

Performance Evaluation of Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges In Nigeria: The Missing Criteria.

Authors: Igbojekwe, Polycarp A. (Ph.D), and Ugo-Okoro, Chigozie P. Department of Hospitality & Tourism Management, Imo State University, Owerri. Nigeria. E-mail: unclepoly112@yahoo.com

Agbonye, Charity Oby, Government Technical College, Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria.

Abstract.

Performance appraisal/evaluation is a systematic process through which employees are given feedback on their performance and further reward and promotion. Criteria for evaluating academic staff of universities and colleges can be categorized into three groups: teaching, research and service; teaching being the primary assignment of the academic. Teaching includes not only what is taught but also how it was taught. The current performance appraisal/evaluation is deficient having placed a greater emphasis on publication and paper presentation at conferences than on teaching effectiveness which is the beginning of academic excellence. As Students evaluation of teachers effectiveness (SETE) is not used in assessing academic staff of universities and colleges, their in-class attitudes and behaviours towards students which should form the core of the performance appraisal/evaluation are not evaluated. Teaching job places a great deal of emotional demand on university lecturers which requires high level of emotional literacy/intelligence necessary for creating conducive emotional climate for effective teaching and learning, thus, their emotional competence ought to be assessed. Unfortunately this is not done; which implies that personality job-fit is not considered as a criterion for appraising academic staff of universities. Based on the above scenario, we conclude that the current performance appraisal/evaluation in Nigeria's tertiary institutions is deficient having failed to evaluate teaching effectiveness. We therefore, recommend that SETE be considered as a criterion in academic staff performance appraisal. The paper also presents other deficiencies of annual performance evaluation report (APER) and how the validity and reliability of SETE can be assured

Keywords: Emotional intelligence; Emotional labour; Performance evaluation; Person-job-fit; Teachers' effectiveness

Introduction

Performance management, particularly performance appraisal aspect of it with regards to academics in institutions of higher education has not received enough attention from , policy makers and administrators of tertiary institutions in the past, hence, its contribution to enhance institutional performance and quality appear to have been neglected. Consequently, universities adopted a *laissez-faire* approach to performance appraisal, thus, academic staff members were not closely monitored in terms of in-class effectiveness. The evaluation criteria used in evaluating the lecturers in Nigerian tertiary institutions today have failed to enhance the quality of performance and credibility of graduates of tertiary institutions because such evaluation methods tend to give low

priority to teaching as noted by Oranu (1983) that describes the quality of teaching in Nigeria as apparently poor, and attributed this to the fact that teaching performance and other in-class behaviours are never recognized criteria when considering university teachers for promotion or reward. Emphasis is rather placed on research publications (Ofoegbu, 2001).

The writers of this paper contend that the use of research publications and paper presentation at conferences as the main performance indicators for lecturers while neglecting in-class effectiveness is counter-productive. This view is informed by the fact that the use of these criteria has resulted in the negligence of the primary assignment of an academic which is excellence in teaching.

According to Adomi (2007) students are the direct consumers of services rendered by universities; hence their views on all aspects of their higher education experiences are essential to the effective monitoring of quality in universities (Hill, Lomas and MacGregor, 2003). In the USA, student evaluation of teaching is part of the faculty member's performance evaluation (Emery, Kramer and Tian, 2003). This is also true of European countries (Curtis, 2002). In Nigeria, student evaluation of teaching has not yet been introduced in universities. Criteria for assessing academics for tenure and promotion in many Nigerian universities include qualifications, teaching, current research, publications, and service to university/community. The promotion and reward systems for academics in Nigeria, however, are largely based on research excellence (Adomi and Mordi, 2003).

Students in developed countries participate in teaching evaluation.. There is some literature on the traits lecturers are expected to exhibit. Murray, et al. (1996) posit that university teachers are expected to possess content competence; pedagogical competence; the ability to deal with sensitive topics in an open, honest, and respectful way; the ability to contribute to the intellectual development of the student; the ability to treat students' grades, other academic records, and private communications with strict confidentiality; assessment of students that is valid, open, fair, and congruent with the course; and, respect for the institution. These are ethical principles, which should be taken into account along with other relevant conditions and circumstances, in the design and analysis of university-college teaching.

As opined by Priestly and Kerpneck (1977), university teacher needs broad knowledge and understanding of the subject as well as a deep knowledge and understanding of at least one substantial area of it. Since their primary business (and that of the university) is teaching, they must know a good deal about what they are teaching and a good deal about how to teach it. Hill, Lomas, and MacGregor (2003) in their investigation of what students in a number of disciplines perceive as quality education, found that students appreciated lecturers who knew their subject, were well organized, and were interesting to talk to. They appreciated lecturers who provided feedback to students during the session and in assignments, and also liked teachers who were easy to be with and helped them to learn.

