fields. Table 4 displays the pairs of fields with significant differences in the ratings that were given to instructors by students. Ratings for instructors of commercial art courses differed significantly from ratings for human services, graphic arts, child care, law enforcement, dental assisting, horticulture, secretarial science, automotive, automotive body, psychology, sociology, English, mathematics, and management. A significant difference resulted between mathematics

instructor ratings and ratings for instructors of culinary arts, computer programming, electronics, accounting, and management as well as commercial art. Ratings for law enforcement instructors differed from ratings for computer programming and accounting in addition to commercial art. Computer programming and accounting also differed significantly from secretarial science.

Table 4. Pairs of teaching fields with significantly different means

TEACHING FIELDS	Com. art	Computer program	Account-ing	Elec-tronics	Culinary arts	Manage-ment
Psychology	X					
Sociology	X					
English	X					
Mathematics	X	X	X	X	X	X
Management	X					
Human Services	X					
Graphic Arts	X					
Child Care	X					
Law Enforcement	X	X	X			
Dental Assisting	X					
Ornamental Horticult	X					
Secretarial Science	X	X	X			
Automotive	X					
Auto Body	X					

The analysis of variance results in Table 2 indicated a significant difference in the student evaluations of instructor scores for the 25 teaching fields in this study and supported rejection of the hypothesis stating that there was no difference in the extent that teaching field effects student ratings of instruction.

The second secondary hypothesis was the following: There is no difference in the extent that full-time versus part-time faculty designations and their teaching field designations interact to effect student ratings of instruction.

Application of analysis of variance techniques tested twenty-five teaching fields and two instructor employment levels at .05 alpha. There were 12,460 surveys in the data set. Table 1 lists the teaching fields and the number of surveys representing part-time and full-time instructors in each field. Summary data are in Table 2.

The results indicated a significant difference in the full-time and part-time instructor employment levels and also in the teaching fields. When part-time instructor ratings and full-time instructor ratings were contrasted among the teaching fields a significant difference in the ratings resulted from the interaction of employment status and teaching fields. This difference supported the

rejection of the hypothesis of no difference in the extent that full-time versus part-time faculty designations interact to effect student ratings of instruction.

In another analysis, the Statistical Analysis System general linear model compared the student ratings of full-time instructors with the student ratings of part-time instructors within each teaching field. The analysis of variance procedure sought variances in each teaching field at two levels of instructor employment; full-time employment and part-time employment.

Full-time instructor ratings were significantly different from part-time instructor ratings in eight of the twenty-five teaching fields when tested at the .05 alpha level. The mean for the ratings of full-time instructors was higher than the mean for the ratings of part-time instructors in the following teaching fields: art, graphic arts, and psychology. The mean for the student ratings of part-time instructors was higher than the mean of student ratings of full-time instructors in five fields. There were more fields with higher means for part-time instructors. In the following teaching fields, the mean for part-time instructor ratings was greater than the mean for full-time instructor ratings: photography, electronics, English, mathematics, and management. The

number of student surveys in each teaching field is in Table 1. There were 12,460 student evaluation surveys in the data set.

The third secondary hypothesis was the following: There is no difference in the extent that functional distinctions of arts and sciences and vocational technical teaching fields effect student ratings of instruction.

The analysis of variance program tested two functional group levels. One functional group included arts and sciences teaching fields and the other functional group included vocational technical teaching fields. The data set consisted of 12,460 student surveys. Summary data are in Table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA Summary for arts and sciences and vocational technical fields and two employment levels

Source	DF	Mean Square	F Value	Proba-bility
Arts and Sciences & Vocational Technical	1	0.4451	0.66	0.4168
Employment Status	1	3.4892	4.52	0.0336
Arts and Sciences & Vocational Technical * Employment Status	1	1.7418	2.58	0.1082

There was no significant difference in the student ratings for arts and sciences versus vocational technical teaching fields at the .05 alpha level although there was a significant difference in the student ratings of part-time instructors and full-time instructors at the .05 alpha level. The results did not support rejection of the third secondary hypothesis stating that there is no difference in the extent that functional distinctions of arts and sciences and vocational technical teaching fields effect student ratings of instruction.

