

Performance Evaluation of Teachers in Universities: Contemporary Issues and Challenges

Hassan Danial Aslam

*Faculty of Management Sciences,
The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan.*

Abstract Achieving effective performance of human resources is primary goal of every organization. In this regard performance management practice of human resource management provides the sound basis of evaluating and developing employee performance in order to get enhanced organizational success. Similar to any organization, universities or higher education institutions evaluates its employees/teachers performance for effective human resource management. Although, both teaching and non-teaching (administrative) staff in universities play an important role in escalating institution's performance, yet teachers are considered to be imperative human resource of higher education institutions. Performance evaluation of teachers in terms of their teaching and research outcome is the primary area of concern for any university and highly unaddressed issue in case of universities in developing countries like Pakistan. The current research explores performance evaluation mechanisms of public and private universities of Pakistan which they employ for their teaching faculty. The aim of this exploratory study is to investigate the performance gaps of public and private universities of Pakistan by focusing teaching faculty performance. It elaborates their performance evaluation procedures and strategies and unearths the influential factors and challenges which are faced by these universities regarding performance evaluation systems. A case study research approach has been adopted by the researchers in which one public and private university of Pakistan has been taken for case analysis. A combination of quantitative and qualitative approach has been adopted for in depth analysis of performance evaluation issues in said universities. Research has been undertaken by the methods of interviews and questionnaires, from teaching staff of universities and results are analyzed for the basis of discussion. Research has shown that the factors like decreased motivation for evaluation, least participation in decision making, organizational competitive culture, semester system norms, obsolete performance evaluation method and lack of training for evaluating performance proves to be potential barriers for effective performance evaluation system in universities of Pakistan. Proposals with their implications for both universities have also been discussed in order to improve the system.

Keywords: Performance Evaluation (PE) , Performance Management (PM) , Higher Education

Introduction

All over the world, universities play a vital role for active participation in the knowledge societies which ultimately leads towards faster economic growth. Because universities in any country develop human capital (students) for not only better contribution in different professions but in society as whole. They are responsible for successful development of an open and democratic civil society, universities where they give their students deep insight of specific subject knowledge; they also provide the social norms of communication and interaction. A quality education providing institute is always proves to be a model for modern civil society (Batoool and Qureshi, 2007).

Although universities always run by teaching faculty and administration both, yet major responsibility of developing students as professionals comes in teacher's hand. To achieve world class standards, effective performance management of university teachers is always major concern in any university. A sustainable and progressive performance evaluation mechanism for teaching faculty of the universities ultimately benefits major stakeholders who are students in terms of enhancement of employment opportunities, improvement of education and training of upcoming human capital, flourishing the learning environment and enriches academic and intellectual knowledge management of university as a whole. Quality of higher education in universities cannot be achieved without continuous assessment and improvement of teacher's performance. A teacher's primary task or generally known function is teaching, which itself is not an easy task. It involves student learning, creating context in which they learn, and providing feedback on their strengths and

weaknesses in a positive and encouraging manner. In this modern age teacher is not only suppose to do teaching but many other tasks. Today's world of knowledge where explosion and information flood is everywhere, university teacher has to be an active learner and organizer of knowledge. Now university teacher is responsible for creating knowledge through research, get it publish in journals, making inter relation between academic and professional world in order to share the ideas and advancement of knowledge, review and update curriculum and create its relevancy with practical field. He is also expected to offer mentoring for his junior faculty members. His research skills should be as much polished which not only help him in his research but also his students and peers for undertaking required research initiatives. By achieving these tasks university teachers can develop their students for active participation in administration and governance with considerable knowledge of relevant theory and context. This matrix of tasks for university teachers makes their job more demanding, changing, growing and creative. Thus, professional development of university teachers requires an effective performance evaluation system throughout their professional career, by which teachers not only informed by the fact that what they are expected to do, but also what resources they have to achieve their tasks and how their performance will be evaluated.

This research focuses performance evaluation of teaching faculty of universities of Pakistan. Although various efforts have been made for university staff performance and development in Pakistan by a government institution known as Higher Education Commission (HEC) yet very little empirical research has been conducted on implications and execution of these initiatives in Pakistani universities (Batool and Qureshi, 2007). This research will undertake in depth study of private and public universities of Pakistan to analyze their performance evaluation system by exploring challenges and influential factors associated with implementation of systematic performance evaluation system.

Higher Education in Pakistan

In 1970s the universities in developed countries gradually started giving more emphasis to new knowledge and research and higher education started offering curricula more relevant to the socio-economic needs of the society. The post-war concept of the university is likely to be career oriented. Higher education in UK appears to focus more on transmission of knowledge, research and training, relevant to the society and service to the community (Skerritt, 1992). The public and private universities in Pakistan do not seem to give a high priority to 'relevance' and 'service to community' aspects in their functioning. This mismatch of higher education with the socio-economic demand is said to be increasing educated unemployment in Pakistan. The other significant difference is universities priorities, like in UK for example, it seems that priority is to research while in Pakistan the primary focus is teaching. However, private universities in Pakistan claim that they have taken teaching to the level of learning and brought it up to international level (Safdar, 2009).