It is on the basis of the aforementioned scenario, that this paper draws the attention of academics and administrators of institutions of higher learning to the need to adopt an effective and efficient performance appraisal model that can add value to the effectiveness of the academic staff and thus, raise institutional growth measures that encompass increased graduate rates and quality, research output and quality of teaching. Besides, research has shown that higher education institutions are facing major challenges regarding the management of performance of academic staff. This paper also reviewed the procedure used to evaluate lecturers in Nigeria's tertiary institutions including colleges of education and highlights the weaknesses of this procedure.

Conceptual Framework of Performance Appraisal

The performance appraisal/evaluation activities enable to determine whether the employees' performance is in accordance with established objectives and it is primarily based on the appraisal of employees' work results and activity (behavior), also competence (skills, abilities and characteristics). In the modern management, performance appraisal is viewed in the broader context of performance management, whereas precision of measurement and accuracy of ratings is accompanied by social and motivational aspects of the appraisal process (Fletcher, 2001). Alongside with task performance, which covers job-specific behaviors and employee's core responsibilities, in the appraisal process more attention has been devoted to non-job specific behaviors, like cooperation, dedication, enthusiasm and persistence. These aspects form contextual performance, because of increasing organizational and task complexities are becoming more and more important (Boyd and Kyle, 2004). Employees' compensation is a process of rewarding employees with monetary and non-monetary benefits according to the value of their work, thus, compensating them for their efforts.

Performance appraisal is a systematic process that seeks to evaluate employees' performance and helps in identifying employee's potential for further growth and advancement within the organization's career ladder. The basic aim of performance appraisal system is to monitor employee performance, boost employee motivation that will in turn improve company morale and is a useful tool for understanding and assessing employee skill potential. Mostly supervisors are the immediate source of judging and evaluating the performance of their subordinates, however in some recent methods of performance appraisal like 360° feedback employee is being evaluated by everyone that comes in contact with him, be it a supervisor, colleague, customers, peer, subordinate managers, team members, suppliers and vendors (Turk, 2005).

This type is different from other traditional method of performance appraisal as in this information about employee is gathered from all possible sources to sketch full picture of employee performance i.e. a full assessment of employee from multiple sources. On the contrary, subordinate (appraisees) are also recognizing the importance of performance appraisals, since this tool of performance management affects their rewards and paves the way for further developmental opportunities like trainings, promotions, transfers, salary increases bonuses etc.

Similarly data gathered through performance appraisal also known as performance evaluation can also be used as a tool for providing Employees Feedback about their performance. Performance evaluation is a systematic process that is done on a periodic basis i.e. annually or bi-annually in some organizations, the basic purpose is to assess individual employee's job performance and productivity according to certain pre-established criteria and organizational objectives.

Performance appraisal takes into account the past performance of the employees and focuses on the improvement of the future performance of the employees. Other purposes of conducting performance appraisals/evaluation are: Developmental and Evaluative Purposes. Developmental purpose is used to identify the weak areas of employee's performance. The gathered data is then used to provide trainings and development opportunities to the employee. On the other hand evaluative purpose helps organizations /evaluators in informing employees about their performance and further in rewarding excellent performance and to punish poor performance.

In addition, Fletcher (2001) opined that performance appraisal as a means by which organizations develop competency, improve employee motivation and achieve equitable allocation of resources. In essence, performance appraisal achieves multiple purposes from measurement to motivation and resource allocation. As noted by Cleveland, Murphy, and Williams (1989), performance appraisal systems can be used to motivate employees through remuneration, promotions, retrenchment, and the improvement of skills, competence and expertise.

Moreover, Seidan, and Sowa. (2011) believe that the ultimate objective of any evaluation procedure is aligning individual goals and objectives with organizational objectives and priorities while individual performance should be reflected in how they contribute to organizational growth and development. According to Bassey, Esu and Inyang (2009), performance appraisal system is a means of investigating employee achievement over a certain period of time for achieving organizational goals. Consequently, performance appraisal is a means of knowledge sharing among subordinates and superiors to adequately measure the progress of the employee which will aid in making strategic human resource decisions.

The effectiveness of an appraisal system is determined by the performance standards. Hence standards must be established according to individual job description which should be tied to organizational goals and objectives. Furthermore, these standards should be a written document which will make it legally binding and objective. Failure to align performance standards with organizational goals and objectives leads to misunderstandings, poor morale, and lack of job satisfaction, ineffectiveness, and confusion (Daley, 2002; Condrey 2012).

