



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

The Analyses of the Teacher's Activities Facing with Efficiency

Mihaescu, Liviu and Mihaescu, Diana and Andrei, Olivia
and Ilie-Bologa, Lia

“Lucian Blaga” University of Sibiu

21 November 2008

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/45246/>
MPRA Paper No. 45246, posted 20 Mar 2013 12:19 UTC

The Analyses of the Teacher's Activities Facing with Efficiency

LIVIU MIHĂESCU, DIANA MIHĂESCU, OLIVIA ANDREI, LIA ILIE-BOLOGA

Faculty of Economic Studies, DTT

“Lucian Blaga” University of Sibiu

Calea Victoriei nr. 10, cod 550024, Sibiu

ROMANIA

liviu.mihaescu@ulbsibiu.ro, diana.mihaescu@yahoo.com, psihosb@gmail.com,

olivia_andrei2004@yahoo.com

Abstract: The element of education has here a very important role not only regarding the aspect of quality of the act but in integrating the need of quality in the national culture. The individual's conception has to assimilate the conviction that the welfare can not exist without a responsible and quality labor. Starting from this mission, it becomes obvious that the entire university's activity should be oriented towards the institution's competitiveness growth both at a national level and at the international level through: the quality of the offer and the result of the activity, a good management, a financial policy adequate to the rational use of the resources and of drawing new resources, to strengthen the international dimension, to encourage the staff's responsible behavior.

Key-Words: education, evaluation process, quality, efficiency

1. Introduction

To provide the teaching quality, learning and researching in the higher education it is the university's management field which have fast developed in the last two decades in Europe and even in the entire world. Laws and National companies, regional or transnational, techniques, criteria and institutional and systemic standards are promoted and insisted upon and applied with strong strictness.

The quality of the university education [1] became a field of interest in all the countries around the world and for different international organizations, as a result of the strong configuration of the effect of many factors.

2. The Institutional Evaluation Process

The evaluation process of the teaching quality in the higher education it is a global and complex process. It contains different elements, dimensions, factors and criteria which interconnect [2]. The evaluation's efficiency depends decisively of the creation and applying a pattern which take into the consideration all this interconnections, pattern applied at “Lucian Blaga” University of Sibiu.

Therefore, this evaluation pattern for the teachers in “Lucian Blaga” University of Sibiu, everything starts from the idea that “evaluation”

(teaching connected) supposes a process which allow to appreciate how efficient it is the teachers activity focused on accomplishing the study program. The evaluation process pursues, to determine and appreciate the measurement of how much of the educational process results are according with the targeted objectives, the teaching methods and the curricula's content [3]. The immanent teaching process, the evaluation help improving the quality of teaching through: supervising the innovation in educational field, improving the courses, identifying the good parts and the weak parts of teaching, more active student implication in the teaching- learning process, learning about the students difficulties, checking the students expectations regarding the teaching process, supporting the teachers for promoting or fulfilling some vacancies, professional satisfaction, bringing important benefits to the institution.

3. Data and results interpretation

Getting focused on the diagnosis of professional quality of the teacher at the institutional level has been generated by two essential moments. The first was assessed by the *principle of the value* which stood at the base of elaborating the theoretic pattern of evaluation which declares that the evaluation it is a valuable judgment accomplished in terms of

quality. The second moment was dictated by the problem of the standards, because the evaluation of the professor from the higher education system supposes to compare the characteristics detected by the standards/ the established norms, having in view providing the useful information for taking the decisions in the DTT (Department of Teacher Training) from the University [4].

We can use many means and techniques of work when we evaluate the quality of the teacher's activity, and a rigorous evaluation enforce an adequate choice of these means. More than that we can see the fact all the *evaluation elements* like: *the evaluation purposes, the sources of information* (students, mates, director, the involved teacher), *the evaluation object* (the type of activity and its dimension) are interrelated.

Therefore the evaluation pattern of the human resources from the DTT enounces very clear the purposes; recommends the multiple sources of information and usage of different means of evaluation applied differently over the professor's activity.