Higher Education Commission (HEC) is responsible for higher education in Pakistan. It operates under the federal ministry of education through a Chairman and the Executive Director who is appointed as the head of the secretariat. HEC is further divided into five main departments, headed by members and advisors. The departments are:

1. Human Resource Development
2. Research and Development
3. Academic and Extra Curricular Affairs
4. Quality Assurance and Learning Innovation
5. Finance, Planning & Development

The ultimate task given to HEC in Pakistan is to help eradicate poverty, promote sustainable human development and share knowledge and information by promoting science and technology as well as research. HEC works with the vision that higher education is to play a central role to the development of the country and with the belief, that through quality education the country can achieve the millennium development goals. Historically speaking, Inter-University Board was established in 1952 to manage higher

education in Pakistan that was changed into University Grants Commission in 1974. Then its name and authorities were changed as Higher Education Commission in 2002 with more powers and autonomy in order to enhance relevance, quantity and quality of higher education in Pakistan.

Since 1955 the five year plans indicate significantly slow progress in higher education. In 9th five year plan (1998-2004) the target was set to increase universities or degree awarding institutions only up to 66. However, in the last five years (2004-2008) this figure has been raised up to 109 including private universities. Currently, there are 57 public and 52 private sector universities approved by HEC.

In recent past HEC has played a significant role to uplift higher education in Pakistan. It has given generous funds to public sector universities and also encouraged private sector to establish universities to meet the socio economic need of the country with a strict policy of quality and standards. HEC appears to be successful through effective interaction of many factors including infrastructure, good governance, admission policies, and curriculum development, quality of faculty and students, strategic planning, research provisions and linking higher education with the labor market (Amna Malik, 2009).

Universities in Pakistan offer both conventional and modern programs. The departments of each discipline are grouped under a faculty. The most common faculties are Faculty of Science (Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics, Statistics, Biology, Earth sciences), Faculty of Arts (Political Science, International Relations, History, Journalism), Faculty of Languages (English, Urdu, Arabic, Persian), Faculty of Commerce (Economic, Commerce, Business management, computer Science) and Faculty of Pharmacy (Pharmacy, health Sciences, MBBS, Conventional Medicine). Each department generally offers masters, M.Phil and PhD programs.

Private universities in Pakistan offer programs only in popular subjects. This sector has limited itself to only business, computer and commerce related degrees. The infrastructure, quality of staff, socio-economic background of the students and performance management system are claimed far better than public sector (Safdar, 2009). HEC has a strict monitoring and assessment procedure in place for both Private and public universities but it is relatively new and universities are taking time to adopt it. The administrative structure is different in both sectors. Public university is headed by a vice chancellor and work through Senate, Syndicate (responsible for recruitment of academic staff), Academic Council and Advanced Study and Research Board. The academic heads are deans and chairpersons. In private sector however, there is generally a president, who is rector and director working through a board of governors. In public sector universities, teachers are generally employed on regular basis while in private universities all appointments are contractual. Quality assurance and performance management system are claimed to be well established in private institutions.

The public sector universities in Pakistan claim to offer good public service and better socio-economic contribution by offering programs in science, humanities, religious studies and languages. The private sector claims that it is producing though in limited disciplines, but better skilled professionals are required desperately by the labor market. The private sector claim is substantiated by the fact that their graduates win better positions in the labor markets. Without having mega physical, financial and human resources the private sector with smart management and effective academic planning has emerged itself in Pakistan as an attractive option to learn for those who can afford to pay almost equal to overseas students (Amna Malik, 2009).

The purpose of this research is to explore the influential factors in performance evaluation systems within Pakistani universities. This research will firstly analyze different perceptions of university teachers about their current performance evaluation mechanisms, different perceptions of appraisers and appraisees towards the government rule of higher education quality and their own institute performance evaluation policies, and will identify gap between them. The findings of this research maybe expected to provide considerable insights towards critical elements and challenges which can be faced in implementation of university performance evaluation system in Pakistani context. In short this research will focus on answering following questions:

Research Objectives

- To analyze and understand the performance evaluation systems executed by public and private universities of Pakistan.
- To identify that what are the potential factors affecting the efficiency of Performance evaluation systems in universities of Pakistan (Public and Private)?
- To identify, what are the challenges and issues that are faced by public and private universities of Pakistan for effective staff performance evaluation and what efforts can be made to improve it?

Literature Review

For every organization (small or big) there are some objectives, goals or missions to accomplish. These goals can be achieved by better planning, implementing strategies and smart management of human resource. One of the important concern however, is the measurement that whether people are doing their work at right time in right manner. This process leads to the area performance management.