Knowledge, skills and abilities, work ethics, personality traits or characteristics and results all can be used to assess performance (Milkovich and Boudreau, 1994). Even though, knowledge, skills and abilities are difficult and costly to measure due to the fact that they are inherent in an individual not specific to the job itself but they signify the minimum requirement needed for optimum job performance. Behaviors are mostly used in the public sector due to the nature of the organization which encourages and incorporates teamwork. Ultimately, organizational culture, organizational climate and nature of the job influence the direction of the appraisal procedure (Murphy and Cleveland, 1995; Daley, 2002; Condrey, 1994 & 2012).

Performance Appraisal in Universities and colleges.

Performance appraisal is a process of assessing, summarizing and developing the work performance of staff in the university. Every University lecturer in Nigeria receives a written performance appraisal annually which provides a feedback on performance and justifies personnel decision such as promotion and compensation (Okafor, 2005). This official form includes a self- assessment page for the lecturer to fill out and it is in turn sent to the respective departmental heads who state their perception. The completed form is then forwarded to the appointment and promotions committee where it is reappraised and action recommended. This could be promotion, continuity with the system, termination or warning. The behaviour standards that form the core of the performance appraisal expected of university staff are set out in the staff hand book and these standards relate to tasks that determine academic excellence and output. Academic peers apply these standards through collegial review of course syllabi, research methods and professional publications. Evaluation of teaching and research is a tool for quality improvement.

There are numerous criteria for measuring the performance of the education process. According to (Turk, 2005) these criteria have been brought out by different studies (McNay, 1997; Willis, Taylor, 1999; Mergen et al., 2000; Ashe-Eric, 2001; Mulford et al., 2004; Griffith 2004). These criteria can be divided into three groups: teaching, research and service. There may be a focus on particular stages of the education process: 1) on input e.g. qualification of staff, nature of students and material resources; 2) on processes e.g. approaches to teaching, student involvement and feedback; 3) on output e.g. qualifications of students, employment rates, staff publications. Quantitative data such as examination pass rates; citation levels for research articles etc. may be also available. In other cases, survey data from students or employers might be collected. The more

criteria presented, even without rigid detailed scoring scales, the better the evaluation will be. Statistical performance indicators should support judgment, not replace it. Teaching does not include only what is done, but how it is done. Quality of performance in teaching requires that the higher educational institutions prepare the students for their first position as well as provide the basis for performance in future positions. Part of the quality of performance is to maintain an awareness of the needs of the student (customer). Teachers are service providers while students are the consumers of their services.

In summary the purposes of performance appraisal in Nigerian universities are:

1. Administrative – promotion, dismissal, organizational planning
2. Motivational – self appraisal and acts as an incentive to hard work
3. Developmental – identify training needs
4. Performance Improvement – through MBO, participative goal setting and other work planning processes.

Some criteria contained in the performance appraisal model used in public universities are set out below: Thus, many have challenged the criteria, particularly quality of publication weighted as high as 30 given the impracticalities concerning publication. Performance appraisal in itself is carried out as an event rather than as a process. It occurs at a given time of the year, and it is the point at which responsible staff begins to document performance discrepancies or deal with performance. Leaving it till a particular time and forwarding to the Appointments and Promotions team places a lot more emphasis on promotion rather than improvement (Okafor, 2005).

Criteria Weighting

- 1. Quality of teaching 15; a) Length/tenure 5; b) Workload 10; c) Quality 5; 2. Current Research 30; 3. Quality of Publication 30; 4. Contribution to University or country 5.**

The level of performance, other factors such as consequences, results and impact of performance should also be examined. Contrary to what obtains in countries like the USA, UK and New Zealand, where students feedback form an important aspect of the proposal, public universities in Nigeria have not seriously considered the aspect of students inclusion. The antecedents of staff face-off with students, histories of riots, assail of lecturers by students is also not very salutary. Lecturers fear that students' feedback may be hijacked for another purpose and would be greatly subjective.

Then of course the problems relating to subjectivity includes some of the following popular rating errors (Okafor, 2005):

1. Halo effect; 2. Horn effect; 3. Central tendency; 4. Strict rating; 5. Lenient rating;
6. Latest behaviour; 7. Spill over effect; 8. Initial impressions; 9. Spill over effect;
10. Need to criticize; etc.

As a means of maintaining standards, performance evaluation compares the performance of the staff with pre-established standards and insists that the staff must meet if he must gain his promotions, or even retain his tenure. In the area of quality improvement, staff performance evaluation when thoroughly executed, discloses what skills and knowledge the staff have brought to teachers education vis-à-vis the skills and knowledge needed to meet the demands of producing effective and competent graduates. Maigul (1996) noted that performance evaluation results in quality improvement of their teaching.