The fourth secondary hypothesis was the following: There is no difference in the extent that full-time versus part-time distinctions and the functional distinctions of arts and sciences and vocational technical teaching fields interact to effect student ratings of instruction. Application of the analysis of variance techniques tested two functional levels and two instructor employment levels at .05 alpha. The arts and sciences functional level group included 6,697 surveys and the vocational technical group data were from 5,763 surveys. Table 1 lists the teaching fields and the number of surveys representing part-time and full-time instructors in each field. The fields are grouped according to arts and sciences and vocational technical classifications in the

table. Summary data resulting from the analysis are in Table 5. No significant difference resulted from the interaction of full-time and part-time employment levels and the arts and sciences and vocational technical functional groups as shown in Table 5. In this case, the indication was not to reject the fourth secondary hypothesis.

In another analysis, the Statistical Analysis System analysis of variance program also analyzed the data in the vocational technical group at two levels. The two levels were full-time and part-time employment. There was no significant difference between the means for part-time and full-time instructor ratings in vocational technical courses when contrasted at the .05 alpha level. There were 5,763 surveys in the data set. Table 6 presents a summary of the analysis of variance statistics for the vocational technical and arts and sciences teaching fields.

Table 6. ANOVA Summary of arts and sciences and vocational technical teaching fields

Source	DF	Mean Square	F Value	Proba-bility
Arts and Sciences	1	4.7372	7.19	0.0073
Vocational Technical	1	0.0535	0.08	0.7812

The Statistical Analysis System model analyzed data in the arts and sciences group at two levels. The number of evaluation surveys in the arts and sciences data set was 6,697. The two levels were full-time and part-time employment of instructors. There was a significant difference in the means for part-time and full-time instructor ratings when contrasted at the .05 alpha level.

The significant difference in the ratings of full-time instructors and part-time instructors in the arts and sciences group of teaching fields did not agree with the result of no difference in the variance of ratings of full-time instructors and part-time instructors in the vocational technical group of teaching fields.

Summary

Inspection of past efforts to assess teaching effectiveness of part-time instructors relative to full-time instructors suggested various independent variables which may provide additional insight into the dependent variables of part-time and full-time instructors. Research attempting to establish the quality of education offered by the two faculty groups lacked consistency. Examination of the population investigated in this research

evoked a possible reason for the variance in the results. This research examined a population sample and subgroups of the same population sample to study the possible variances caused by the way the data were analyzed.

CHAPTER 5.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this research was to investigate whether differences in teaching performance exist between full-time instructors and part-time instructors in a community college within specific educational disciplines. Past research investigated the teaching effectiveness of part-time and full-time instructors collegewide but did not consider instructor subgroups related to disciplines. This study examined faculty ratings from a number of arts and sciences and vocational technical fields.

The analysis examined scores from student evaluations of instructors at one midwestern community college. Multiple analysis of variance analyzed part-time and full-time instructor groups, using student evaluations of instructor scores for teaching fields. The data set included scores from 12,460 instructor evaluation forms in twenty-five teaching fields. The procedure applied analysis of variance at two levels of instructor employment: full-time and part-time employment.

The results indicated a significant difference in student ratings of full-time and part-time instructors in

the collegewide analysis. The mean for the ratings of part-time instructors was greater than the mean for full-time instructor ratings. There was a significant interaction when the teaching field effect was included with full-time and part-time employment levels. Full-time instructor ratings were different in eight of the twenty-five fields. The difference in student ratings for arts and sciences versus vocational technical fields was not significant. When contrasting arts and sciences and vocational technical fields with the two employment levels, no significant difference resulted. The mean of part-time instructor ratings was significantly higher than the mean of full-time instructor ratings on a collegewide basis, but groups of instructor ratings within the college provided statistical test results which differed.

