

AN ANALYSIS OF FACULTY EVALUATION BY STUDENTS A CASE OF COMSATS UNIVERSITY LAHORE

Ms. Naila Yosuf

COMSATS Institute of information technology Lahore, Pakistan

naila@ciitlahore.edu.pk

ABSTRACT ; Education has identified the need for teacher evaluations and it is mandatory in universities and education Institutes like “COMSATS Institute of information technology Lahore Campus” (CIIT Lahore). The purpose of the study is to analyze the results of faculty evaluation by students, in CIIT Lahore. In the current study there is an in depth analysis of the outcomes of all the Quality factors included in evaluation form. The contents of the evaluation instrument based on different group dimensions related to teachers, like; course content and additional subject material, teachers’ knowledge of the subject, teaching style, ethical behavior, teachers’ regularity and punctuality and course organization. The outcomes of this study gave a holistic view of the faculty evaluation feedback in CIIT Lahore. Results showing that excellent category for any of the group of questions have maximum percentage of 62% and poor category for any of the group of question has minimum percentage of 3.0%.

Key words: Faculty evaluation, Cu-online, Evaluation instrument, case study, CIIT Lahore

1. INTRODUCTION

Teachers’ can play a pivotal role in students’ character building and this can be done by successful teaching. Teachers are valued for the contributions they make to their classroom and institution. They demonstrate the value of lifelong learning and encourage their students to learn and grow [1,2] escribed that “there is an increased consensus that highly qualified and effective teachers are necessary to improve student performance and there is a growing interest in identifying an individual teacher’s impact on students’ achievement”. Students are the audience of teachers’ play in the class room and they can best judge their teachers.

Teacher evaluation by students is commonly practiced in many developed and developing countries at different levels of education in different institutes and universities [3]. In Pakistan teacher evaluation by students at the higher education level is a recent phenomenon, which has also been stressed by the Higher Education Commission (HEC) of Pakistan [3]. COMSATS has also practicing teachers’ evaluation by students.

The Commission on Science and Technology for Sustainable Development in the South East Asia (COMSATS) is an international organization. Its aim is to fill the gap between the developed and developing world through practical implementation of science and technology. COMSATS was initiated by The Third World Academy of Sciences (TWAS) under the leadership of Nobel Laureate, Dr. Abdus Salam. The foundation-conference of COMSATS was held at Islamabad on 4th & 5th October 1994. Representatives from thirty-six countries attended the conference and participants included twenty-two Ministers, members of the diplomatic community of Islamabad and representatives of international organizations, like UNESCO, UNIDO, UNEP and the World Bank.[4]

COMSATS currently represents 21 developing countries across three continents namely Bangladesh, China, Colombia, Egypt, Ghana, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Korea (DPRK), Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Srilanka, Sudan , Syria ,Tanzania ,Tunisia, Uganda and Zimbabwe. COMSATS has selected thirteen Centers of

Excellence in its member countries to develop a Network of International Science and Technology Centers for Sustainable Development in the South. These Centers have been selected as nodes and are being used to provide a leading role in their respective areas of specialization. [4]

COMSATS has focused its attention on variety of field of science and technology on priority basis. So far, it has selected fields of Information Technology, Renewable Energy, Climate and Environmental Sciences, Chemical Sciences, and Development of Small and Medium Enterprise (SME). These targeted areas are revised from time to time according to the changing national/regional priorities and expanding areas of expertise of the COMSATS Network of Centers of Excellence. Within Pakistan major activities of COMSATS are taking place through its subsidiaries: COMSATS Internet Services (CIS) and COMSATS Institute of Information Technology (CIIT). CIS has set up and is operating modern communication systems in most cities throughout the country and CIIT has been established for training professional human resource.[4]

