# OVERCOMING STUDENTS' LETHARGY IN EVALUATING LECTURERS' TEACHING COMPETENCE: COVENANT UNIVERSITY EXPERIENCE

**A. Odukoya, A. Atayero, A. Williams, A. Afolabi, P. Akande**

*Covenant University (NIGERIA)*

## Abstract

The indispensable role of regular evaluation in experiencing continuous growth and development is an established fact. Considering the pivotal role of students in any education system, it is imperative that they are involved in Lecturers' evaluation exercise. Ironically, many students hardly take this exercise seriously. Consequently the core objective for this study was to find effective and empirical ways of helping students overcome the lethargy in evaluating Lecturers' competence, such that a more reliable and valid feedback can be obtained that would be useful in improving Lecturers' competence. Series of interviews were conducted to decipher the reason for this lethargy. A quick expert review of the previous Covenant University Lecturers' evaluation form, for content validity was made. Guided by current findings on the rudiments of effective teaching and learning, the draft of a new evaluation form, tagged Lecturer's Teaching Competence Evaluation Form – Student's Version [LTCEF-SV], was developed. Based on current findings on indicators of effective Lecturers, the LTCEF-SV was partitioned into 11 sections, namely: Subject Mastery; Human Relations; Communicative Skill; Pedagogical Skill; Class Control/Students' Management; Time Management/Absenteeism; Learning Materials; Testing and Evaluation Skill; Record Keeping & Organizational Skill; Originality, Creativity and Innovation; and ICT and Technology Usage. At the end of the instrument, the respondents were requested to summarize their perception of the Lecturer's competence and comment on any other issue not addressed in the form. Each section is comprised of two to eight prompts. Adopting a participatory research approach, a special review team comprising of students from 100, 200, 300 and 400 levels, female and male lecturers, and representatives of university management edited the draft copy of the LTCEF-SV for face validity. The outcome of this exercise was further subjected to critical review by a certified Psychometrician, thus establishing its content validity. The reviewed LTCEF-SV was then programmed and posted on the school website for test-run with representatives from all departments in the university. The feedback from this test run further served to improve the quality of the LTCEF-SV. Campus-wide sensitization forum was also held before the entire student body responded to the LTCEF-SV. The final validation strategy applied was triangulation. This involved Managements' covert and overt observations of Lecturers in situ. This conglomeration of evaluation approaches furnished deeper insights into respective Lecturer's overall competence and served as more reliable information for feedback and remediation. Plans are also underway to give students appropriate feedback. The overall result showed that the primary objective for this project was achieved. From comparison of students' responses to the previous and current evaluation form, it was quite apparent that the lassie-faire attitude of Covenant University students towards evaluating Lecturers' competence has, to a large extent, been overcome.

Keywords: Lecturer's competence, Student's evaluation, Lethargy, Triangulation, Validity, Reliability.

## 1 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

It is virtually undisputable that education is an instrument par excellence for achieving individual and national development. However, to achieve this feat, the educational delivery system must be handled rightly. It can however be argued that the quality of Lecturers largely determine the quality of students, all things being equal. Even when virtually all other elements within the learning system fail, an astute Lecturer propelled by intrinsic motivation can perform wonders with students. This is why it is very important to have the right calibre of Lecturers in a learning system. Even with the right calibre of Lecturers, it is still necessary to regularly evaluate Lecturers for competent delivery and offering appropriate feedback cum recommendations for improvement. This exercise has the tendency of propelling Lecturers, and eventually their students, to experience continuous growth and development.

It can be posited that *what is not inspected should hardly be expected*. The way Students and Teachers focus on topics constantly examined over the years is partly a proof of the assertion.