What is performance management? It is according to Aguinis (2007) "a continuous process of identifying, measuring and developing the performance of individuals" He further adds that this continuous capacity building needs clear objectives, observing and measuring performance and regular feedback. PM primarily focus on its employees to develop their capabilities. It does not only do capacity building but "Performance management helps managers to sense earlier and respond more quickly to uncertain changes" (Cokins, 2004).

PM is neither a technique nor a single process, it can be considered as a set of process, or a concept, a holistic philosophy that includes motivation of employees to perform well, employees knowledge about what their managers expect of them, development of employees, monitoring and measuring performance in order to know what areas are to be improved (Wilson, 2005). Armstrong and Baron (2005) highlighted the same point saying that "PM is a strategy which relates to every activity of organization and its implementation depends on organizational context and can vary organization to organization".

Literature highlights (Greer, 2001, Koontz and Wehrich, 2005) two major intentions of PM, first it affirms that when people are involved in goal setting they will consider themselves responsible for its results and second intention state that achievement of these goals depends upon degree of support (resources, processes, systems) that employees get from their management in order to meet these goals. Bascal (1999) explains the essence of PM that it is an ongoing partnership between employee and supervisor with regard to major job functions, employees involvement in goals generation, and discussion that how both can work together to accomplish these goals. It also deals with performance measurement procedures and how the constraints in achieving high performance will be removed? Before discussing PM further it seems appropriate to review briefly the background of performance evaluation.

Performance Evaluation to Improve performance

Every organization (small or big) requires maintaining performance of its employees in order to get their best. Similarly, in university administration, higher management consistently searches different ways of evaluation and development for their faculty members. This evaluation process provides basis for promotion, tenure and remuneration of faculty members (Reddy, 2006). The concept like "Teachers are born and not made" or "Teacher is only effective if he can deliver lecture" are no longer exist. Today teacher is involved in so many activities like planning updating course, developing learning environment, facilitating discussion, creating interactive environment where students can suggest solutions, preparation of tests, assignment setting, providing feedback and proper counseling of students. Today university teacher is not only responsible for giving his students proper insight of subject but also responsible to make his overall personality and vision in

order to make him successful professional and human being. Such varied and widespread responsibilities demands a systematic evaluation system for university teachers, but keeping in mind its trivial nature, this evaluation system should be fully supported by administration and the students so that faculty members can not overlook or disregard it at any stage (Sheikh, 2007).

Evaluation of faculty members is not as much new. It always existed in any form like evaluation of teacher research publications or casual observation by the students. Students surface teacher's abilities in class and his grip on subject. They appraise him in every lecture at every single phase because they are his keen observer for the whole lecture nearly every day. But more systematic evaluation system let teacher know about his weak and strong points as they are pointed by his students and peers. The literature (Miller, 1974; Seldin, 1980; Kahn, 1993; Stronge, 2006) illustrate various types of evaluation methods like evaluation by high ups, students, peers but combination of these methods generally used in different parts of the world to identify the performance gap and to provide opportunities to prevail over these gaps in university teaching faculties (Sheikh, 2007). By and large, faculty members encourage performance evaluation if it results in more satisfaction, improvement and rewards for effective teaching in larger context and also if it ultimately leads to further insight to university priorities regarding teaching environment and towards better learning atmosphere for students who are the major stakeholders in this system (Reddy, 2006).

Purpose of Performance Evaluation

The obvious and principal purpose of performance evaluation is to guide an instructor to improve his teaching capability in order to deliver his best. As Seldin (1980) asserts that as no one is perfect in this world everyone needs to improve at every stage of life. He further emphasized that as students need guidance and advice for their error correction, similarly faculty members need more accurate and honest data for their self improvement in weak areas. Positive improvement in teaching faculty can take place only when they will have large measures of their performance evaluated on kind of facts came out from evaluation results. Any faculty performance evaluation system will not work unless teachers are not been transmitted by the specific instructional elements which have to be improved. Goldstein and Anderson (1977) forced upon teacher responsibility in evaluation system pointing out that teacher should be able to make change and increase his productivity by improving those areas which are being pointed out as evaluation results.

Including the above mentioned central objective, evaluation has many other purposes like accountability of teacher and professional growth of teacher. As Peterson (2000) emphasized on both purposes forcing the idea that accountability is important in order to assure that teacher is delivering the services as per requirements of institution and performance improvement leads to professional growth and development of teacher. Stronge (1995) emphasized the same point saying that accountability and performance improvement are supportive interests that are inevitable for development and enhancement of educational service delivery. He further emphasized that there must be coherent link between multiple purposes of teacher evaluation. McGreal (1988) put it in plain words saying that these multiple purposes of evaluation process can be achieved if this evaluation is considered as one part of larger mission, when this conception not only knotted with teacher improvement but with university improvement at large. Another obvious and old reason of performance evaluation in universities is for personnel decisions of promotion, tenure decisions, for performance rewards, guidance in hiring decisions and termination decisions. Seldin (1980) pointed out that many institutions are now emphasizing on more than traditional evidences (like research publications and employee service period in the institution) for tenure and promotion decisions. He further put forward another purpose of evaluation which is to provide data to major stakeholders like board of trustees, government officials, individual or organizations operating off the campus. Lastly, assessing faculty performance can leads to many benefits to students. By regular and systematic evaluation system teachers will increase their productivity and efficiency in order to provide students with new teaching methods, improved leaning atmosphere and more detailed research on subject outline and contents.