COMSATS Institute of Information Technology (CIIT) started its journey in 1998, and established its first campus at Islamabad in April 1998. In August 2000, in recognition of CIIT’s achievements, the Federal Government granted it the status of a Degree Awarding Institute (DAI) through promulgation of its charter. On the advice of the Federal Government, efforts are also under way for opening an overseas campus in the Gulf region. CIIT is now slated for up gradation as a university by the name of ‘COMSATS University’ as approved by federal cabinet. During the last 11 years, CIIT has proven itself one of the fastest growing educational institutions of the decade. All through these years, various external bodies have evaluated CIIT and the quality of its programs, based on very stringent quality and professional standards. The most important autonomous entities and regulatory bodies evaluating CIIT and its programs are the Higher Education Commission (HEC), National Computing Education Accreditation Council (NCEAC), the Pakistan Engineering Council (PEC), and the

Institute of Scientific Information (ISI) a Web of Knowledge.[4]

The CIIT, besides its principal campus at Islamabad, has six other fully functional campuses at Lahore, Abbottabad, Wah, Attock, Sahiwal and Vehari, while few more campuses are in different planning stages. Presently, the Institute in the respective campuses offering 55 degree programs of graduate and undergraduate level. The CIIT at present comprises of five Faculties and 16 Departments. Presently, 23 under graduate degree programs. and 32 graduate programs are on offer in which more than 18,000 students are enrolled. Total present student strength is 20,000 with faculty strength of 2,000 working in CIIT. More than 320 faculty members and academic managers holding PhD qualification are currently serving the CIIT. The remaining have MS/MPhil in relevant fields. CIIT has proudly produced more than 12,000 graduates since its inception in 2000. So far, 33 convocations have been organized in its campuses. More than 420 faculty members are undergoing advanced education leading to MS and PhD degrees and post doctoral research in USA, UK, China, France, etc. The funding for advanced education has come from CIIT Scholarships, HEC Scholarships and Ministry of Science and Technology Scholarships.[4]

COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, M.A Jinnah Campus, Lahore .This campus was established in January 2002 and it consists of 11 different departments like Management sciences, Computer sciences, Telecom & computer engineering, Physics, Chemical, Architecture, office of research Innovation and Commercialization (ORIC), Mathematics, Statistics, Interdisciplinary research centre in Biomedical and material (IRCBM) and Humanities. There are 12 graduate and 7 under graduate programs are running under these departments and more than five thousand students are being studying in different graduate and undergraduate programs. In CIIT Lahore there are total 404 faculty members are in employment. Presently 343 of them are teaching and 61 faculty members are on leave for higher studies[5]. CIIT has a firm focus on adding quality to its academic program as well as to all other segments of its operations. For this purpose CIIT offers both in-house and foreign scholarships for higher education in different disciplines to its faculty. It also provides training workshops and seminars time to time. As CIIT concerned with the education growth and quality teaching so it always concerned to provide valuable teaching to its students. In addition to providing different education opportunities to its faculty for their grooming it also keeps check on them in many different ways like; it developed an evaluation system to assess its faculty in different perspectives; through their heads, by students, on the basis of research output and by their participation in administrative and co-curricular activities.

Faculty evaluation by students is a mean to measure faculty teaching performance and student teacher relationship. Faculty evaluation is a good source to keep check on the working of teachers and to enhance the professional performance of teachers and due to this “Researchers are conceiving of teacher evaluation as a mechanism for

improving teaching and learning” [6]. The teacher performance evaluation process serves as a measurement of performance for individual teachers and as a guide for teachers as they reflect upon and improve their effectiveness. This study focused towards teachers’ evaluation by students in CIIT Lahore. In this study an analysis has been conducted about evaluated results of CIIT Lahore faculty, by their students. There is an online information system (Cu-online) of CIIT which is responsible for handling the evaluation process. Cu-online is a web based, an integrated and self service information technology environment meant for faculty, staff, students, and parents. It’s an information system for all the employees and students of CIIT to do reporting, data extraction and information analysis.

Literature Review

Teachers’ evaluation is one of the important factors that can contribute to the quality teaching and teachers can be evaluated in many different ways; by students, peers, heads, by their research output and participation in curricular activities. As mentioned by [7] “teacher evaluation is the most effective method to improve educational quality. From the ancient times, assessment of the quality of pedagogical has been considered an essential method of evaluation in educational settings. For teachers ‘assessment, different methods are used such as group director’s opinion, dean’s judgment, Co-works assessment, self-evaluation and students opinion. The last one is more common method used for teachers”.