Worldwide, the indispensable role of regular evaluation in enhancing quality and in experiencing continuous growth and development has been established (Cullen, Joyce,Hassall, & Broadbent,(2003; Harrison, Douglas, & Bursdal, 2004; Gibbs,1995; Dorasamy and Balkaran, 2013). Considering the pivotal role of students in any education system, it is imperative they are involved in Lecturers' evaluation exercise. Ironically, many students hardly take this exercise seriously. Even when students take the exercise seriously, Teachers hardly accept the outcome of students' evaluation. Their bone of contention is that students are unqualified to provide a valid evaluation of lecturers' competence (Nasser and Hagtvet, 2006; Machingambi, Severino and Newman, 2011; McKeachie, 1997; and Orpen, 1980-2). Despite the perceived significance of Students' evaluation of their Lecturers, the reliability and validity of their evaluation have been an object of concern (Penny, 2003; McKeachie, 1990; Beran & Rokosh, 2009). The ***problem*** is that some Lecturers abhor the idea of being evaluated, especially by students. Conversely, students are bored with the idea of evaluating Lecturers, convinced that the results of such evaluation are hardly utilised by Management. However, findings from the *Waikato University study* indicate that some Lecturers were positive about students' capacity to evaluate teaching and majority of interviewees made use of students' feedback to varying degrees to modify practice (Spiller, 2010).

Learning is hardly complete without monitoring, evaluation and feedback. After setting the learning objectives, it is imperative that the School Administrators closely monitor all the elements within the learning context for optimal performance and timely achievement of the set goals. For instance, Teachers and Learners should be regularly evaluated with regular feedbacks given for remediation purpose. Continuous assessment should be more valued than summative assessment. The former warns and allows for correction while the latter give the final verdict of years of learning efforts. If rightly handled, continuous evaluation of all the elements within the learning context would save a lot of financial and material wastage while helping to cheaply deliver the learning success desired (Odukoya, 2013).

Odukoya (2013) further reiterated that the cornerstone of a Lecturer's competence is not only in subject mastery, but more in teaching methods. Some Lecturers certified for subject mastery are hardly effective when it comes to communicating their knowledge to students. This is largely a problem of pedagogy. The teaching method largely determines the learning process. The method of communicating the information [stimuli] to the mind [i.e. nervous system] of students determines the degree of learning that will take place. Merely ***talking,*** as most Teachers prefer to do, barely achieves the learning goal. According to Dale (1969), the talking method delivers about the lowest level of learning. If extra effort is made to add pictures or video, the degree of learning achieved is reported to move to 30% and 50% respectively. Interestingly, these teaching and learning methods are still under passive domain. The students are hardly *actively* involved. This explains the low level of learning often achieved with these methods of teaching. As learning becomes more student centred, with students becoming more actively involved in the learning process, via group discussion, tutorial, dramatization, simulation and real practical works, the degree of learning attained tends to increase to as much as 90% (Dale, 1969). This submission in turn corroborates a popular Chinese proverb that says: '*Tell me I forget; Show me and I may remember; Involve me and I will understand*'. The new Covenant University *Lecturers' Teaching Competence Evaluation Form- Students' Version* [LTCEF-SV] incorporates these vital learning principles.

The growth in the number of higher education institutions has necessitated a focus on the provision of quality programs within a highly competitive environment. In response, many higher education institutions have come to rely increasingly on student ratings of teaching. Even though such an evaluation instrument is criticized by many academics, it is unlikely that the use of student ratings will be abandoned, as it is seen as a key indicator in quality monitoring (Penny, 2003; Wongssurawat, 2011; Hau, 1996). Penny's submission here succinctly captures the ***significance of this study***. Organizations and institutions that refuse to listen to their customers are apt to go into extinction soon. The secret of Toyota motor's consistent leadership in the automobile industry can be traced to their culture of not only listening to their customers, but making virtually 100% utilization of feedbacks obtained thereof. In the academia, students are the primary customers. It is imperative that regular and reliable feedbacks are obtained from them, among other sources of feedbacks, and acted upon, to experience continuous growth and development in our institutions. Consequently one of the core ***objectives of this study*** is to find effective but empirical ways of helping students overcome the lethargy in evaluating Lecturers' competence, such that a more reliable and valid feedback can be obtained that would be useful in improving Lecturers' competence.