The analysis of the Department's professors it is made starting with its structure inside the Department (Table no.1), so the didactic activity in the Department it is provided by 13 titular teachers.

Table 1.
The structure on levels from the DTT

<i>No.</i>	<i>Didactic levels</i>	<i>Number</i>
1.	Professor	2
2.	Lecturer (1)	2
3.	Lecturer (2)doctor	3
4.	Lecturer (2) post-graduate	4
5.	Assistant post-graduate	2

One of the main instruments thru which could be obtained information regarding quality of the didactic activity is represented by the *Evaluation questionnaires* for the students.

Despite the variety, the questionnaires addressed to the students are the instruments presented in general as a rating scale, integrating a limited and defined number of multiple choice items. Choosing the answers usually vary between 3-7 points and it represents a perpetual beginning with "total consent" or "very important" till "total disagreement" or "not important". The items correspond with the aspects considered to be

adequate for evaluation. The questionnaires have in general more aspects.

Although often used, the questionnaires addressed to the students are very disputed. The objections discuss more about the lack of form found sometimes in these questionnaires, the limited content, the items' nature which could strengthen a conventional point of view of the teaching activity.

As a response to these objectives we have to say that a unique and universal questionnaire can not respond to all the demands and the specific of the different aspects of the teacher's activity. We need vary instruments for evaluating the diversity of the evaluated fields.

One of the main problems raised by the use of the multidimensional questionnaires in evaluating the academic human resources activities it is referring to the idea that the characteristics regarding the activity efficiency are invariable in their essence. With other words, the "essential" qualities of a good activity are the same, it doesn't matter the course, the department, faculty, major or university [5].

These "essential" qualities could be evaluated independent by the context, ignoring the situation's specific.

The factorial analyses applied to the multidimensional questionnaires prove the some qualities are invariable. Although, the fact that even with the help of the factorial analyses could be reproduced the efficiency factors, regardless of the concrete situations, it doesn't matter that the same thing will happen when it will be used another questionnaire.

The multidimensional evaluation questionnaires are uneven some reported to the others. The items and the dimensions vary from one questionnaire to another with the exception of the general dimensions. Given these differences, we could say that the different obtained results, eventually, by the teachers are due to the differences between the applied questionnaires and not because of the different methods used in teaching.

For avoiding these problems are used identical questionnaires for all the teachers evaluated, the questionnaires which contain specific items in a formative purpose and general items in a summative/ administrative purposes.

The formative questionnaires are applied during the activities development, and the summative/ administrative questionnaires – at their end. Thus are covered bought purposes, by different means.

No doubt, *the successful systems of evaluation addressed to the students* reflects the needs and the specific of the university institutions which implements and uses them. We can not affirm that a strategy of gathering and analyzing information it is better than the other. On the contrary there are few examples which prove that although the evaluation questionnaires addressed to the students are differently built, serving different purposes, the obtained results are valid and useful. This diversity of instruments suggest the idea that for a program's success of evaluation the policies implemented in accordance with the higher education needs and the member's cooperation in applying and collecting the students appreciations are very important.

The evaluation instruments had by students at their disposal form "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu, in order to evaluate the department's teaching staff are: *The evaluation questionnaire of the teacher's activity* and *the evaluation questionnaire of the student's level of satisfaction reported to the professional and personal development provided by the DTT*.

The analysis of the obtained results after applying the questionnaires addressed to the students was made having in view the next factors of efficiency of the course/ seminary, spread on items:

1st Factor – *Preparing and organizing the course/ seminary* contain the main items: 2,3,4,32,37,38,43-52,54-63;

2nd Factor – *The interest/ stimulation of the intellect* have as components the items: 27, 29, 35, 39;

3rd Factor- *Presentation/ communication skills* contain as main items: 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 34;

4th Factor – *The interaction between the teacher and student* contain as main items: 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22;

5th Factor – *Evaluation/ retroaction* contain as main items: 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11;

6th Factor – *The subject knowledge* contain as main items: 23, 24, 25, 26, 31;

7th Factor – *General evaluation* has as components the items: 1, 40, 41;

Explanations: The results were interpreted according to the next 5 qualifications of quality levels [6].