The analysis of the data within teaching fields indicated that part-time instructors were rated higher than full-time instructors in some fields, while full-time instructors were rated higher in other fields. Also, there were fields with no significant differences in the ratings of the two groups of instructors. Although the differences were statistically significant at the .05 Alpha level, examination of the means revealed that the differences were not large.

This research implied that more accurate statistical

information may result from analysis of groups within the community college. The extent of differences in the teaching performance of subgroups may be obscured or magnified by the choice of levels at which data analysis occurs. Differences in part-time and full-time instructor performance, as represented by student evaluation ratings, support expanding data analysis practices. Grouping data and analyzing the groups independently within the community college may provide more accurate results.

Student assessments of instructors became popular methods for evaluating instruction at community colleges cited (Cagle, Behrendt & Parson, Davis, Balcher & McKetterick). The sample populations varied in the research and the results differed in comparisons of the teaching performance of part-time and full-time faculty. Were the variances due to differences in sample population groups or to abilities of the two instructor groups? By analyzing the sample from a collegewide population and subgroups of the same sample, variations in the results could be attributed to differences in part-time or full-time instructor performance.

Differing factors appeared to effect the analysis results for the various population samples studied in the review. Some factors which were identified in the review of literature may be relevant to the results of this study.

Kulik and McKeachie (1975) identified four factors which influence student rating variance. These factors, student characteristics, transfer characteristics, course characteristics and interaction effects, may differ for disciplines or departments. In the current study, grouping faculty evaluation ratings for teaching fields controlled some of these factors. The results indicated that part-time instructors rated higher than full-time instructors in some fields, full-time instructors rated higher in another set of fields, while the remaining instructors rated about the same. Courses within departments appeared to have similar goals and achievement variables according to Vreeland and Bidwell (1966). Biglan (1973) also found relationships for departments.

Grouping data to control the effect attributed to stages identified by Kolb produced no significant difference in part-time and full-time instructor ratings for the arts and sciences and vocational technical group of fields. Kolb (1981) studied the student characteristics related to student learning. He differentiated student requirements for learning in different curriculums. The active stage related to professions and the abstract related to pure academic disciplines. In the community college the active or professions suggest characteristics of vocational technical courses and the passive or pure

academic disciplines resemble characteristics of arts and sciences courses.

An appropriate level for analyzing student evaluations of instructors was the teaching field which often corresponds to departmental levels in colleges. At community colleges, teaching field is used as the subgroup term because of the variety of organizational patterns existing in community colleges.

This study analyzed data groups which corresponded with the groups described in the research. Results of the analysis of faculty evaluations by teaching fields which consisted of courses aggregated for a discipline, differed for teaching fields. Part-time instructors rated higher in five of the fields, full-time instructors rated higher in three of the fields and there was no difference in ratings of instructors in the other seventeen fields.

Research resulting from studies by Cagle (1978), Hagerstown Junior College (Behrendt & Parson, 1983), and Friedlander (1980) conflicted. The collegewide analysis of ratings disagreed with the findings of Cagle, Behrendt and Parson, and Friedlander. Part-time and full-time ratings were significantly different but part-time instructors rated higher. Cagle found that full-time instructors rated higher than part-time instructors. Analysis of Hagerstown full-time instructor and part-time instructor evaluations

indicated no significant difference in teaching effectiveness. Friedlander considered full-time instructors to be more effective when he studied the activities and experience of instructors. These studies involved samples of community college instructors from a collegewide population. Each analysis investigated part-time and full-time instructor effectiveness as a group on a collegewide level.

Testing the primary hypothesis confirmed that significant differences in student ratings of part-time and full-time instructors existed when comparing ratings of all full-time and all part-time instructors at the community college. Part-time instructors rated higher than full-time instructors. Testing the secondary hypotheses sought information about student ratings of full-time and part-time instructors when grouped according to teaching fields, arts and sciences fields, and vocational technical fields. A significant difference in part-time and full-time instructor ratings occurred in teaching fields but did not in arts and sciences and vocational levels when part-time and full-time levels were contrasted. Some insight into the inconsistencies resulted from an analysis of ratings within arts and sciences fields and then in vocational technical fields. The analysis of instructor subgroups representing teaching fields presented results

which did not always agree with the analysis of collegewide data.