Covenant University (CU) is a growing and dynamic vision-birthed, vision driven university founded on a Christian mission ethos and committed to pioneering excellence in the academia. CU is driven by the compelling vision of *raising a new generation of leaders for the African Continent* on the platform of a holistic, human development and integrated learning curriculum with the objective of raising *total* men/women who will develop their world. CU is located at kilometre 10 along Idi-iroko way in Ota, Ogun state, Nigeria. Presently, CU operates the collegiate system. There are two colleges – the College of Development Studies (CDS) and the College of Science and Technology (CST). The CDS is made of the School of Social Sciences (SSS), School of Business Studies (SBS) and School of Human Resources Development (SHRD). The CST is made up of School of Engineering, School of Environmental Studies (SES), and School and Natural and Applied Sciences (SNAS).

## 1.1 Research Questions

This study sought to find answers to the following research questions:

1. Why are students often not excited with the idea of evaluating their lecturers?
2. In what ways can students be helped to overcome the lethargy of evaluating Lecturers' teaching competence?
3. In what ways can the psychometric properties (reliability and validity) of LTCEF-SV be enhanced?
4. In which cluster of teaching competence indicators were Lecturers consistently rated high (or Low) by Students?
5. What category of Lecturers (by course and gender) were rated high (or low) by students?
6. What are the findings from the Triangulation effort?

# 2 METHODOLOGY

The survey research design was used in this study. The population of study were university students in Nigeria – which is over 2 million. The sample for this study is the **7083** registered students of Covenant University for the 2013/2014 Session. This is a purposive sample. The summary distribution of the sample is presented below:

| | **COVENANT UNIVERSITY, OTA, NIGERIA** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **SUMMARY OF REGISTERED STUDENTS FOR 2013/2014 SESSION** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **100 LEVEL** | | | **200 LEVEL** | | | **300 LEVEL** | | | **400 LEVEL** | | | **500 LEVEL** | | | **College Total** |
| | **F** | **M** | **Tot** | **F** | **M** | **Tot** | **F** | **M** | **Tot** | **F** | **M** | **Tot** | **F** | **M** | **Tot** | |
| **School of Business Studies** | 169 | 109 | 278 | 183 | 100 | 283 | 167 | 123 | 290 | 155 | 122 | 277 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1128 |
| **School of Human Resources Developt** | 123 | 50 | 173 | 117 | 38 | 155 | 95 | 23 | 118 | 118 | 43 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 607 |
| **School of Social Science** | 153 | 87 | 240 | 177 | 90 | 267 | 140 | 64 | 204 | 112 | 60 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 883 |
| **College of Development Studies (CDS)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2618 |
| **Sch. of Engineering** | 121 | 432 | 553 | 108 | 387 | 495 | 136 | 423 | 559 | 97 | 304 | 401 | 129 | 416 | 545 | 2553 |
| **Sch. of Environmt. Studies** | 49 | 89 | 138 | 41 | 92 | 133 | 50 | 101 | 151 | 49 | 103 | 152 | 34 | 49 | 83 | 657 |
| **Sch. of Natural & Applied Sciences** | 125 | 191 | 316 | 122 | 160 | 282 | 139 | 175 | 314 | 157 | 186 | 343 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1255 |
| **College of Science and Technology (CST)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4465 |
| **GRAND TOTAL** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **7083** |

**Source**: *Covenant University Data Centre*

The instruments used in this study were: Interview Guideline, the LTCEF-SV, and Observation Guideline. To decipher the reason for apparent Students' lethargy towards evaluation of Lecturers' teaching competence, CU students were randomly interviewed. An expert's review of the previous Lecturer's Evaluation Form, for content validity, was made. A new evaluation form, tagged ***Lecturer's Teaching Competence Evaluation Form – Student's Version*** (LTCEF-SV), was developed, based on current findings on the rudiments of effective teaching and learning (e.g. Odukoya, 2013),. The LTCEF-SV is partitioned into 11 sections, namely: *Subject Mastery; Human Relations; Communicative Skill; Pedagogical Skill; Class Control/Students' Management; Time Management/Absenteeism; Learning Materials; Testing and Evaluation Skill; Record Keeping& Organisational Skill; Originality, Creativity and Innovation;* and *ICT and Technology Usage*. The instrument is concluded with and open ended question requesting respondents to summarise their perception of the Lecturer's teaching competence and comment on any other issue not addressed in the form. Each section is comprised of two to eight prompts.