The researches regarding this problem it is not yet a defined theory for determining what part from the field should be very well covered in order that the performances to be considered satisfactory, thus imposing the wanted standard. A standard can be pinpointed in an empirical way, establishing criteria at the medium or maximum level of a given population. But, proceeding to determining the institutional level of the teacher's quality taking into consideration the possibilities which could be offered by a bigger number of examined samples, the intention was to establish an "empiric standard" which could serve as a base for establishing the "wanted standard" and the comparison criteria for the individual evaluations.

The investigation was focused of the usual activities developed in the higher education: course and seminary. *The sample* for evaluating the activities was built from the students from different faculties and majors from LBUS, as well as by evaluation commissions of the TTD's teachers.

For ***evaluating at the institutional level*** the quality of the academic human resources from TTD was applied the *Questionnaire of teacher's evaluation*. The test sample contained **1485 students** from different majors organized by "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu, students which attend the Teacher's training courses. In accordance with the Evaluation regulation of the teachers from "Lucian Blaga" University, the evaluated teachers identity can not be made public. Therefore each evaluated teacher has received a code (CD1....CD11).

On the bases of the results we can make a classification of the teachers. We can observe from data analysis that the best positioned teacher has the score **4,87** – *excellent*, and the one with the last result **4,294** this is a *good* result.

The average of the courses quality is of **4,60 favorable evaluations** (Table 2).

We can say that at an institutional level, the courses/ seminaries quality according to the LBUS's referentials by the category "*Very well*", category which can be considered as "empiric standard", acting as standard for the individual results obtained at this activity.

Table 2
TDD's rating catalog

Grading	Grading score	No. of teaching staff
Unsatisfying	1-1,99	0
Satisfying	2-2,99	0
Good	3-3,99	0
Very good	4-5	11
TOTAL		11

Comparing the results obtained by teachings staff evaluated we can observe that the differences are very small (Table 3)

Table 3
Rating catalogue of the results

Ranking TS	Ranked teacher	Teacher's average	Position in reference to the highest score	Position in reference to the lowest score	Position in reference to the standard score
1	TS 7	4,871	0	0,577	0,271
2	TS 11	4,854	0,017	0,560	0,254
3	TS 6	4,847	0,024	0,553	0,247
4	TS 10	4,819	0,052	0,525	0,219
5	TS 5	4,720	0,151	0,426	0,120
6	TS 4	4,673	0,198	0,379	0,073
7	TS 1	4,452	0,419	0,158	-0,148
8	TS 9	4,416	0,455	0,122	-0,184
9	TS 2	4,326	0,545	0,032	-0,274
10	TS 8	4,312	0,559	0,018	-0,288
11	TS 3	4,294	0,577	0	-0,306

The average which it is considered here to be the **standard value** it is **4,60**. The *deviation from the quadratic average* it is very small, what demonstrates that the TTD's staff are relatively *homogeneous* form the evaluation's point of view. The *dispersal* for the data pattern is **0,23**, what shows a very small impartition of the used data, and the *coefficient of variation* it is of 5%.

The *amplitude* show also a very small value of **0,577** compared with the evaluation scald, which has values between 1 to 5, therefore the amplitude is of 11% out of the scald's value.

Thanks to the homogenous individual data,

having in view the *deviation from the standard value*, are reduced, evenly distributed in the interval **[- 0,306; 0,271]**.

Actually, the individual results interpretation, helps shaping the final conclusion which shows that very little ranking differences given by students, globally to each TTD's teachers.

After processing the results having in view the factors and the established pointers in evaluating the classes by the students, we can enunciate the following at the level of the pursued factors.

The high ranking was recorded for the items:

- the course's objectives were clearly defined;
- the course's content was rigorously structured;
- the important notions were sufficiently explained;
- the teacher used a clear and concise language;
- stimulates the student's interest for the subject;
- teaches with professionalism;
- provides interesting and attractive explanations.

These results show that the students appreciate the level of structure and clarity of the courses and seminaries. The students appreciate oral expression and the teacher's skills to communicate with them.