Overall, effective teaching evaluation must have its basis on certain principles and with clear purposes that what an institution wants to get out of it. Evaluation must be consisting of best possible procedure and it must be fundamental part of teaching learning process, not a disruption to the learning process. Data collection for evaluation process should be consisting of well defined parameters which are acceptable by both students and teachers. Teacher evaluation process should be growing process for students and teachers where they should accept their responsibilities. As student should give fair and factual feedback upon teacher performance in class and this is teacher responsibility to make efforts for better learning environment and improve himself in order to deliver effective teaching (Reddy, 2006).

Effective Teaching

Before going into detail discussion of teacher evaluation methods, we have to explore effective teaching for which we are assessing performance. Above discussion is all about performance in effective teaching, but what the effective teaching is? According to Seldin (1980) some faculty members go up against teacher evaluation because they think that how teaching can be evaluated when there are no effective teaching parameters. He further opposes this view by saying that "No one doubts that we are short of many answers to the teaching-learning process, just as we still have missing pieces to the cancer puzzle. But we do have some of the answers". Numbers of research methods like observational analysis, correlation studies, factor analysis and the critical incident approach have been used in order to identify characteristics of effective teaching (Seldin, 1980). As Miller (1974) explored six characteristics of effective teaching are (1) Lesson planning for class, (2) Having deep insight of subject, (3) Giving confidence to students for presenting their own ideas and suggestions, (4) student motivation, (5) fair and unbiased feedback on students performance and, (6) Having genuine interest in teaching subject. Reddy (2006) supports the above mentioned qualities of teacher but he also emphasized that teacher should deliver clear and understandable lectures, be able to interpret complex ideas and assumptions and be able to make good examples in order to relate the idea with real world setting. He further explains a research conducted on senior students (ten years out of university) and junior students who were in final year of university. Both groups agreed that effective teaching includes "adequacy of preparation, stimulation and intellectual curiosity and progressive attitude". Irby (1978) summarizes teaching effectiveness in four key points consisting of "(1) organization/ clarity, (2) enthusiasm/stimulation, (3) instructor knowledge, (4) group interactional skill" (cited in Seldin, 1980). Eble (1976) has divided characteristics in two broad dimensions, one is personal characteristics in which teacher should be enthusiastic, energetic, approachable, broad minded, apprehensive and creative. Other dimension is about mastering a subject in which he should have clear ideas, be able to point out relationships with practical implications, can pose useful questions and be able to create positive learning environment.

Today university teacher is not only an instructor but he has to prove himself as role model for his students because he is not only working on students insight for subject but also making their personality and vision. A good teacher makes his teaching effective by motivating and personifying enthusiasm in his students. He makes his sessions interesting and full of academic excitement. He always tries to develop interest of his students in different subject areas and create an environment where they feel free to explore problems and suggest their solutions. He maintains deep knowledge of his subject and he always shows his willingness to deliver this knowledge whether he is in or out of class (Miller, 1972).

Methods of Performance Evaluation of University Teachers

After determining the evaluation criteria or effective teaching parameters, next question in front of any academic institution is how to know whether these qualities are possessed by teaching faculty? Seldin (1980) emphasized that students, teacher colleagues, administration and teachers themselves take part in this evaluation as "components of the collective judgment of teaching performance". He further explains that

students are always able to provide reliable information about teacher performance and his effectiveness regarding teaching. Similarly peers because they are in same business can give their positive contribution for evaluation process. Teacher self appraisal, if conducted in accurate and constructive manner not only proves to be an authentic part of whole evaluation information but also an abrupt and effective motivation for performance enhancement.

- *Student Evaluation*

There is no doubt in the fact that students are daily observers of their teachers. Also this observation is not limited to the classroom but teachers are also judged by their role as academic advisor and student counselor. Thus students are manifestly potential and valuable source of teacher evaluation which is inevitable. There are many ways of taking students opinion on teacher performance like exit interview, discussion with students about teachers, student testimonial or student questionnaires. Generally, a questionnaire consisting of questions about teacher performance in class throughout the semester is dominant source of collecting student views (Seldin, 1980).

However, many teachers and authors pose question on student rating and teaching improvement. Centra (1974) is of the view that students are not mature enough to rate their teachers. Reddy (2006) adds in this argument by saying that student judgment is more based on entertainment rather than quality of learning environment and long run usefulness. Kent (1967) stressed that students' maturity is necessary so teacher evaluation meetings and questionnaires should be given to students when they leave the university. Seldin (1980) stressed on inconsistent behavior of students saying that unfavorable evaluation of teacher can lead to serious damage to professor's promotion or tenure contract. He explains that students can get biased with the teacher not specifically for his teaching style but for personal conflicts as well or maybe sometime they get more generous if evaluation is for teacher promotion and less generous if it is about teaching improvement.