Beside quality improvement and maintenance of standards, performance evaluation is one of the keys to validating policies, plans and procedures operating within an organization (Walklin, 1992). The above functions coupled with the requirement that lecturers/teachers should teach the students as they are expected to teach, makes the evaluation of their performance a necessity.

There are methodological weaknesses in the current ways of evaluating the performance and progress of lecturers/teachers.. The evaluation of lecturers/teachers in some Nigeria's higher institutions is hitherto carried out by means of Annual Performance Evaluation Report (APER) part of which is completed by the evaluated personnel and the other part by his head of department, or unit head. This evaluation is carried out for the sole purpose of promotion. However, it does not actually take consideration of physical evaluation of individual staff progress performances during the period being evaluated.

Besides the personnel data of the evaluated staff, the main information required from the first part of the APER require personal information including: main duties; researches; ad-hoc duties; scholarly activities such as seminar, conferences, workshops, and courses attended; and, publications. These items of information are used to determine whether the staff satisfies two out of the four conditions on which the promotion of academic staff is said to be normally based. The two conditions are: Evidence of scholarly research publications; and evidence of effective service to the institution. The APER does not provide the authorities with information on evidence of effective teaching and evidence of good character, loyalty to the institution and personal integrity (Nakpodia,2011)

Bernett (1992) argues that assessment of competency based on publication records is not enough to demonstrate the competency of the lecturers. Given the fact that academic excellence begins with excellence in teaching, evaluation of the teacher should focus more on practical teaching skills rather than the exclusive assessment of other criteria. Another weakness of the current evaluation method through the use of APER form is that it is not advisory in nature. The advisory role is important since in spite of the requirement that lecturers must have acquired minimum level of education and some of them are not trained to teach. Such untrained teachers according to Wilson (1993) are seemingly employed to teach on the assumption that if they had done well in their own academic studies, they are therefore capable of teaching their subjects effectively to students. This assumption lacks merit given the fact that knowledge of subject matter is a different thing from methodology of teaching and application of knowledge base. A good evaluation procedure should therefore, make provision for advice to the staff on how to improve their competence in teaching. It is undoubtedly plausible that, excellence in teaching is the principal objective of university education hence, any criteria for excellence in the evaluation of academic staff performance must be taken it into consideration by making student rating a valid procedure (Saint, 1995). Moses (1985) suggests that the evaluation of the competency of lecturers should include the measurement of competence in the relevant subject matter; communication skills; commitment to facilitating students learning; and, the degree of concern for individual students. Therefore, the best approach to the evaluation of teachers and lecturers should be the "students' rating system" where the students should be surveyed as to determining the skills and competency of those that teach them.

Oranu (1983) remarked that students are the consumers of teaching (services) and thus, are in a better position to evaluate teaching excellence. Menne (1974) suggests that: (a) Students are the most accurate raters; (b) Students rating generally agrees with peer ratings whether or not the peer rating procedure includes a class visit; and, (c) Administrators tend to be less accurate (because of fewer raters) and not as commonly agreeing with the ratings by peers and students. Marsh (1988) approves students rating and argued that it is a source of diagnostic feedback to faculty about the effectiveness of their teaching; it is a measure of teaching effectiveness to be used in tenure/promotion decisions, and it serves as a source of information for students to use in the selection of courses/instructors. The fact that student

rating provides feedback on teaching effectiveness underscores its validity as a source of data for offering useful advice to staff on how to improve their teaching. It therefore serves both as an assessment and advisory roles.

The multidimensional nature of a well constructed student t rating scale makes it a convenient source of information about a staff's moral standing with his students than the APER form rating. The rating of the lecturers by the students on variables that have to do with their professional ethics will help to check such moral vices prevalent in our tertiary institutions as sexual harassment, and commercialization of scores and grades (Nakpodia, 2011) and bullying. Performance appraisal in higher institutions hitherto carried out by means of Annual Performance Evaluation Report (APER) is not a convenient source of information about a staff's emotional stability and his moral standing with his students.

Every lecturer/teacher performs emotional labour. Emotional labour is defined in behavioural terms by Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) as the act of displaying the appropriate emotion with the goal to engage in a form of impression management for the organization. Performance of emotional labour requires that workers suppress their private feelings in order to show the organizationally desirable work emotions by displaying organizationally specified display rule as part of their service performance (Hochschild, 1983). Emotion in the workplace plays a significant role in how the entire organization communicates within itself and with its stakeholders. Positive emotions in the workplace have desirable effects, while negative emotions can lead to some negative consequences.

Further more, workplaces have been described as emotional arenas which consist of several features such as job demands, job characteristics, and work events that require emotional responses on the part of the employee which affect their work related attitudes and job behaviours such as job performance and job satisfaction (Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996). However, the intensity of this affect evoked by an emotional event is determined by personal dispositions such as personality traits and mood. The role of emotions in the workplace is treated by Affective Event Theory (AET) proposed by Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996).