Student ratings of all part-time community college instructors and all full-time instructors formed the classifications representing the two factors for the primary hypothesis test. As a collegewide group, the ratings of part-time instructors differed from the ratings of full-time instructors. The resulting rejection of the primary hypothesis provided a basis for investigating whether part-time instructors differ from full-time instructors in general or whether they differ by some more specific characteristics.

Testing of the secondary hypotheses provided an opportunity to investigate the variability of instructor effectiveness in teaching fields and in functional groups. One functional group represented teaching fields classified as arts and sciences disciplines while the other group included vocational technical courses. The first secondary hypothesis was rejected. Full-time and part-time instructor ratings were significantly different in twenty-three pairs of the twenty-five teaching fields tested. The commercial art field appeared in fourteen of the pairs. This concentration of difference in one field indicates that more investigation is warrented in assessing the teaching performance of instructors in the commercial

art field. These results suggested that students do perceive a difference in the performance of instructors relative to the associated teaching field.

Test results indicated rejection of the second secondary hypothesis. There is no difference in the extent that full-time versus part-time faculty designations and their teaching field designations interact to effect student ratings of instruction was the second ancillary hypothesis. The statistical test results indicated that there was significant interaction when the teaching field effect was included with the employment status.

The third secondary hypothesis was that there is no difference in the extent that functional distinctions of arts and sciences and vocational technical courses effect student ratings of instruction. There was no significant difference in the teaching effect of instructors for vocational technical teaching fields and arts and sciences disciplines in the statistical analysis.

Again, more diverse results appear for instructor groups than for the aggregate college faculty. Statistical test results did not support rejection of the fourth ancillary hypothesis. The hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the extent that full-time versus part-time distinctions and the functional distinctions of arts and

sciences and vocational technical teaching fields interact to effect student ratings of instruction. There was no difference in the student ratings of arts and sciences versus vocational technical teaching fields when including both part-time and full-time instructors, but there was a significant difference in the student ratings of part-time instructors and full-time instructors when analyzing the data for arts and sciences courses as one group.

Another analysis of full-time and part-time instructor ratings within the group of instructors of arts and sciences courses indicated a significant difference in the ratings of full-time and part-time instructors. A similar analysis of full-time and part-time instructor ratings within the group of instructors of vocational technical courses resulted in no significant difference in the ratings of full-time and part-time instructors. These groupings produced results which disagreed with the analysis supporting the fourth secondary hypothesis.

The results indicated that students rate instructors of vocational technical and arts and sciences teaching fields as a whole, about the same. However, students rated part-time instructors higher than full-time instructors when considering only arts and sciences teaching fields. Students also rated full-time instructors about the same as part-time instructors when considering only vocational

teaching fields. These observations suggest that investigation of the data in functional groups may provide more specific information about full-time instructor and part-time instructor ratings.

Implications for the Use of Student Evaluation of Instructor Scores

The following implications may encourage more practical applications of the statistics resulting from analysis of student evaluation of instructor scores:

1. More specific information is available when data is analyzed in groups which display similar population characteristics.

2. More precise assessment of instructor characteristics may be possible.

3. When no difference results from analysis of collegewide student evaluation data, important information may be hidden.

4. Resources for improving teaching through staff development may be identified.

5. An alternative hiring process for part-time instructors may improve teaching performance in those fields where faculty received lower ratings.

6. Implications for staff development by teaching

field may become evident.

7. Targeting faculty groups for staff development provides more efficient use of time, money, and materials.

8. Grouping evaluation data permits investigation of functional groups of instructors in arts and sciences or vocational technical fields.

9. Resulting statistics may identify some new areas for improvement.

10. Resulting statistics may identify additional areas for investigation to improve teaching performance.

Practical Application of the Results

The findings related to the primary and secondary hypotheses indicated that more specific information is available by further analyzing the data. Analysis of the aggregate data established the overall perspective of instructor effectiveness afforded by the primary hypothesis test. Application of the results of analysis of data grouped according to teaching fields yielded differing measures of teaching performance for part-time instructors and full-time instructors.