[8] described Teachers’ Evaluation Programs have become a regular feature of many public sector universities in Pakistan. However, the evaluators in each university have different practices to conduct teachers’ evaluation and there in no uniformity in teachers’ evaluation programs throughout Pakistan. Furthermore, there is no system in place to evaluate the teachers’ evaluation program itself.

According to [9] the use of students’ ratings for evaluating teacher effectiveness is the single most researched issue in all of higher education. This issue is especially important at a teaching and learning institution as supported by [10] “Student ratings add a valuable component to the range of input for the evaluation of teachers”. Teachers’ performance evaluation by students’ feedback is one of the best ways to check and evaluate teachers’ performance as discussed by [11] “Student evaluation of teaching (SET) is a widely used instrument in higher education”. An evaluation instruments can be used to get feedback from students’ about their teachers. These instruments can include different group dimensions which consists of many questions related to different aspects of teachers and teaching like; course content and additional subject material, teachers’ knowledge of the subject, teaching style, ethical behavior, teachers’ regularity & punctuality and course organization etc.

Course contents and subject material includes the course outline & course handbook should be provided by the teacher to the students at the start of the session. Course outlines are intended to provide students with an overall plan for a course to enable them to function efficiently and effectively in the course. Research on teachers’ personality traits and behaviors has produced few consistent findings

[12, 13], with the exception of studies finding a recurring positive relationship between student learning and teachers' "flexibility," "creativity," or "adaptability" [12, 14, 15].

A positive and respecting behavior with students means regarding them with special attention, honoring them, showing consideration toward them, being concerned about them, appreciating them, relating to them, admiring their strengths, and caring for them. Young people are dignified and strengthened by adult respect. The absence of such respect is corrosive.

Teaching style is also very important for good teaching. As the technology is getting advance day by day so teachers can adopt different teaching styles to bring change and innovation in teaching style. As also recommended by [16] Successful teachers tend to be those who are able to use a range of teaching strategies and who use a range of interaction styles, rather than a single, rigid approach.

Knowledge of the subject is a dimension that could be related to teacher effectiveness. [17, 18]. Although researches supported this assumption but the findings are not always as strong and consistent as one might suppose. Studies of teachers' scores on the subject matter tests of the National Teacher Examinations (NTE) have found no consistent relationship between this measure of subject matter knowledge and teacher performance as measured by student outcomes or supervisory ratings. Most studies show small, statistically insignificant relationships, both positive and negative

While [19] summarized the results of thirty studies relating teachers' subject matter knowledge to student achievement. It makes sense that knowledge of the material to be taught is essential to good teaching, but also that returns to subject matter expertise would grow smaller beyond some minimal essential level which exceeds the demands of the curriculum being taught.

It may also be that the measure of subject matter knowledge makes a difference in the findings. Measures of course-taking in a subject area have more frequently been found to be related to teacher performance than have scores on tests of subject matter knowledge. It may be that the positive effects of subject matter knowledge are augmented or offset by knowledge of how to teach the subject to various kinds of students. As different students have different intellectual ability and aptitude level. A teacher must know how to organize the course according to the students' caliber. [20] Effective teachers adjust their teaching to fit the needs of different students and the demands of different instructional goals, topics, and methods.

Hence it proved from the literature that teachers evaluation play very important role for the enhancement of education growth and quality as said by [3] "Teacher evaluation by students can go a long way in enhancing the professional performance of teachers. Following an effective assessment tool is inevitable for the right analysis". Teachers' evaluation through students is crucial to their evaluation. Teachers knowledge of the subject, teaching style, course contents, teachers regularity and punctuality and teachers positive

ethical behavior with the students; are major dimensions by which teachers can be evaluated by their students and these factors can be the part of evaluation form.

3. METHODOLOGY

The data for the study is taken from Cu-online, CIIT Lahore. The data we analyzed is about 5367 registered students of CIIT in different graduate and undergraduate programs of different departments of fall session, 2012. The data includes the online filled evaluation forms by students. The evaluation instrument (**Appendix A**) is based on 25 questions. For the analysis purpose the questions of the instrument are categorized into six groups, these groups show the dimensions by which teachers are evaluated. The questions are measured on 1 to 5 liker scale. The groups are; course content & additional subject material, regularity & punctuality, teaching style, course organization, current issues and updated knowledge of the subject and ethical behavior.