The ***face validit***y of the LTCEF-SV was ascertained via participatory research approach involving a special review team comprised of students from 100, 200, 300 and 400 levels, female and male lecturers, and representatives of university management; while Psychometric experts ascertained its ***content validity.*** The reviewed version was then programmed and posted on the school website for test-run. Further review was made from feedbacks obtained from the test-run.

In order to enhance the validity of the LTCEF-SV, few contradictory statements [i.e. positive statements re-stated as negative statements] were injected into the instrument. Consequently, students who nonchalantly completed the forms had their forms rejected at submission time. This experience compelled such students to change their negative attitude. This strategy, therefore, further served to enhance the psychometric property of the LTCEF-SV.

Finally, *triangulation* technique was applied to further enhance the validity of the LTCEF-SV. This involved Managements' *covert and overt observations of Lecturers in situ*. The multiple evaluation approaches furnished deeper insights into respective Lecturer's overall teaching competence and served as more reliable information for feedback and remediation. The reliability and validity of the observation instrument used for triangulation purpose in this study were ascertained by making observations of a Lecturer more than once and by more than one Management staff. Plans are also underway to make observations in situ lectures with CCTV, which will also be recorded.

Before opening the LTCEF-SV for campus-wide usage, sensitization seminar was conducted to enlighten students on the significance of the evaluation exercise. The post-pilot study version of the LTCEF-SV was eventually posted on the university website. In addition, the LTCEF-SV was programmed such that once a student successfully completes evaluating all his/her Lecturers, a print-out featuring courses evaluated was enabled. This print-out became a statutory requirement for entry into the semester examination hall. This way, all students were mandated to complete the LTCEF-SV. Consequently, all the registered 7083 registered students of Covenant University completed the LTCEF-SV.

The programmed coding of the LTCEF-SV also facilitated data capturing. The University Data Centre aptly captured all responses and converted the data into excel templates. This way, data analysis was made easy. The data was analysed with simple descriptive statistics. This includes: frequency count, mean, percentages and bar charts. The qualitative analytical method was also used in this study. Answers to a number of the research questions were obtained this way.

## 3 RESULTS, FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The volume of data/results obtained via this exercise was quite large. It could hardly be fully reported in an article of this nature. Consequently, in this report, sampled result outputs, especially under the charts, were featured.

***RQ1: Why are Students often not Excited with The Idea of Evaluating their Lecturers?***

*Random interview of students* on this issue was conducted to understand the basis of their apathy towards Lecturers' evaluation. Listed below are some of the findings:

1. Virtually all the students interviewed agreed they have been responding frivolously to *the LEF*. Asked why they did that?
2. Some students felt the information supplied in the evaluation form was hardly being utilised, hence they see it as a waste of time filling it.

3. Some were perturbed by the closeness of the exercise to examination; they feel there is no luxury of time to start filling a questionnaire, hence the tendency to hurriedly fill the forms without paying attention to details. It was therefore suggested that if the form is completed not too close to the exam period, it is possible to get better feedback.
4. The occasional poor internet connectivity, which causes slow uploading of form tend to further discourage students from doing a good job of completing the form.
5. Some felt there is nothing at stake in filling or not filling the form correctly, hence the apathy.
6. Some felt the information supplied could be traced back to them, thus incurring the wrath of the Lecturers.

The cogent feedbacks obtained from the students served as powerful guide in the development and administration of the new LTCEF-SV. The usefulness of the exercise also suggested the need for Management to regularly seek feedback from staff, students and parents.

***RQ2: In What Ways can Students be Helped to Overcome the Lethargy of Evaluating Lecturers' Teaching Competence?***

From the experience of this study, the following strategies were found effective in ameliorating students' lethargy towards evaluating Lecturers' competence:

- Use of Participatory Research Approach (PRA), in which students and lecturers were actively involved in the development of the evaluation instrument from the onset, as against a top-down traditional approach proved very effective in breaking students' cold-shoulder attitude.
- Regular review of the evaluation instrument (in this case the LTCEF-SV) is necessary, still using the PRA.
- Regular sensitization seminars should be held with students to make realise and appreciate the significance of the evaluation exercise.
- The evaluation exercise should not be too close to the examination.
- All information supplied by students should be treated with uttermost confidentiality. Nothing should be personalized. There should be no avenue for Lecturers to trace information back to the respondents. Students should be made to see the transparency of this process.
- Management should make visible use of the students' evaluation results, as long as the evaluation instruments are duly validated. As much as possible, students should be made aware of such usage. Students should be given feedback on the outcome of the evaluation exercise.
- The evaluation instrument should be programmed such that students can only access examination admission slip after duly completing the instrument.
- The internet connectivity should be improved to allow for quick download and submission of completed evaluation forms online.
- Students who offered logical and useful suggestions, especially in the open ended sections, should be rewarded.
- The positive outcomes, in terms of Faculty and Students' development as a result of the utilization of the students' evaluation exercise should be regularly publicised. This is apt to motivate everyone to more actively participate in future evaluation exercises.

***RQ3: In What Ways can the Psychometric Properties [Reliability and Validity] of LTCEF-SV be Enhanced***?

From the experience of this study, the following methods were found effective:

- The instrument developers should regularly update knowledge of the proven world acclaimed ***indicators of teaching competence*** and generate prompts around such themes.
- The instrument developers should adopt the PRA as part of the process of developing the LTCEF-SV. The PRA Participants should be responsible for ascertaining the ***face validity*** of the evaluation instrument.
- The input of a certified Psychometrician should be encouraged. Such should be responsible for ascertaining the ***content validity*** of the instrument.

- The adoption of ***Triangulation*** technique is imperative to enhancing the psychometric properties of the students' evaluation instrument. Other reliable and valid evaluation modes should be used in combination with the students' evaluation to derive a more valid assessment of Lecturers' competence.
- Data analysis should not be limited to quantitative analysis. Extensive use of ***qualitative analysis*** methods should be incorporated.
- The adoption of the various strategies for helping students overcome their lethargy towards completing the LTCEF-SV will go a long way at enhancing the reliability and validity of the instrument.

| Lecturer Code | Lecturer Gender | 1st Highest Trait | Stud. Rating | 2nd Highest Trait | Stud. Rating | 1st Lowest Trait | Stud. Rating | 2nd Lowest Trait | Stud. Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ARC 2 | F | Human relations | 83 | Subject Mastery | 82 | Teaching Method | 73 | Class control | 73 |
| BCH 2 | F | Class control | 83 | Time management | 82 | Teaching Method | 68 | Creativity & innovation | 76 |
| BFN 2 | F | Subject Mastery | 84 | Human relations | 82 | Teaching Method | 72 | Communicati on skills | 75 |
| ACC 2 | F | Subject Mastery | 81 | Class control | 81 | Teaching Method | 63 | ICT & tech usage | 68 |
| ARC 1 | M | Subject Mastery | 85 | Human relations | 80 | ICT & tech usage | 48 | Teaching Method | 63 |
| BCH 1 | M | Human relations | 82 | Class control | 78 | Teaching Method | 63 | Creativity & innovation | 67 |
| BLY 1 | M | Class control | 83 | Subject Mastery | 78 | Human relations | 50 | Teaching Method | 56 |
| ACC 1 | M | Subject Mastery | 80 | Class control | 77 | Teaching Method | 61 | Learning material | 67 |
| BLY 2 | F | Class control | 76 | Record keeping/organizat ion | 76 | Teaching Method | 67 | ICT & tech usage | 69 |
| CHM 1 | M | Subject Mastery | 77 | Human relations | 76 | Learning materials | 62 | Teaching Method | 64 |
| BFN 1 | M | Subject Mastery | 76 | Class control | 73 | Teaching Method | 59 | Creativity & innovation | 68 |
| PHY 1 | M | ICT & tech usage | 70 | Subject Mastery | 69 | Teaching Method | 61 | Class control | 65 |
| CHM 2 | F | Time management | 69 | Record keeping/organizat ion | 68 | ICT & tech usage | 53 | Teaching Method | 57 |
| MAT 2 | F | Human relations | 69 | Subject Mastery | 68 | Teaching method | 56 | Class control | 61 |
| MAT 1 | M | Record keeping/organization | 68 | Human relations | 67 | Teaching Method | 55 | Creativity & innovation | 59 |