On the other hand supporters of students rating consider it as an essential part of teacher evaluation but with certain careful measures. As, for instance, Gage (1974) pointed out in his research that student rating can result in improved teaching if students rating questions comes with detail explanation of ideal teacher or ideal behaviours in teaching learning environment. It means that if students are well explained about the difference between real and ideal teacher they would be in better position to give fair feedback. Melnick and Adams (1975) stressed the same point that student rating leads to teaching improvement but with concentration on some influences like teacher should be known about the student rating appraisal and he should be motivated and known by the improving procedure. Pambookian (1972) supported the relation between student rating and teaching improvement presenting his findings that the teachers who rated themselves higher than students they improved, however those whom self rating was low as compare to students they took it easy and thought there is no need of improvement (cited in Seldin, 1980). Doyle (1975) concluded that if student rating data is gathered, interpreted and judged carefully, it can provide constructive contribution to personnel decisions and teaching improvement (cited in Seldin, 1980).

Lastly, no one can deny the fact that students are the major stakeholders of any academic system, so their opinion is necessary in teaching evaluation system as Seldin (1975) put it in plain words saying that "the opinions of those who eat the dinner should be considered, if we want to know how it tastes". But only student rating method of teaching evaluation is not sufficient. It has to be embedded with additional information from other sources and carefully evaluated data in order to have sound performance decisions.

- *Colleague Evaluation*

Gathering evaluation data from colleagues in teacher assessment often proves to be an authentic source in judgment of curriculum development, student assessment, teaching procedures and teaching effectiveness.

Not only teachers but administrative staff of department can give feedback on teacher performance regarding administrative responsibilities in committees, boards and search groups (Reddy, 2006). According to Seldin (1980) colleagues can serve as reviewers of evaluation information which has been taken from different sources during teacher performance assessment procedure. In addition to that colleagues themselves as a result of their own observation can provide judgmental information on teacher's class performance. He further emphasized that colleague evaluation is not only consisting of teacher performance judgments or general view about colleague but also includes examination of instructional material. Although few universities go in for such a review because it is argued that through this procedure teacher privacy and academic freedom is being affected. Still assessment of instructional material which includes course syllabus, course objectives, examination procedure, learning approaches, textbooks and handbooks, reading list or reference lists given to students and many more, if done by senior faculty members in a positive and constructive way no doubt can provide useful judgmental information in teacher evaluation (Seldin, 1980). Miller (1974) emphasized on transparency in evaluation of instructional material and suggests that teacher instructional material evaluation and observation should be conducted by the teacher teaching same subject and one outside teacher of same discipline. They should go through all the material and results should be forwarded to assessed teacher and head of the department. Morton (1961) supports the idea of class visitation and observation of teaching performance and forces that class visitation can be useful if it involves friendliness in constructive, critical and instructional feedback.

But critics like Gage (1974) disagree with this idea and argues that when teacher is being observed by someone whom decision can lead him towards major consequences like promotion or salary, he can get confused and it can affect his teaching performance for that moment. As Centra (1974) enforced the point that colleague evaluation should not lead to major decisions like promotion and salary increments unless faculty members invest much more time in class visitations, so that teacher feel comfortable and consider it daily routine. Eble (1976) showed same concern and enforced on negative consequences saying that teacher is always get "suspicions towards the visitor's intentions, uneasiness caused by stranger in the classroom, violation of dignity or professional standing and doubts about the outcome of the observation". According to Seldin (1980) generally those institutions who adopted colleague evaluation for teaching improvement but not for personnel decisions have been successful in improving teaching capabilities of their teaching faculty. Also relation of junior and senior teaching faculty for improvement purposes always leads to institutional progress and performance enhancement. He further emphasized that colleague evaluation can be more effective if the teacher being assessed does not get defensive and hide his weak areas, if observer give him positive, objective, informal and factual feedback, if observer receive formal interpersonal training before starting evaluation and if administration put its best in promoting constructive faculty relationship.

- *Self Evaluation*

Self evaluation can be another source of data in teacher evaluation. Bligh (1975) asserts that self evaluation should be most vital and most frequent form of assessment in order to improve ones own teaching. He further explains that teachers should be given choice of methodology by which they will implement their self evaluation, but this choice should be properly justified by them. Sayer and Harding (1975) force the point that self evaluation not only produces the urge to develop course of action or guidelines but also to produce the evidence of his effective teaching. Dressel (1970) pointed out self evaluation as essential step in teacher performance assessment as it provides chance for exploring his weak areas in teaching and to improve it. But authors like Bayley (1967) argues with this viewpoint and asserts that this can lead teacher to self-delusion that he is the best, and maybe hide his weak areas and acquire defensive behaviour instead of being open and realistic about his teaching. As Ozmon (1967) asserted that honest self-appraisal where teacher takes every question seriously and answer in realistic manner is very rare.