Every dimension has many different questions ranging from 2 to 6. The dimension "course content and subject material" includes questions like; 1) the syllabus clearly stated course objectives, requirements, procedures and grading criteria. 2) The course integrated theoretical course concepts with real-world applications. 3) The syllabus clearly stated course objectives, requirements, procedures and grading criteria. 4) The instructor provided course handbook at beginning of the semester. 5) The subject matter presented in the course has increased your knowledge about the subject. 6) The instructor provided relevant additional material apart from the textbook. The second dimension is teachers' regularity and punctuality which comprises of following five questions; 1) teacher arrived on time in class. 2) Teacher left each class on time. 3) The instructor returned the graded script in a reasonable amount of the time. 4) The instructor delivered lectures as per notified time table. 5) The instructor was easily accessible during the university hours.

Furthermore, there is a group of "Teaching Style" which is having questions; 1) the instructor clearly demonstrated knowledge of the subject. 2) The instructor maintained conducive class room environment for learning. 3) The instructor motivated students in subject learning. Moreover, there is a category of questions about "course organization". And it is based on the questions; 1) the instructor was prepared for each class. 2) The instructor followed the lecture plan during the whole semester. 3) The instructor has completed the whole course within stipulated period. 4) The instructor conducts quizzes on time and gave assignments on regular basis. 5) The assignments and exams covered the materials presented in the course. The fifth dimension is covering the concept of "current issues and updated Knowledge of the subject" and it is checked by these two questions; 1) The instructor provided ideas about recent developments in the subject; 2) The instructor explained subject matter with additional examples. At the end evaluation instrument have a group of questions based on "teachers ethical behavior". The questions are; 1) the instructor showed respect toward students and encouraged class participation. 2) The instructor was fair in examination

and related assessments. 3) The instructor did not demonstrate gender bias. 4) The instructor had strong moral and professional ethics and groomed student's ethics and moral values.

Each question has some points ranging from 0 to 1 and total of all points collectively shows a person's evaluations number which is called quality factor, that any teacher achieves by students evaluation. The quantitative techniques that are used in this study are; Mean/average test and frequency test.

4. Findings and Discussion

Total 5367 filled evaluation forms has been analyzed in this study. Findings of the analysis (**Appendix B**) depict that the group one that is about "course content and subject material" has the highest percentage of 61.2%. It means out of 5367 student there are 19716 students who evaluated their teachers as excellent in course content and subject material, in other words they are highly satisfied with the contents and material used by their teachers to teach them. 7406 students evaluated their teachers as very good; it indicates that twenty three percent of students of CIIT Lahore are satisfied with the course material through which they are being taught. Further 3055 (9.5%), 945 (2.9%), and 1080 (3.4%) take course contents and subject material as good, fair and poor respectively.

Second category is of "Teachers regularity and punctuality". In CIIT Lahore 16472 (61.4%) students rate their teachers as excellent in regularity and punctuality. According to these students their teachers arrive on time and leave the classes in time. This percentage depicts that the faculty is good in delivering the course contents in time and give time to students as and where desired. Excluding 61.4% there are 23.3% students who consider their teachers as regular and punctual in their duties. Besides sixty two and twenty three percents, there are 6%, 2.7% and 3% students who consider their teachers as good, fair and poor respectively. There is a third group which is related to teachers' "teaching style". Teaching style includes the questions about the class environment, teaching Aids, teachers' way of delivering lectures. Its outcomes are 9703 (60.3%) as excellent, 3773 (23.4%) as very good. (1588) 9.9% as good in teaching style. 945(3.1%) as fair and 542 (3.4%) consider them as poor. About 61 percents students are highly satisfied with the teachers teaching style. It means they are satisfied with way teachers deliver the lectures either on white board or by using Aids. It also clearly demonstrates that 61 percent students are comfortable with the class room environment.