***RQ4: In which Cluster of Competence Indicators were Lecturers Consistently Rated High (or Low) by Students?***

Taking 50% as cut off point for low or poor performance, no Lecturer was rated low or poor in the entire university [see 2nd table below]. The lowest overall rating was 58%. The data here is fairly representative of the two main Colleges in the University. Out of the thirty [30] slots for 1st and 2nd highest rated competence traits featured here, the frequency of occurrence of ***Subject Mastery*** was highest [10 or 33%]; while ***Teaching Method*** recorded the lowest rating by students [15 or 50%]. The summary of Lecturers' competence traits that received the highest and lowest ratings is presented below:

| Competence Indicators with Highest Ratings | | Competence Indicators with Lowest Ratings | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Indictors** | **Students' Ratings** | **Indictors** | **Students' Ratings** |
| Subject Mastery | 10 [33%] | Teaching Method | 15 [50%] |
| Human Relations | 7 [23%] | Creativity & Innovation | 4 [13.3%] |
| Class Control | 7 [23%] | ICT Usage | 4 [13.3%] |
| Record Keeping/Organization | 3 [10%] | Class Control | 3 [10%] |
| Time Management | 2 [6.7%] | Learning Material | 2 [6.7%] |
| ICT usage | 1 [3.3%] | Human Relations | 1 [3.3%] |
| | | Communication Skill | 1 [3.3%] |

The implication of this finding is that, though a remarkable proportion of students perceived their Lecturers as exhibiting Subject Mastery, a far higher proportion reported that Lecturers were not using effective teaching methods. This finding is in agreement with current submissions in scientific reports that University Lecturers are low in pedagogical skills (Morales, 2011). Apparently this was what informed the decision of higher institutions like University of Lagos, Nigeria in making acquisition of a minimum of Post Graduate Diploma in Education [PDGE] compulsory for all her Lecturers who lacked professional teaching exposure.

***RQ5: What Category of Lecturers [by Course and Gender] were Rated High (or Low) by Students?***

| COURSES/DEPT | Lecturer's GENDER | STUDENTS' RATING | COURSES/DEPT | Lecturer's GENDER | STUDENTS' RATING |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ARCHITECTURE | M | 91 | MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM | M | 74 |
| BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION | M | 91 | MECHANICAL ENGINEERING | | 74 |
| ARCHITECTURE | M | 83 | BANKING AND FINANCE | F | 73 |
| BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION | M | 82 | COMPUTER SCIENCE | F | 73 |
| ARCHITECTURE | M | 81 | MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM | M | 73 |
| COMPUTER SCIENCE | M | 81 | COMPUTER SCIENCE | F | 73 |
| ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING | M | 81 | CIVIL ENGINEERING | M | 73 |
| ESTATE MANAGEMENT | M | 81 | CIVIL ENGINEERING | M | 73 |
| BIOLOGY | M | 81 | POLICY AND STRATEGIC STUDIES | M | 73 |
| ARCHITECTURE | M | 80 | BUILDING TECHNOLOGY | M | 72 |
| MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM | M | 80 | BIOCHEMISTRY | F | 72 |
| ARCHITECTURE | F | 79 | BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION | M | 72 |
| ARCHITECTURE | M | 79 | ECONOMICS | M | 72 |
| BANKING AND FINANCE | F | 79 | INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY | M | 72 |
| COMPUTER SCIENCE | | 79 | MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM | M | 72 |
| ARCHITECTURE | M | 78 | COMPUTER SCIENCE | M | 72 |
| BIOCHEMISTRY | F | 78 | ECONOMICS | F | 72 |
| INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY | M | 78 | ECONOMICS | M | 72 |
| BIOLOGY | M | 77 | ECONOMICS | M | 72 |
| BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION | M | 77 | ECONOMICS | M | 72 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY | M | 77 | ECONOMICS | M | 72 |
| COMPUTER SCIENCE | F | 77 | ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING | M | 72 |
| ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING | M | 77 | ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING | F | 72 |
| MICROBIOLOGY | M | 77 | MARKETING | F | 72 |
| ACCOUNTING | F | 76 | POLITICAL SCIENCE | M | 72 |
| MARKETING | F | 76 | MARKETING | M | 71 |
| BIOCHEMISTRY | | 75 | BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION | F | 71 |
| BUILDING TECHNOLOGY | M | 75 | MATHEMATICS | M | 71 |
| LAW | F | 75 | APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY | M | 71 |
| MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM | M | 75 | FRENCH | M | 71 |
| COMPUTER SCIENCE | F | 75 | ARCHITECTURE | M | 70 |