No doubt, above mentioned arguments are valid regarding self-evaluation mechanism but if data is carefully gathered in harmonized format and interpreted judiciously, self evaluation can be authentic source of information in evaluation process. This data can also support colleagues, promotion committee and administration judgment but again it should be taken only one data component not the whole data for performance evaluation (Seldin, 1980).

- ***Department Administrator Evaluation***

Major addition in evaluation information is evaluation data obtained from administrator. Usually, head of department writes performance report which includes data from all sources, and his own observation during the tenure period of the teacher. In evaluation capacity administrator acts as an organizer and summarizer of information and forward this report to high level administration for further decisions. The departmental head is manager of his department and is responsible for his department faculty performance and development. Administrator is the person who collects all information from various sources. Information is not gathered from single source like student evaluation and peer evaluation but composite data is collected from different levels of institution.

This composite data is gathered through "three cycle" process (Student evaluation, peer evaluation and self evaluation) from those who are in daily contact with faculty member consisting of negative and positive feedback. This data then evaluated by administrator and summary is forwarded to upper management in order to make proper decisions concerning an individual faculty member. In this way this whole process proves to be improvement oriented and for better performance of teacher in particular and institution in general (Reddy, 2006; Skelton, 2005).

Research Methodology

This exploratory research supported by survey strategy which is conducted to identify the issues of performance evaluation of teachers in higher education of Pakistan. Public and private universities are been taken as case. In-depth interviews and questionnaires were used as key sources of collecting the primary data.

The sampling method used in this research was Stratified sampling. Three strata were selected as Dean, chairman/HOD and faculty. The sample size determined by the researchers was 100 with 1.29 margins of error and 99% confidence level, belonging to all three strata explained above.

A comprehensive questionnaire consisting of 28 questions categorized in 8 major dimensions including space for suggestions was designed in order to get detailed insight regarding research objectives. 100 valid questionnaires were analyzed in terms of percentages by using Microsoft excel.

The results of the questionnaire were discussed to identify which factors contribute the most towards performance evaluation of teachers and what are the problems in their regard.

In order to increase reliability of current research, in depth interviews have also been conducted from 63 teachers of the university belonging to all three strata and were included in discussion.

Findings and Discussion

Islamia University of Bahawalpur (IUB) which is a public sector Case Study University of this research consists of a highly hierarchal organizational structure. Each department is headed by a chair person who is responsible for the PM system in his department. Each faculty consists of five to six academic departments which are headed by Dean of Faculty and deans are bound to report to the Vice Chancellor of the University. IUB is using traditional PM system for managing performance of its faculty teachers. Annual Character Report (ACR) is written by the head of department, each year, which contains the achievements or

weaknesses of the teachers throughout the year. Facts for this report, comes from his student results, teacher research work and from teacher evaluation by students. It is a confidential a report which is not allowed to be shown to anyone else including the person who is being assessed. The only condition in which it is discussable is when this report is too negative and leads to major consequences. This report is then submitted to Dean of Faculty and all the promotional or tenure track decisions are made on the basis of these annual reports. This PM system only focuses on performance evaluation of teachers but as this report is not discussed with teachers its focus on teacher development is minimized.

One of university dean justified the system emphasizing that

" This ACR method for assessing teachers performance is very effective so far, and we have been using it for many years, yes there are some drawbacks like no discussion between appraiser and appraise but now we have instructed our department heads to have informal performance review meetings. But still we cannot change the system on our own because IUB is a public university and funded by the government, we have to follow the traditional performance evaluation system which is being used in other governmental institutions of Pakistan" (Dean, IUB).

On the other hand, Preston University (PU) which is a private sector Case Study University of the current research is chaired by its rector and under the rector; deans are working for their respective departments. However, PU is not using a traditional PM approach, but one designed for its own purposes. According to newly introduced formal PM system; teacher is firstly described briefly about his job description and then receives a week's training for semester system teaching. Performance parameters are students result, punctuality, communication, research work, evaluation by students etc. According to PM system, observation of teacher while teaching is also included in performance evaluation. Annual performance review is documented as report, written by the head of department, who discusses it with his faculty members in order to let them know what the areas of more attention are. PU also has great focus on professional development of teachers by seminars, training workshops and with mentoring culture within departments. Above mentioned PM systems are formal systems which are being implemented in both universities by their upper managements.