The next category is of "course organization". It describes how much teachers are expert in course organization. Out of total 5367 there are 16287 students who rate their mentors as excellent in course organization. It imply that 60.7% of students are highly satisfied with the way of delivering course contents, quiz assignments distribution and their grades, furthermore their teachers are good in grades distribution from total 100 marks. 23.7% consider the faculty as very good organizers about teaching material class arrangements and in above mentioned points etc .9.4% of the total students say as just good and 3.0% as fair and 3.2% students say our teachers are poor in course organization. It

depicts just 3.2% students say that their teachers are poor contents delivery, marks distribution among quizzes, assignments, presentations and other class activities.

After course organization there is another category which is about "current issues and updated knowledge of the subject". This category includes the questions about the current issues and According to students' there are 6287 (58.6%) students who say that teachers are excellent in giving updated knowledge of the subject and vary good in giving updated information. 2615 (24.4%) categorized them as very good and 1119 (10.4%), 363 (3.4%) and 350 (3.3%) as good, fair and poor respectively in the mentioned areas. Last and the sixth group of questions in the evaluation instrument is about teachers "ethical behavior". Questions are related to the fair and respectable behavior of instructors. Further it consists of questions like teachers' unbiased behavior and strong moral and ethical relations with the students. 12899 (60.1%) students groped their teachers as excellent in ethical treatment by their teachers. 5090 (23.7%) as very good and 2113 (9.8%), 640 (3.0%) and 726 (3.4%) as good, fair and poor respectively in ethical behavior.

5. CONCLUSION

This study is an analysis of the results of teachers' evaluation process in COMSATS Institute of Information technology, Lahore. Data for the analysis has been taken from cu-online, based on feedback by students about their teachers for fall-session, 2012. Results shown that excellent category for any of the questions has maximum percentage of 62%. And poor category for any of the question has minimum percentage of 3%. According to the study conducted, the areas like teaching style, ethical behavior, regularity and punctuality need improvement

The current study is helpful for learning about how students rate/evaluate their teachers in a university. It can be useful for the faculty and the management of CIIT for the improvement purposes and for personnel decisions respectively. CIIT Faculty can use this study to get a holistic view of the feedback by students. And the management can use it for personnel analysis and decision making. On the basis of such analysis management can design training courses and workshops for teachers' learning and growth. As shown from the findings, excellent category achieves 60.3% percentage on average. It shows that CIIT Faculty need improvement in all the disciplines to get outstanding results by students' evaluation.

Although this study is supportive to know about the CIIT faculty performance from their students perspective but there are some limitations of it. The major limitation of the study is that it's a case study and targeting just one Institute. This study is based on the analysis of 343 faculty members and 5367 students of CIIT Lahore. This study is the holistic view of the outcome of the feedback of students of CIIT about their teachers. It's a generic perspective which portrays a whole picture of teachers' evaluation by their students in CIIT Lahore. There might be some faculty members who are having excellent ranking in all group dimensions, and some might have just satisfactory and poor rating. But, this study is unable to differentiate it.