To answer this research question, the 20 Lecturers rated highest (as indicated by the green highlight) were used. As mentioned earlier, no Lecturer was rated below 58% on the overall. This implies that students generally perceived Lecturers as competent. The range of obtainable raw scores that were converted to percentage was 0 to 159, with maximum score of '3' and minimum of '0' per item. There were 53 items in all. Out of the 20 highest rated Lecturers in the University, 7 [or 35%] were from Architecture department, followed by Business Administration department with 3 Lecturers [or 15%]. The possible explanation for this finding is that Architecture is a highly practical course with virtually all the practical tools needed readily available. It is one of the rare courses that can be taught by DOING THE REAL THING – the best active/student-centred teaching method that delivers the highest degree of learning (Dale, 1969). The summary of courses/departments featured in the list of top 20 Lecturers rated highest by students is presented below:

| Course/Department | Number of Lecturers in the Top 20 Ranking |
|---|---|
| Architecture | 7 [35%] |
| Business Administration | 3 [15%] |
| Biology | 2 [10%] |
| Computer Science | 2 [10%] |
| Electrical & Electronics Engineering | 1 [5%] |
| Estate Management | 1 [5%] |
| Biochemistry | 1 [5%] |
| Management & Info Science | 1 [5%] |
| Banking & Finance | 1 [5%] |
| Information & Communication. Engrg. | 1 [5%] |

Out of the 20 highly rated Lecturers, three [3] were female Lecturers while seventeen [17] were male. Current statistics showed that there are more Male Lecturers in Covenant University. This could be attributable to fact that more male lecturers scaled the University employment screening exercise over the years, hence more males were employed. It could also imply that more males than females applied for employment in Covenant University over the years. The interpretative bottom-line here is that care must be taken in concluding, at this point, that male Lecturers were adjudged better than female Lecturers. This may require further studies.

***RQ6: What are the Findings from the Triangulation Effort***?

The Triangulation involved Managements' covert and overt observations of Lecturers in situ, using the LTCEF-SV items as guideline. This conglomeration of evaluation approaches furnished deeper insights into respective Lecturer's overall competence and served as more reliable information for feedback and remediation. Below is an extract of some of the findings from the Triangulation effort:

- **'XXX 213'** – It was a fairly large class. Majority of the students could hardly hear the Lecturer. There was no Public Address System [PAS]. Consequently some of the students were sleeping while some were busy doing other things [with laptops, ipads, writing other notes etc]. The Lecturer used laptop without a projector. .
- **'CCC 111'** – Virtually the same experience as in 'XXX 213' was recorded. This was even a larger class. It was a sheer waste of time and effort, with about 4 lecturers on ground for 'revision'.
- **'YYY 413'** – This was a different experience altogether. The class was of smaller size hence PAS was not needed. The Lecturer however used laptop and projector. The class was livelier. It was apparent a greater measure of communication.

The ironical thing is that many of the students who evaluated these Lecturers reported they used multi-media and projector, among others. A Lecturer merely using a laptop that was facing him or her alone to teach is as good as not using a multimedia. Any multimedia that does not enhance communication and students' learning should hardly be scored positively. Students hardly report they or their fellow students were reprimanded for sleeping or using distractive items like ipad, laptop, doing other things (etc) during lectures. Yet these events were observed in situ. This suggests that some of the LTCEF-SV respondents [i.e. students] were sentimental and not completely truthful in their evaluation, Some students tend to use the opportunity to get back at a Lecturer they are not too pleased with. This should be expected in an opinion poll of this nature. These observations tend to confirm the need for triangulation as a strategy for enhancing the reliability and validity of students' evaluation instruments. If we must use students' evaluation as part of the tools for judging Lecturers competence, then effort must be made to checkmate these negative students' caprices.