Operational Challenges

Engagement in Setting Objectives and Performance Evaluation Standards

Major theme of performance management cycle is continuous communication. As Fletcher (2004) asserts that PM initiates the process of engagement and discussion between manager and employee for setting objectives, evaluation criteria, resources needed for achieving goals and for continuous professional development. IUB and PU both have clear policy of giving detailed job description of teacher when any teacher joins the university. Results also showed that 91% of the participants (Agree 48% and Strongly Agree 43%) agree with the statement that they have clear and specific objectives. However, concerns are shown, about the continuous communication about these targets, their performance evaluation criteria and about teaching and research development. In total, 40% of (IUB) participants disagree that they have effective communication with their head and 23% are not sure about this statement. Moreover, 45% of the (IUB) participants disagree that they have been involved in goals setting process. However, it is necessary to note here, that communication situation is not same in all departments of IUB as one of the participant portrayed positive picture of his department saying that

" Yes, we are given a feedback by the head of department. I am satisfied with the way it is conducted as the head appreciates all the efforts and improvements made by his teachers at the same time discusses all

the loopholes. Discussions help us to come up with new ideas and suggestions" (Assistant Professor A, IUB). But unfortunately these encouraging views are very few; research shows that this positive communication atmosphere is not true in majority of (IUB) departments.

As one of the interview participant said,

"I have my job description and goals of teaching classes per week. But when I want to discuss my problems relating to resources or any other matter, I find no one to discuss" (Assistant Professor B, IUB).

On the other hand, in Preston University, about communication, percentages (32% disagree that they have effective communication with department head) are not as higher as IUB are, which shows that the majority of the participants are satisfied from their communication with heads, but still people have mentioned some problems of lacking effective communication.

As one participant showed his concern that

"It will not be true if I say that I don't have good communication with my head but often he seems to be very busy or maybe not inclined enough to discuss performance issues with that much energy that should be there. Also there is no discussion on objectives setting, we have been given specified goals and we have to achieve them. University does not engage us at any level for setting our goals." (Associate Professor, PU).

Above mentioned, interview statement clearly indicates, dissatisfaction of teachers regarding their goal setting engagement or discussion. Although, questionnaire results shows that PU participants are more satisfied in comparison to IUB regarding their communication with their heads, yet they have clear concerns about goals setting engagement as 52% participants disagree with the statement that they have been involved in setting their objectives.

These communication problems, when discussed with department heads of both case study universities, explored number of issues in operating effective performance evaluation system by continuous communication between teachers and their department heads.

Time Pressure for Department Heads

One of the major issues, mentioned by heads of both universities, is time pressure. They emphasized the point that a head has to do many other jobs like curriculum planning, admissions, students' problems, administrative meetings and their own lectures. Among all these activities, they stress that one to one performance review meetings with each faculty member on various matters, is nearly impossible. One of the interview participants stressed that

"If I conduct performance review meeting with all the faculty members, I should not do any other duty then." (Department Head, IUB).

Another participant, however, mentioned a bit optimistic view saying that

"I used to have informal meetings with my staff on tea breaks, to me this is the most appropriate way of discussing different departmental issues, and when I feel that anyone needs personal counseling I myself invite him for one to one discussion" (Department Head, PU).

Motivation

Another, issue raised from the research respondents of both universities is, the motivation of heads and faculty members to have effective performance evaluation system. Engaging the teacher for his objective setting and for maintaining effective communication with constructive feedback requires dedicated motivation from both sides (teacher and head). But research shows that this motivation is lacking in terms of initiatives taken by heads or teachers both. In both case study universities (IUB and PU), research shows that teachers and heads avoid having their performance discussion in order to keep themselves away from embarrassment or any disagreements between them.

One of participant (IUB) explained this as

"Teacher seems to be reluctant to have performance discussion because they think they will have to pay heavy cost for this, or maybe more work will be assigned to them by their heads. Every time they think why should I cause problems and put myself in conflicts so just let it go as it is" (Department Head, IUB).

"Sometimes, teachers don't take initiative to discuss performance problems, because they think that they are their personal problems and if discussed with head, head will consider us weak or poor performer. So they don't come to us" (Department Head, PU).

On the other side, teachers expect department heads to initiate the process. As participant said that

"This is responsibility of chairman of the department that he should encourage his faculty members to have discussion on performance issues. He should act like a role model and should prove from his behavior that he will not open a new dispute but will give constructive feedback and guidance for effective performance" (Assistant Professor, PU).

When this low motivation issue rose in interviews with deans and department heads, in addition to time problem they showed concern about uneasiness in conducting performance reviews or engaging the teachers in performance discussion. They feel uncomfortable to give negative feedback on a teacher's performance. Particularly, in Pakistani context where few people can receive negative feedback in positive way without feeling of threat to their self-esteem, it is difficult to convince them that these are the problem issues in their teaching or research performance. In this context, little harsh feedback from department head can lead teacher to low professional motivation and mistrust which can make the teacher mind to leave the university.

As department heads indicated

"I want to give constructive feedback to my department teachers but the thing is that what is the proof that they will take it constructively" (Department Head, IUB).

Another, motivational issue raised by teachers in both case study universities is about appraiser ability to appraise. They insisted that this is not necessary that every head can be good appraiser. Proper communication training and information about performance evaluation system is required in order to get positive and progressive results. It is always very sensitive for head and faculty member to discuss poor performance areas so it needs a department head to discuss these issues with great care and sense of responsibility. This is another reason of lacking motivation among department heads that they have not given any sort of training for conducting performance evaluation in their department. Performance evaluation

system is highly affected when the understanding of the system concept and methods are badly lacking.