6. REFERENCES:

1. *Teacher evaluation process*, D.o.p. Instruction, Editor. 2012: North Carolina.
2. Little, O., L. Goe, and C. Bell, *A Practical Guide to Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2009.
3. Sarwar, A. and S.M. Sarwar, *Teacher Evaluation by Students in Business Programs*. focus. **2**(6): p. 01-25.
4. *ABOUT CIIT*. 2013 Thursday, August 01, 2013 [cited 2013 18th July, 2013]; Available from: www.ciit.edu.pk.
5. *About CIIT*. 2013 Friday, August 02 ,2013 [cited 2013 2013]; Available from: www.ciitlahore.edu.pk.
6. Danielson, C. and T.L. McGreal, *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. 2005: Ascd.
7. Najafipour, S. and M. Amini, *A Survey of teachersview points of Jahrom Medical School Towards Teachers Evaluation By Student*. Iranian Journal of Medical Education, 2002. **2**: p. 41-42.
8. Usmani, M.A.W., et al., *Meta Evaluation of a Teachers' Evaluation Programme Using CIPP Model*. Archives Des Sciences, 2012. **65**(7).
9. Doyle, T., *Evaluating teacher effectiveness-research summary*. Learner Centered Teaching, 2004.
10. Scriven, M., *Student ratings offer useful input to teacher evaluations*. 1995, ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation, the Catholic University of America, Department of Education.
11. Pounder, J.S., *Is student evaluation of teaching worthwhile?: An analytical framework for answering the question*. Quality Assurance in Education, 2007. **15**(2): p. 178-191.
12. Schalock, D., *Research on teacher selection*. Review of research in education, 1979. **7**: p. 364-417.
13. Druva, C.A. and R.D. Anderson, *Science teacher characteristics by teacher behavior and by student outcome: A meta-analysis of research*. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1983. **20**(5): p. 467-479.
14. Berliner, D.C. and W.J. Tikunoff, *The California beginning teacher evaluation study: Overview of the ethnographic study*. Journal of Teacher Education, 1976. **27**(1): p. 24-30.
15. Freiberg, H.J. and H.C. Waxman, *Alternative feedback approaches for improving student teachers' classroom instruction*. Journal of Teacher Education, 1988. **39**(4): p. 8-14.
16. Hamachek, D., *Characteristics of good teachers and implications for teacher education*. The Phi Delta Kappan, 1969. **50**(6): p. 341-345.
17. Andrews, J.W., *Preservice Performance and the National Teacher Exams*. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980. **61**(5): p. 358-59.
18. Darling-Hammond, L., *Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence*. 1999: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington Seattle, WA.
19. Byrne, C. *Teacher knowledge and teacher effectiveness: A literature review, theoretical analysis and discussion of research strategy*. in meeting of the Northwestern Educational Research association, Ellenville, NY. 1983.
20. Doyle, W., *Recent Research on Classroom Management Implications for Teacher Education*. Journal of Teacher Education, 1985. **36**(3): p. 31-35.

Appendices:**Appendix A****COMSATS Institute of Information Technology MA Jinnah campus Lahore****Teacher Evaluation Performa****(To be filled by the student)****Teacher:** _____**Class** _____

QNO	Question	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The instructor provided course handbook at beginning of the semester					
2	The instructor was prepared for each class					
3	The instructor arrived on time in each class					
4	The instructor left each class on time					
5	The instructor clearly demonstrated knowledge of the subject					
6	The instructor followed the lecture plan during the whole semester					
7	The instructor provided relevant additional material apart from the textbook					
8	The instructor provided ideas about recent developments in the subject					
9	The instructor has completed the whole course within stipulated period					
10	The instructor explained subject matter with additional examples					
11	The instructor showed respect toward students and encouraged class participation					
12	The instructor maintained conducive class room environment for learning					
13	The instructor was fair in examination and related assessments					
14	The instructor returned the graded scripts etc. in a reasonable amount of the time					
15	The instructor conducts quizzes on time and gave assignments on regular basis					
16	The instructor did not demonstrate gender bias					
17	The instructor had strong moral and professional ethics and groomed student's ethics and moral values					
18	The instructor delivered lectures as per notified time table					
19	The instructor was easily accessible during the university hours					
20	The instructor motivated students in subject learning					
21	The subject matter presented in the course has increased your knowledge about the subject					
22	The syllabus clearly stated course objectives, requirements, procedures and grading criteria.					
23	The course integrated theoretical course concepts with real-world applications					
24	The assignments and exams covered the materials presented in the course					
25	The course material was modern and updated					







Appendix B
COMSATS Institute of Information Technology MA Jinnah campus Lahore
Teachers Evaluation Results and its Analysis for the fall-session 2012