Emotional labour is relevant in the educational institutions given the particular demands of the lecturing/teaching jobs and it is incumbent upon the academic staff to manage his emotion as part of his job in order to create the appropriate in-class emotional climate that is conducive for effective teaching and learning. Unfortunately, the current APER form has no provision for assessing emotional competence (emotional literacy/intelligence) of lecturers/teachers, and since SETE is not in use, no opportunity is created for assessing in-class emotional climate possibly created by lecturers/teachers. Humans/students are emotional beings, thus, when emotionally disturbed, effective teaching and learning cannot take place.

It is required that employees who perform emotional labour must at least be emotionally literate or at best be emotionally intelligent. Emotional intelligence is defined by Goleman (1995) as the ability to manage one's own emotions and to sense and control those of others. While Salovy, Bedell, Detweller and Mayer (2000) define emotional intelligence as the ability to perceive, appraise, and express emotion accurately; the ability to assess and generate feelings when they facilitate cognition; the ability to understand affect-laden information and make use of emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth and well-being. Goleman (1995) posits that employees with high emotional intelligence appear better able to display required emotion since they are more aware of what is required as part of the job role (Grandey ,2000). Goleman (1999) proposes five core elements of emotional intelligence model: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, and empathy and relationship management.

Obviously, not all lecturers/teachers possess the required level of emotional intelligence to create the conducive emotional climate for effective teaching and learning; in other words they cannot

effectively perform emotional labour. Since such lecturers are allowed to remain on the job and get promoted, it means that personality/ person-job –fit has not been made a criterion for performance appraisal, promotion and reward for academic staff.

“Person–job fit is defined as the compatibility between individuals and the job or tasks that they perform at work. This definition includes compatibility based on employee needs and job supplies available to meet those needs, as well as job demands and employee abilities to meet those demands” (Kristof-Brown, 2007) . Put differently, it is the degree to which a person’s cognitive abilities, interests and personality dynamics fit those required by the job. Better person job fit means that employees will be more motivated to do better at their job and will succeed in their role within an organisation. It also means that a company is able to increase productivity, revenue and reduces costs associated with employee turnover. In the university system, person-job fit will help to maintain standard and improve quality of teaching.

A case study conducted at the University of Zambia (Banda, 2012) explored whether student evaluation can make a difference in improvement of quality of teaching in a particular department. This exploration was considered important because improvement of teaching is the ultimate purpose of teaching evaluation and should be most justifiable reason for evaluating teaching. The case study also presents a new evaluation scoring system that was used. The study revealed that teaching in the academic department was of better quality the following year and the evaluation of teaching effectiveness contributed to that improvement because students provided useful feedback for the lecturers. The UNZASAS method has the capacity of identifying tendencies about specific attributes, and by its being sensitive proved to be an effective tool for interpreting students’ perceptions on the quality of teaching given by academic faculty, and providing faculty with formative feedback

A current practice among colleges and universities in the USA is for the administration to use student evaluation instrument of teaching effectiveness as part of the faculty member’s performance evaluation. In a study that tracked the use of student evaluations of faculty in 600 colleges between 1973 and 1993, Seldin (1993) found that the use of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (SETE) increased from 29 percent to 86 percent.

Evaluation of teaching has been around for a long time and is usually concerned with accountability - to assure the public and relevant authorities of the standards of teaching at the institution. Regrettably, evaluation of teaching has had a lot of opposition and lots of controversy, even to date. For example, it has been blamed for grade inflation to mention

but one. However, unlike North America, Europe and Australia where evaluation has got accepted and is widespread, in Africa, and in Nigeria in particular, it is yet to be established. Although some opponents of student evaluation of teaching cite issues related to reliability and validity of the evaluation, research indicates that students’ ratings are adequate in terms

of validity and reliability. Ratings of a given instructor are reasonably consistent over courses, years, rating forms, and groups of raters. Other evidence has shown that students taught by highly rated teachers tend to learn the subject matter better than those taught by lower rated teachers. However, it must be admitted upfront that student evaluation of teaching does not tell the whole story and can be lacking in scope to measure the worth of academic standards of university graduates, and must always be supplemented by other sources of data on teaching and academic contribution.

Critiques of Students Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE).

The above merits of student ratings notwithstanding, some doubts have been raised over their validity, reliability, and generalization. Okoro (1991) for instance observes that students sometimes

fill in what they think the teacher would like rather than how they feel about him. He also reasons that some teachers may treat students very leniently and may spend a lot of time joking with them in order to obtain favourable rating from them. The later reasoning is akin to what is known as “Dr. Fox Effect” i.e. the over-riding influence of instructor expressiveness on students’ evaluation of college/university teaching (Marsh, 1988). The interpretation of this effect means that a lecturer who is very enthusiastic can entice favourable evaluation even though his lectures may lack meaningful content. Other factors believed to affect the validity of student rating have been given by (Marsh, 1988).