Further analysis of grouped data scores provided a basis for decisions as to whether the results applied to all part-time and all full-time instructors or to groups of

part-time and full-time instructors. The succeeding analysis by groups helped establish whether it was reasonable to assume that the results of analysis hold for all instructors. Differences in subgroups could be obscured by aggregating data for the entire college faculty. The analysis established that a more precise assessment of instructor characteristics may emerge when student ratings are grouped by teaching field, or arts and sciences and vocational technical disciplines.

The results of this research imply that generalizations about part-time or full-time employment status may be inappropriate when based on collegewide anaysis of student evaluations of instructors. Amassing evaluation ratings of instructors may hide strenths and weaknesses within part-time or full-time faculty groups. These strengths or weaknesses are important to recognize when evaluating the instruction provided by faculty at community colleges.

Generalization of the specific results of this study may be inappropriate for community colleges located in communities with different pools of citizens from which to draw part-time employees. The indication that part-time instructors rate as well or better than full-time instructors may be attributable to the community college location. This community college was in a large

metropolitan area which contained a relatively large group of people qualified through work experience or training in instructional areas offered by the insititution. A metropolitan area is more likely to offer more qualified personnel willing to teach on a part-time basis.

Another limitation to consider when considering the results of this investigation, is that the evaluations were made on a short term basis. Students evaluated their instructors while attenting the course taught by the instructor. The community college maintained a quater system and students were exposed to the instructor for a limited time. Only short term student judgements of instructors are in this study. This weakness may have been controlled partially by the fact that every instructor was evaluated each year. The data in the study were collected during two years.

Information gained from analysis of instructor evauation ratings could be applied in the following example. When no difference in instructor performance exists in a teaching field, all instructors may be effective or all instructors may be poor. By looking at the means of the ratings, this situation becomes more definitive. A high mean may suggest recognition for outstanding teaching as a group, or it may provide a resource for improving the effectiveness of instructors in

other teaching fields through teacher development programs.

When the full-time instructors in a teaching field rate higher than part-time instructors, full-time instructors become a possible resource for staff development programs targeting part-time instructors in that teaching field. An alternative hiring process for part-time instructors may be investigated as a means of improving the performance of part-time instructors in the weak teaching fields.

If part-time instructors are rated higher than full-time instructors in a teaching field, some staff development activities may be instituted to reduce the differences. For example, some areas for development include attitudinal changes, personal development, becoming more current in the field, relating the field to the community, or incorporating career related aspects of the teaching field.

Full-time instructors rated significantly different from part-time instructors in the arts and sciences group. Part-time instructors rated higher. This outcome offers the following questions to investigate. Is being free of additional duties of full-time faculty a positive factor? Are full-time faculty bogged down by student personal attention, advising, curriculum revision, and meetings?

Are part-time instructors more motivated because they like what they are doing? Are part-time instructors teaching for personal fulfillment rather than for a livelihood? Do students expect more from full-time instructors?

Pertinent information and a more accurate interpretation of the students' perception of instructor effectiveness may emerge through detailed analysis of the data collected by community colleges. Many institutions obtain student evaluations of instructors. The data collected can help form a basis for alleviating weaknesses and rewarding strengths when analyzed in groups.

Student evaluations of instructors provide a valuable assessment of instructor performance in the classrooms. However, additional forms of evaluation may expand and enhance the evaluation of instructor performance in this research. An example may be a measure of student performance.

The research results implied that more accurate statistical information may result from analysis of groups within the community college faculty. Community college disciplines, divisions, departments, vocational technical, continuing education, and campus locations are examples of natural subgroups that may be appropriate groups to study.

Detailed investigation of evaluation ratings relative to groups may provide more specific strengths and weaknesses. Identifying instructor actions associated with evaluation items, may provide areas of improvement for instructors when associated with teaching fields or functional groups.