The low ranking was registered for the items:

- the evaluation criteria were clearly explained;
- the teaching support was variant;
- the teacher was impartial to the evaluation;
- the teacher used efficiently the time during the class.

According to the results, the data concerning the teaching support could be reported at objective causes (the limited financial resources- important obstacle in providing a pertinent teaching support), then the data regarding the evaluation made by the students could be reported both for the objective one as well as for the subjective. A certain fact is that the "Evaluation" factor reflects the contradictory aspect of the academic teacher's activity and need improvement.

The student's observations and suggestions are a supplementary source of information which reflects the students' content or discontent in terms of the evaluated activity. According to the results

the students have the tendency to focus their comments upon the teacher's characteristics and the studied subject. They pay less attention to the organizational proposal, structure and improving the activity manifesting the presence of the critical skills and the absence of the designer skills.

Comparing the relatively arid statistical results, the analysis of the students' comments reflect directly the positive/ negative moments and provide useful information for improving the didactic activity.

Are encountered *observations* which show the students' hope regarding the improvement of the academic staff's activity: "I would like that this evaluation to have a positive reflection over the teachers' teaching techniques and the change to be acknowledgeable", "I hope that after applying this questioner the quality of teaching will improve in the university. Not to be a waste of time."

There are students which mentioned diverse problems about the evaluation and teaching techniques in general: "Teachers should be lenient regarding the ranking", "To diversify the teaching methods", "The teaching activity to be more creative" etc.

4. Conclusions

The analyses of the quantitative and qualitative results allowed that the **students representation regarding the academic staff's evaluation** to be generalized. Therefore, the students say that the evaluation it is an important activity and they could help for improving the didactic activities.

The students having this quality of evaluators assign to themselves an important role in the evaluation process of the teaching staff. Some of them question the use of this process having the sensation that the teaching staff and one that are taking the decisions do not take into consideration.

Why do students consider the evaluation useless? We could have many answers to this question, because they probably do not see the essential changes as a result of the evaluation. In their opinion nothing changes, especially the teachers with a low evaluation. Second because the students do not know how the results of this evaluation will be used, who has access to these results, if the teacher has access to the evaluation made by students, the consequences of the evaluation, the changes made by the teachers.

The teachers' quality it is essential because they accomplish the complex process of students' training. Therefore it is compulsory that the teachers' evaluation to have an open character, honest and formative and to be able to assure the efficiency of the training process.

It is unanimously admitted the importance of education in general and the higher education especially, in the present and the future's state of a nation. The education it is an act of conscious, of its quality depending not only the future nation's welfare, and in the same time, the power, the influence and even the existence of it as distinguished entity in the regional and worldwide configuration.

References:

- [1] Arcaro, J. S., - *Quality in Education – and implementation, Handbook*, St. Lucie Press, Delray Beach, Florida, 1995;
- [2] Atanasiu G. M., *Managementul internațional și asigurarea calității în învățământul superior*, Editura Economică, București, 2000;
- [3] Miclea M., Oprea D. *Evaluarea academică*. Cluj-Napoca, 2002;
- [4] Diana Mihăescu, Liviu Mihăescu, *Utilizarea econometriei în modelarea deciziei manageriale*, în Conferința Națională de Psihologie Cluj Napoca, Ed. ASCR, Cluj Napoca, 2006;
- [5] Diana Mihăescu, Olivia Andrei, Lia Ilie-Bologa, *Studiu privind evaluarea activității din învățământ pe baza aplicării modelului multidimensional*, în Conferința Națională de Psihologie Cluj Napoca, Ed. ASCR, Cluj Napoca, 2006
- [6] For the scales 5-1 points:
5,00–4,75 points (100%-95% favorable evaluations) – *excellent*
4,74–4,00 points (95%-80% favorable evaluations) – *very good*
3,99–3,25 points (80%-65% favorable evaluations) – *good*
3,24–2,50 points (65% -50% favorable evaluations) – *sufficient*
2,49–1,25 points (50%-25% favorable evaluations)- *insufficient*