If SETE instruments are used in isolation, as they are in some institutions, and without alternative or collaborative measures, then students become the primary determinants of a lecturer’s success or failure in his or her academic career. At institutions that emphasize teaching (as opposed to research), higher-than-average levels of teaching effectiveness are often expected. Therefore, it follows that student measurements of teaching effectiveness if used in isolation have the potential to buoy or sink a lecturer’s career. One school of thought at many business schools is that students should be viewed as the products of the business program, rather than its customers (Emery *et al.*, 2001). In other words, the lecturers are the immediate customers and industry/society is the ultimate customer. From this position, it is clear that the use of SETE, which implicitly captures lecturer’s popularity, is inappropriate for measuring instructional effectiveness (i.e. learning). Ironically, while business departments purport to use student appraisals to increase total quality, Deming (1986) has suggested that the practice is inaccurate and demoralizing.

In addition to criticisms of the evaluation philosophy and the validity of the instrument, there are other reasons to criticize the use SETE as the only method of evaluating teaching effectiveness. Comm and Mathaisel (1998) observed that in some industries, subordinates are used to evaluate their bosses but *never* as the only measure of supervisor effectiveness. Typically, this is used as the least weighted of several methods to ascertain effectiveness. A student evaluation of teaching effectiveness (SETE) is often the most influential information in promotion and tenure decisions at colleges and universities focused on teaching. Unfortunately, this instrument often fails to capture the lecturer’s ability to foster the creation of learning and to serve as a tool for improving instruction.

From the very beginning, student instructional rating questionnaires have been touted as a cheap and convenient means of evaluating the teaching of college and university faculty. College administrators eagerly embraced SETE in the 1960s because they were perceived to be able to offer a ready vehicle for assessing faculty members. The perceived promise, technical appearance and utter simplicity of SETE have ensured the popular use of student instructional ratings for nearly 40 years now. Research, however, indicates that SETE is not the only possible source of information about teaching effectiveness, and it is certainly not the best source of that information. Nationally, researchers have conducted hundreds of academic exercises on the reliability and validity of SETE. It is widely believed that SETE fails to distinguish between factors that are within the faculty members’ control and system-determined factors that are beyond their control. Several companies perhaps education administrators should only use SETEs to collect qualitative information for feedback and focus on objective measures of outcomes for the teaching portion of promotion and tenure decisions. Further, if feedback is the primary purpose of using SETEs, then it seems logical to evaluate faculty members every semester, regardless of rank or tenure.

Recommendations on how to use SETE to ensure validity and reliability.

It is well understood that the need to make personnel decisions concerning academics requires that SETEs be part of that decision process. As such, we support the following recommendations to

improve the use of student evaluations made by (Emery et al, 2003): Use multiple sources of data. Do not use student ratings as the only measure of teaching effectiveness. They do not provide evidence in all areas relevant to teaching effectiveness (e.g. command of subject matter, appropriateness of course content and objectives). Make the wording on SETE instruments more “achievement” oriented rather than “satisfaction” oriented. Add questions that concern how much the students learned from the course and remove questions such as how well the instructors know the subject matter; students are not knowledgeable enough to make precise judgement. Additionally, any comparison should be performed against similar courses (e.g. a business course to a business course but not a business course to a music course). Ensure that the data/measures are technically acceptable, i.e. are reliable and valid. Require students to specifically comment on ratings less than satisfactory. This will provide an opportunity to assess the credibility of negative ratings.

Crumbly (1995) suggests that one way is to make student evaluations more reliable. Train the evaluators to evaluate and the supervisors in giving feedback. If students are to be an integral part of the unit’s evaluation system, train them to evaluate during a freshman seminar. Further, the use of untrained evaluators (students) may be subject to a legal challenge (Malos, 1998). Administrators, on the other hand, need to be trained in giving constructive feedback to prevent a reduction in motivation. If work behaviours rather than outcomes are to be evaluated, administrators should take the opportunity to observe the ratee’s performance including concepts of what is acceptable and effective teaching behaviour. As such, units need to examine their evaluation systems to ensure that faculty members of different cultures are not receiving lower ratings because they are different.

In conclusion, (Emery et al, 2003), endorse the notion that “no one has taught anything, unless someone has learned something”. As such, they encourage those programs that evaluate lecturers based on outcomes to come forward as models. They also recognize that the activity of teaching is essentially that of human interaction, and as such is inextricably tied to the student’s perception of a lecturer’s personality. Finally they hold that “an evaluation of teaching effectiveness, however, must be based on outcomes. Anything else is rubbish” Put differently, above statement suggests that evaluation of teaching effectiveness should be based solely on the quality of the products (university graduates).