Q NO	QUESTIONS	CATEGORY	EXCELLENT	EXCELLENT %	EXCELLENT_group_AVG %	EXCELLENT_group_AVG	VERY GOOD	VERY GOOD %	VERY GOOD_group_AVG %	VERY GOOD_group_AVG	GOOD	GOOD %	GROUP_AVG	Good_group_AVG %	FAIR	FAIR %	FAIR_groupAVG	FAIR_group_AVG %	POOR	POOR %	Poor_group_AVG	POOR_group_AVG %	TOTAL STUDENTS IN EACH GROUP
1	The instructor provided course handbook at beginning of the semester	1	3544	66.03	19716	1045	19.47	7406	23.0%	443	8.25	3055	9.5%	163	3.04	945	2.9%	172	3.2	1080	3.4%	32202	
7	The instructor provided relevant additional material apart from the textbook	1	3166	58.99		1256	23.4		561	10.45	191		3.56	193	3.6								
21	The subject matter presented in the course has increased your knowledge about the subject	1	3256	60.67		1261	23.5		530	9.88	143		2.66	177	3.3								
22	The syllabus clearly stated course objectives, requirements, procedures and grading criteria.	1	3190	59.44		1323	24.65		535	9.97	153		2.85	166	3.09								
23	The course integrated theoretical course concepts with real-world applications	1	3216	59.92		1310	24.41		515	9.6	143		2.66	183	3.41								
25	The course material was modern and updated	1	3344	62.31		1211	22.56		471	8.78	152		2.83	189	3.52								

3	The instructor arrived on time in each class	2	3373	62.85	16472	61.4%	1190	22.17	6254	23.3%	498	9.28	2579	9.6%	148	2.76	727	2.7%	158	2.94	803	3.0%	26835
4	The instructor left each class on time	2	3378	62.94			1201	22.38			488	9.09			143	2.66			157	2.93			
14	The instructor returned the graded scripts etc. in a reasonable amount of the time	2	3134	58.39			1348	25.12			560	10.43			160	2.98			165	3.07			
18	The instructor delivered lectures as per notified time table	2	3314	61.75			1263	23.53			506	9.43			132	2.46			152	2.83			
19	The instructor was easily accessible during the university hours	2	3273	60.98			1252	23.33			527	9.82			144	2.68			171	3.19			
5	The instructor clearly demonstrated knowledge of the subject	3	3238	60.33	9703	60.3%	1240	23.1	3773	23.4%	537	10.01	1588	9.9%	167	3.11	495	3.1%	185	3.45	542	3.4%	16101
12	The instructor maintained conducive class room environment for learning	3	3182	59.29			1301	24.24			540	10.06			166	3.09			178	3.32			
20	The instructor motivated students in subject learning	3	3283	61.17			1232	22.96			511	9.52			162	3.02			179	3.34			
2	The instructor was prepared for each class	4	3356	62.53	16287	60.7%	1204	22.43	6373	23.7%	474	8.83	2527	9.4%	169	3.15	797	3.0%	164	3.06	851	3.2%	26835
6	The instructor followed the lecture plan during the whole semester	4	3242	60.41			1250	23.29			551	10.27			149	2.78			175	3.26			
9	The instructor has completed the whole course within stipulated period	4	3182	59.29			1331	24.8			513	9.56			178	3.32			163	3.04			
15	The instructor conducts quizzes on time and gave assignments on	4	3233	60.24			1290	24.04			533	9.93			151	2.81			160	2.98			

	regular basis																		
24	The assignments and exams covered the materials presented in the course	4	3274	61		1298	24.18		456	8.5		150	2.79		189	3.52			
8	The instructor provided ideas about recent developments in the subject	5	3117	58.08	6287	1308	24.37	2615	563	10.49	1119	201	3.75	363	178	3.32	350	3.3%	10734
10	The instructor explained subject matter with additional examples	5	3170	59.06		1307	24.35		556	10.36		162	3.02		172	3.2			
11	The instructor showed respect toward students and encouraged class participation	6	3246	60.48	12899	1250	23.29	5090	530	9.88	2113	162	3.02	640	179	3.34	726	3.4%	21468
13	The instructor was fair in examination and related assessments	6	3182	59.29		1318	24.56		512	9.54		170	3.17		185	3.45			
16	The instructor did not demonstrate gender bias	6	3215	59.9		1253	23.35		551	10.27		161	3		187	3.48			
17	The instructor had strong moral and professional ethics and groomed student's ethics and moral values	6	3256	60.67		1269	23.64		520	9.69		147	2.74		175	3.26			

Groups

-  Course content and subject Material = 1
-  Teachers' regularity and Punctuality = 2
-  Teaching style = 3
-  Course organization= 4

	Current issues and updated Knowledge of the subject = 5
	Ethical behavior = 6