Summary

This research described full-time and part-time faculty performance within community college subgroups. Identifying effective instructors may lead to improvements in the quality of instruction and employment practices. Variations in part-time and full-time instructor performance, as represented by student evaluation ratings, support expanding data analysis practices. Grouping data and analyzing the groups independently within the community college may provide more accurate assessments of teaching performance. Investigating the quality of education offered by part-time and full-time instructors within subgroups may aid in forming a basis for decisions in hiring practices, staff development, inservice training, reward systems, and accountability. Results may apply to the accountability of community colleges to students, to the community, and to funding sources at every level

within the community college whether faculty, administration, or the governing body.

REFERENCES

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1987). One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C.: Palmer, J. A.

Arrington, A. Z. (1980). Effect of costs and constraints on the optimum employment combination of full-time and part-time faculty at urban community colleges. University Microfilm International, 8027693.

Behrendt, R. L., & Parson, M. H. (1983). Evaluation of part-time faculty. New Directions for Community Colleges, 11, 33-43.

Biglan, A. (1973a). Characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57, 195-203.

Biglan, A. (1973b). Relationships between subject matter characteristics and the structure and output of university departments. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57, 204-213.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational Research. New York: Longman.

Cagle, C. A. (1978). A comparison of the results of student evaluations of teachers between full-time faculty and part-time faculty at an urban two-year college. Dissertation Abstract International, 52, 2710A.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1977). The Two-Year College Instructor Today. New York: Praeger.

Costin, F., Greenough, W. T., & Menges, R. J. (1972). Student ratings of college teaching. Review of Educational Research, 41, 511-535.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16, 297-333.

Cronbach, L. J., Gleser, B. C., Nanda, J., & Rajaratnam, N. (1972). The Dependability of Behavioral Measurements. New York: John Wiley.

Cruise, R. J., Furst, L. H., & Klimes, R. E. (1980). A comparison of full-time and part-time instructors at midwestern community college. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 10, 65-72.

Davis, D., Balcher, M., & McKitterick, R. (1986). Comparing the achievement of students taught by part-time versus full-time faculty. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 10, 65-72.

Easton, J. Q., & Guskey, T. R. (1983). Estimating the effects of college, department, course, and teacher on earned credit rates. Research in Higher Education, 19, 152-157.

Feldman, K. A. (1977). Consistency and variability among college students in rating their teachers and courses: A review and analysis. Research in Higher Education, 6, 223-274.

Friedlander, J. (1980). Instructional practices of part-time faculty. New Directions for Community Colleges, 30, 27-36.

Hartnet, R. T. & Centra, J. A. (1977). The effects of academic departments on student learning. Journal of Higher Education, 48, 491-507.

Kandzer, J. (1977). A comparison of student rating of teaching effectiveness for full-time versus part-time faculty in selected Florida community colleges. Dissertation Abstracts International, 2509.

Kolb, D. A. (1981). Learning styles and disciplinary differences. In A. W. Chickering and Associates, The Modern American College (pp. 232-255). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kolb, D. A., & Lewis, L. H. (1986). Facilitating experiential learning: Observations and reflections. New Directions for Continuing Education, 30, 99-107.

Kulik, J. A., & McKeachie, W. J. (1975). The evaluation of teachers in higher education. Review of Research in Education, 3, 210-239.

Landers, M. G. (1979). Part-time faculty: Their responsibilities & their effectiveness. Excerpted from the Annual Report to the Texas Association of Junior and Community College Instructional Administrators by the Research Committee. ED 180 517.

Mathis, C. (1980). Evaluating the effectiveness of teaching. New Directions for Program Evaluation, 6, 21-37.

Marsh, H. W. (1982). Factors affecting students' evaluations of the same course taught by the same instructor on different occasions. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 485-497.

Marsh, H. W., & Overall, J. U. (1981). The relative influence of course level, course type, and instructor on students' evaluations of college teaching. American Educational Research Journal, 18, 103-112.

Overall, J. U., & Cooper, T. L. (1981). The growth of part-time faculty: Economic and quality considerations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Institutional Research. ED 213 349.