Conclusion

Performance appraisal/evaluation is a systematic process through which employees are given feedback on their performance and further reward and promotion. Insight from the literature reveals that in many universities and colleges there are numerous criteria for evaluating academic staff of universities and colleges, however, these criteria can be categorized into three groups: teaching, research and service; teaching being the primary assignment of the academic. Teaching effectiveness includes not only what is taught but also how it was taught, punctuality and attendance to scheduled lectures. The literature has also revealed that the current performance appraisal/evaluation is deficient having placed greater emphasis on publication and paper presentation at conferences than on teaching effectiveness. As SETE is not used in assessing academic staff of universities and colleges, their behavioural skills which should form the core of the performance appraisal/evaluation are not being evaluated. This means that the quality of interaction between lecturers/teachers and students is not being monitored.

Teaching job places a great deal of emotional demand on university lecturers which requires high level of emotional literacy/intelligence necessary for creating conducive emotional climate for effective teaching and learning. The extent to which an academic performs emotional labour

determines the quality of interaction between lecturers and students. Researchers have found that an individual's disposition particularly his personality traits determine how well he performs emotional labour. Failure to use SETE in performance appraisal means that personality-job-fit is not considered as a criterion for evaluating lecturers/teachers. Further more this implies that there is the possibility that there are lecturers/teachers who do not possess emotional competence required of an academic.

In conclusion, we maintain that any performance appraisal criteria that fail to consider the use of SETE is grossly inadequate because excellence in teaching is the primary objective of university education. Based on the above, we also conclude that the current performance appraisal/evaluation in Nigeria's tertiary institutions is deficient.

Researchers have confirmed the validity and reliability of SETE notwithstanding criticisms levelled against SETE. We therefore, recommend that SETE be considered as a criterion in academic staff performance appraisal. SETE is a convenient source of qualitative feedback on in-class behavioural tendencies of lecturers/teachers; however, we warn that SETE should not be used in isolation.

REFERENCES

Adomi, E. E. & Mordi, C. (2003). Publication in foreign journals and promotion of academics in Nigeria, *Learned Publishing* 16(4): 259-63

Adomi, E.E.(2007). Student Expectations of Faculty in a Nigerian LIS School. Publication and academic reward. *Scholarly Publishing*, pp 233-37

Abrami, P.C., d'Apollonia, S. and Cohen, P.A. (1990), "Validity of student ratings of instruction: what we know and what we do not", *Journal of Education Psychology*, Vol. 82 No. 2, pp. 219-31.

Arreola, R.A. (1995), *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*, Anker Publishing, Boston, MA.

.Ashe-Eric. (2001), Designing an Effective Faculty Compensation System. *Higher Education Report*, 28(2), pp. 55-66.

Ashforth, B and Humphrey, R. (1993). Emotional Labour in service Roles: The influence of Identity, *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 18, No. 1. Available at: www.jstor.org. (Accessed 13th July, 2013).

Banda, S. S. (2012) Student Evaluation of Teaching: A case study from School of Medicine (UNZA). *Medical Journal of Zambia*, 35(3), pp 94 -99.

- Boyd, N. M., Kyle, K. (2004), Expanding the View of Performance Appraisal by Introducing Social Justice Concerns, *Administrative Theory & Praxis*,
- Comm, C.L. and Mathaisel, D. (1998), ``Evaluating teaching effectiveness in America's business schools: implications for service marketers'', *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 163-70.
- Crumbley, D.L. (1995), ``The dysfunctional atmosphere of higher education: games professors play'', *Accounting Perspectives*, Spring, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 27-33
- Curtis, P. (2002). Lecturers face student evaluation. Available at: <http://educatioguardian.co.uk> (Accessed, 18th November, 2014).
- Emery, C.R., Kramer, T.R., & Tian, R.G. (2003). Return to academic standards: a critique of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness. *Quality Assurance in Education 11(1)*: 37 - 46.
- Emery, C.R. Kramer . T.R. and Tian R.G.(2003) Return to academic standard. *Quality Assurance in Education Volume 11 . Number 1 .. pp. 37-46* <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/0968-4883.htm>. (Accessed 22nd October, 2014).
- Goleman, D. (1999), *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. New York. Bantam Books.
- Grandey, A.A. (2000), Emotion Regulation in the Workplace: A New Way to conceptualize Emotional labour. *Journal of occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 5, No. 1. www.phd.scripts.psu. (Accessed, 25th May, 2013).
- Griffith, J. (2004), Relation of Principal Transformational Leadership to School Staff Job Satisfaction, Staff Turnover, and school performance, *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol 42, No 3, pp. 333-356.
- Hill, Y., Lomas, L. & MacGregor, J. (2003). Students' perceptions of quality in higher education, *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp 15-20
- .
- Hochschild, A. (1983), *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feelings*. Berkeley University of California Press.
- Kristof-Brown, A. (2007). Person–job fit. In S. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology*. (pp. 619-621). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: <http://dx.doi.org>. (Accessed 20th November, 2014).