## 4 RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

It is imperative students are involved in the evaluation of Lecturers teaching competence because they are the primary customers in the learning business. This point has been reiterated by several researchers such as Price, Handley, Millar, & O`Donovan (2010). For any business to thrive, it is vital the business owners/managers regularly listen to their customers. Feedback from students should go beyond evaluating Lecturers' teaching competence. They should also be allowed to frankly express their views on other elements and events in the learning system. It is by constantly listening to them and making necessary adjustments that the staff, students and indeed the entire learning system will grow and develop. This is the super key to being number one in a business sector. World-class business conglomerates like Toyota, Honda, Samsung, General Electric (etc) have proven this principle many times over. All that is required, as done in this study, is to apply *pragmatic triangulation techniques* that will enhance the psychometric properties of the students' evaluation instruments. For the LTCEF-SV, this is just a test-run; better triangulation techniques are being developed to further enhance its validity.

## REFERENCES


[1] Beran, T.N., and Rokosh, J.L. (2009) 'Instructors' perspectives on the utility of student ratings of instruction', *Instructional Science,* 37(2), 171-184.

[2] Cullen, J., Joyce, J., Hassall, T. & Broadbent, M. (2003). Quality in higher education monitoring. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 11(1), 5 – 14.

[3] Dale, Edgar (1969). *Audiovisual methods in teaching*, third edition. New York: The Dryden Press; Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

[4] Dorasamy, N and Balkaran, R (2013). Role of Student Ratings of Lecturers in Enhancing teaching at Higher Education Institutions: A case study of the Durban University of Technology. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies,* 5 (5), 268-281.

[5] Gibbs, G. (1995), 'The Relationship between Quality in Research and Quality in Teaching', *Quality in Higher Education*, Vol. 1, No. 2.

[6] Harrison, P. D., Douglas, D. K. & Bursdal, C. A. (2004). The relative merits of different types of overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(3), 311-323.

[7] Hau, H. (1996), 'Teaching Quality Improvement by Quality Improvement in Teaching'*, Quality Engineering*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 77-94.

[8] McKeachie W. (1997) 'Student ratings: The validity of use', *American Psychologist*, 52(11), pp 1218-1225.

[9] Machingambi, Severino and Newman, Sisulu (2011). 'University Lecturers' Perceptions of Students Evaluation of Their Instructional Practices' in *Anthropologist*, 13(3): 167-174.

[10] Morale, S. (2011). Pedagogical practices at General Studies at the UNALM. UNALM:*Research report.*

[11] Nasser, F. & Hagtvet, K. H. (2006). Multi level analysis of effects of students and instructors/course characteristics on student's ratings. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(5), 569 – 589.

[12] Odukoya, Dayo (2013). 'The Learning Process' in "*Psychology of Learning*" [Book of Reading]. Ota: Covenant University [In Press].

[13] Orpen, Christopher (1980)-1.'The susceptibility of student evaluation of lecturers to situational variables' in *Higher Education* May 1980, Volume 9, Issue 3, pp 293-306.

[14] Orpen, Christopher (1980)-2. 'Student Evaluation of Lecturers as an Indicator of Instructional Quality: A Validity Study' in *The Journal of Educational Research* Vol. 74, No. 1 (Sep-Oct., 1980), pp. 5-7. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27539788.

[15] Penny, A. R. (2003). Changing the agenda for research into students' views about university teaching: Four shortcomings of SRT research. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8(3), 399 – 411.

[16] Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., & O`Donovan, B. (2010). Feedback: all that effort, but what is the effect? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35* (3), 277–289.

[17] Spiller, D (2010). 'Student evaluations: do lecturers value them and use them to engage with student learning needs?' In "*Unlocking the Impact of Tertiary Teachers' Perceptions of Student Evaluations of Teaching*". New Zealand: Ako Aotearoa.

[18] Wongssurawat, W. (2011). What's a comment worth? How better to understand student evaluations of teaching. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 19(1), 67 – 83.