Palmer, J. A. (1983). How is quality measured at the community college? Community College Review, 11, 52-62.

Piercy, R. J. (1974). Student evaluation of faculty and administrative uses of the results, (unpublished dissertation, Indiana University).

Rayder, N. F. (1968). College student ratings of instructors. The Journal of Experimental Education, 37, 75-81.

Sullivan, A. M. & Skanes, G. R. (1974). Validity of student evaluation of teaching and the characteristics of successful instructors. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66, 584-490.

Trent, B. L. (1984). Community college students' evaluations of the teaching skills of part-time versus full-time instructors. Dissertation Abstracts International, 7, 3056A.

Vreeland, R. S., & Bidwell, C. E. (1966). Classifying university departments: An approach to the analysis of their effects upon undergraduates' values and attitudes. Sociology of Education, 39, 237-254.

Wilson, R. C. (1986). Improving faculty teaching. Journal of Higher Education, 57, 196-211.

Wilson, R. C., Gaff, J. G., Dienst, E. R., Wood, L. & Bavry, J. L. (1975). College Professors and Their Impact on Students. John Wiley: New York.

APPENDIX

Procedures for Faculty and Support Staff Evaluation

PURPOSE: The purpose of the faculty and support staff evaluation is to provide a consistent methodology for evaluating performance, enhancing self-improvement, and encouraging professional development of faculty and support staff.

SCOPE: This procedure applies to all full-time nine and twelve month teaching faculty and support staff who are issued annual Notices of Appointment approved by the Area Board of Governors.

1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The general principles underlying the faculty and support staff evaluation are:

a. To provide a system for measuring and evaluating faculty and support staff performance.

b. To provide a conducive environment for faculty and support staff self-improvement.

c. To provide an evaluation process which allows for input from staff members, the supervisor and students, as applicable.

d. To provide faculty and support staff members with knowledge of evaluation criteria.

e. To provide a climate for ongoing communications concerning performance between faculty members/support staff and the supervisor.

f. To provide documentation as required for administrative purposes.

2. STUDENT EVALUATION PROCEDURES (for faculty)

a. Frequency - Student evaluations shall be conducted on a quarterly basis. A representative sample of each faculty member's classes shall be selected for student evaluation by the appropriate Division Chairperson with a minimum of five classes evaluated each year on each faculty member.

b. Student Evaluation Form - The student evaluation form is designed to be anonymous, self-explanatory and easily administered. A copy of the form is attached.

c. Distribution - The instructor shall appoint a student to oversee the distribution and collection of student evaluation forms. The student shall insure that completed Student Evaluation of Teaching Forms are placed in an

envelope, sealed, and delivered to the Office of Admissions. The Office of Admissions will then forward the evaluations to the appropriate supervisor who prepares the forms for Computer Services processing.

d. Access to Student Evaluations - The appropriate Division Chairperson shall insure that student evaluations are maintained and safeguarded in division files for a period of two years. The faculty member, the supervisor, and other individuals designated by the President may have access to student evaluations.

e. Computation - The appropriate Division Chairperson shall ensure that evaluation ratings are sent to Computer Services for processing and that a compilation of student comments is prepared for distribution to the faculty member.

f. Student Evaluation Composite Report - A composite evaluation report provided by Computer Services shall be reviewed with the faculty member by the supervisor. The completed report shall be used as an input to the supervisory evaluation.

Procedures for Part-Time Faculty Evaluation

PURPOSE: The purpose of the part-time faculty evaluation is to provide a consistent methodology for evaluating performance and improving the teaching effectiveness of part-time faculty.

SCOPE: This procedure applies to all part-time teaching faculty who are issued notices of part-time assignment and who are not covered by other college faculty evaluation procedures.

1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The general principles underlying the part-time faculty evaluation are:

a. To provide an environment for improving part-time faculty teaching skills.

b. To provide a system for measuring part-time faculty performance.

c. To provide an evaluation process which allows for input from students and the part-time faculty member's supervisor.

d. To provide part-time faculty members with knowledge of evaluation criteria.

e. To provide a climate for on-going communications concerning performance between the part-time faculty member and the supervisor.

f. To provide documentation for purposes of retention.