Malos, S.B. (1998), "Current legal issues in performance appraisal", in Smither, J.W. (Ed.), Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, pp. 49-94.

Mergen, E., Grant, D., Widrick, S. (2000), Quality Management Applied to Higher Education, *Total Quality Management*, 11(3), pp. 345-353.

Okafor, T. (2005). Performance Appraisal a chore or a cure – A review of public sector approach of Nigerian Universities. *Conference on "Trends in the Management of Human Resources in Higher Education"* 25 - 26 August 2005 at the OECD Headquarters, Paris

Mulford, B., Kendall, L., Kendall, D. (2004), Administrative Practice and High School Students' Perceptions of their School, Teachers and Performance, *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol 42, No 1, pp. 78-97

McNay, I. (1997), Strategic Planning and Management for Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe, *Center of Higher Education Management*.

Rasheed, M. I. Aslam, H.D. Yousaf, S. and Noor, A. (2011). A critical analysis of performance appraisal system for teachers in public sector universities of Pakistan: A case study of the Islamia University of Bahawalpur (IUB). *African Journal of Business Management* Vol. 5(9), pp. 3735-3744, Available online at <http://www.academicjournals.org/AJBM> (Accessed 21st November, 2014).

Salovey, P., Mayer, J.D., Goldman, S.L., Turkey, C. and Palfai, T. (1995). Emotional attention clarity and repair: exploring emotional intelligence using the Meta-model-scale. In J.N. Pennebaker (ed.). *Emotional, disclosure and health*. Washington DC America. Psychological Association.

Türk, K., Roolah, T. (2005), A Comparison of the Appraisal Systems and Appraisal-Compensation Interlinks Used By Estonian Public and Private Universities, University of Tartu FEBA Working Paper Series, No 41, Tartu University Press.

Malgui H.W. (1988). The Role of Research and Evaluation in Survival of Education in Nigeria. *Journal of Quality in Education* 3, 177-184

Marsh, H.W. (1988), Evaluation of Teaching. In M.J. Dunkins (ed) *Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education* 181-187. Oxford: Pergamon.

Moses I. (1985). *High Quality Teaching in a University: Identification and Description*.

Studies in Higher Education 10 (3) 301-313.

Nakpodia, E.D.(2011). A Critique of the Methods of Evaluating the Competency of Lecturers in Nigerian Tertiary Institutions. Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria. *African Journal of Education and Technology, Volume 1 Number 1, April 2011; pp. 53-59.* Email: edwardnakpodia@yahoo.com

Ofoegu, F.I (2001) Motivational Factors and Teacher Classroom Evaluation and Management in Edo State” *Current Issue in Educational Management in Nigeria,*

Okoro, O.M. (1991) *Program Evaluation in Education.* Obosi Nigeria: Pacific.

Oranu, R.N (1993). Improving University Teaching: Students as Evaluators of Teaching Effectiveness. *WAJE* 24, (1,2,3), 106-113..

Priestely, F. E.L. and Kerpneck, H. (April, 1977). Publication and academic reward,*Scholarly Publishing,*pp 233-37.

Saint W.S. (1995).Universities in Africa, Strategies for Stabilization and Revitalization. *World Bank technical paper No. 194, African Technical Department Series,*. E-mail: molefgn@vodamail.co.za.

Seldin, P. (1993). The use and abuse of student ratings of instruction”, *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* 21 July, p. A-40. CA.

Türk. K. (2005). The Study of Performance Appraisal And Compensation In Estonian Public And Private Universities University Of Tartu, Estonia

Walklin L. (1992). *Putting Quality into Practice.* England: Stanley Thomes.

Willis, T. H., Taylor, A. J. (1999), Total Quality Management and Higher Education: The Employers' Perspective, *Total Quality Management,* 10(7), pp. 997-1008.

Education in Nigeria is overseen by the Ministry of Education. Local authorities take responsibility for implementing state-controlled policy regarding public education and state schools. The education system is divided into Kindergarten, Primary education, Secondary education and Tertiary education. Nigeria's central government has been dominated by instability since declaring independence from Britain, and, as a result, a unified set of education policies has not yet been successfully implemented