2. STUDENT EVALUATION PROCEDURES

a. Frequency - Student evaluations shall be conducted on a quarterly basis on those courses designated by the supervisor.

b. Student Evaluation Form - The Student Evaluation Form is designed to be anonymous, self-explanatory and easily administered. No other instructions other than those provided on the form shall be provided to the students.

c. Distribution - The instructor shall appoint a student to oversee the distribution and collection of Student Evaluation Forms. The student shall insure that completed Student Evaluation Forms are placed in an envelope, sealed and mailed via inter-office mail to the appropriate supervisor.

d. Access to Student Evaluations - The appropriate Division Chairperson shall insure that student evaluations are maintained and safeguarded in Division files for a period of two years. The

part-time faculty member, line supervisor, and other individuals designated by the President may have access to student evaluations.

e. Compilation - The supervisor shall insure that individual student evaluation scores are compiled on the Student Evaluation Composite Form.

f. Student Evaluation Composite Form - The composite evaluation shall be reviewed with the part-time faculty member by the supervisor at the time of the evaluation conference, and at other times designated by the supervisor. It shall be signed by both parties and used an an input to the supervisory evaluation. A copy of the form is attached.

99

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

YOUR ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS
CAN HELP IMPROVE TEACHING

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Use No. 2 Pencil. Make only one mark per question. Make all erasures complete.

   CORRECT MARKS ●●●● INCORRECT MARKS ⊘⊗⊘◒

2. Please answer all questions.
3. Written comments can be placed on the back of this sheet.
4. Show how you feel about your instructor and course by darkening the bubble that most nearly applies.
5. The rating scale ranges from 1 = 'Poor' to 5 = 'Excellent'.

Instructor's Name: _____

REASON FOR TAKING THIS COURSE
- ○ REQUIREMENT FOR A MAJOR
- ○ AN ELECTIVE
- ○ JOB UPGRADING/PROMOTION
- ○ PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

ENROLLMENT STATUS
- Ⓕ FULL TIME
- Ⓟ PART TIME

EXPECTED GRADE
Ⓐ Ⓑ Ⓒ Ⓓ Ⓕ Ⓟ Ⓡ Ⓘ

Course: _____ — _____ — _____
prefix course# section#

PART A: PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR INSTRUCTOR.

Poor Excellent

		Poor Excellent
①②③④⑤	1. Is well prepared for each class.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	2. Shows respect for student opinion and concerns.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	3. Welcomes students questions and discussions.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	4. Answers student questions and comments.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	5. Is willing to help students outside of class time.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	6. Is excited about teaching his/her subject.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	7. Uses methods that help students learn.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	8. Encourages student participation in class.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	9. Makes the subject matter clear.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	10. Would recommend this instructor to other students.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	11. Uses examples to explain the material.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	12. Has a clear understanding of his/her subject matter.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	13. Can relate course materials to real-life situations.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	14. Gives tests and/or assignments about the material taught in class.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	15. Starts class on time.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	16. Returns tests and/or assignments promptly.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	17. Ends class on time.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	18. Offers help to students when they need help.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	19. Gives fair and reasonable tests and/or assignments.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	20. Helps students to develop creative abilities.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	21. Talks so students can understand him/her.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	22. Is open to different viewpoints from students.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	23. Provides class outline at beginning of course describing requirements, objectives and evaluation procedures.	①②③④⑤

PART B: PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE COURSE.

Poor Excellent

		Poor Excellent
①②③④⑤	24. Course is offered at a good time of day/night.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	25. Equipment needed for the course is available.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	26. Textbooks and reading materials seem to apply to the class.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	27. Classrooms or laboratory facilities are helpful to learning.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	28. Would recommend this course to other students.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	29. This course was offered on the campus most convenient to me.	①②③④⑤
①②③④⑤	30. I would rate this course.	①②③④⑤

WRITTEN COMMENTS MAY BE PLACED ON BACK