One insisted that

"How can a person be a good administrator, teacher, counselor and performance appraiser at the same time? It is possible but difficult, however if there is sufficient training for these roles is provided, it's easy to make it" (Associate Professor, PU).

"I will not blame my department head, because he has not been trained in conducting performance review meetings in effective communication style. What he has observed from his past experience is rigid and dictatorial leading style of staffs in other Pakistani organizations" (Senior Professor, IUB).

Above mentioned factors of low motivation and different participants views reflects their worries about discussing the performance issues because they can lead to negative reactions. However, it does not mean that this is the problem which cannot be resolved, as cultural change is required in order to increase motivation on both sides. This is the major operational challenge in implementing performance evaluation system in any university of Pakistan, that proper communication, and continuous engagement of employees in setting their job objectives, performance evaluation and development methods, is vastly necessary in order to have effective staff performance (Amna Malik, 2009). Also, formal evaluation system program necessitate proper planning, training of faculty members and heads and requires clear description of intentions of administrator about implementing the program as there should not be any confusion and fear among faculty members (Miller, 1974).

Organizational Culture

From brief interview sessions and further examination of appraisal systems, another reason of lacking effective communication between heads and faculty members is strong political environment in government universities like IUB. High power system, strong hierarchal structure where senior employees consider themselves right in every matter, conspiracy, low moral ethics, blame game were some of the common practices among the employees, and one of the major hurdles which create biases or unfair performance evaluation.

One of the basic reasons of power based culture is cultural baggage and a rigid power focused hierarchal structure which is common practice in Pakistani context. This environment where only a head of department thinks himself, perfect in all matters and does not discuss any issue with his subordinates, it is hard for anyone to take initiative for performance discussion with him. Those heads who believe in dictatorial administration style, block the opportunities of open discussion on various matters because they do not like conflicts and only emphasize on following their orders. In this power distance culture, not only employee's performance is affected but also it breaks the whole performance management cycle within the organization.

Moreover, in this scenario those who raise some point of discussion or voice for cultural change are highly disliked by their heads and those who follow the path of 'yes boss' culture, become the favorite group of their head. This concern among IUB participants is very clear that 58% (including 40% with strongly disagree) of the participant disagree with the statement that '*Performance appraisal in my organization is fair and unbiased*'.

Clear dissatisfaction is shown in interview statements as well. As one of the participant expressed that

"if we maintain 'yes boss' culture and salute every decision of our head, we will have good performance review report, but if we raise issues and ask to have discussion, we will have to pay its heavy cost" (Assistant Professor, IUB).

On the contrary, in Preston University, as compare to IUB results, research shows that organizational culture is different from traditional governmental institute in Pakistani context. One of the major advantages of private sector institution is that their employees at any management level take great care of their reputation in terms of their work performance. Because they know if they will not maintain their performance, they might be asked to leave. Results show that teachers in Preston University do not feel that their performance reviews are biased or unfair, as 67% agreed that their performance review is fair and unbiased. According to PU participants, major reason of this less power based organizational structure is that there is check on check. Every head knows that his performance will be assessed by his department performance and colleague reviews. In this case he always put his best efforts to create positive and interactive environment where everyone can raise and discuss the issues.

As one of the PU participant mentioned that

"This sense of responsibility in department heads that they have to maintain performance of department without imposing their decisions on faculty members, comes from the fear of immediate effect of poor performance or rigid behavior, if reported to higher authorities" (Dean, PU).

As above statement clearly states that higher authorities are more concerned about managing their middle management performance in private sector, which is the element lacking in public sector universities and this is major cause of autocratic and power based culture in public institutions.

As one of the Dean of IUB indicated that

"The people who like dictatorial leadership style, they know they are permanent employees of government from last 40 years, maximum what we can do is to disturb their ACR which does not bother them much because they are at highest point of their profession" (Dean, IUB).

Teaching and Research Performance Issues

Above mentioned issues focused on the operational aspects of performance evaluation systems in case study universities in Pakistani context, which should be addressed at departmental and administrative level. But it is necessary to point out here that a teacher's performance in universities is linked with two core duties or responsibilities on which his performance has to be assessed and developed. These duties are 'teaching and research'. After discussing the operational level issues, under this heading, the author will discuss performance issues and challenges faced by university teachers in delivering their core duties.

Evaluation of Teaching in Semester System

Before 2002, all universities in Pakistan were operating under annual system of examination for their university students. In 2002, semester system consisting of two levels of examination in one year, was introduced in some of universities and gradually spread all over the Pakistani universities (Public or Private). As compared to previous system in which teacher who teaches the subject was not involve in paper setting and marking, in this system, teacher is responsible for teaching subject, setting exam papers and paper marking.

Regarding the system, participants from both universities, raised their concern about having only one evaluation method in semester system which is teacher evaluation by students. Research shows that high percentages (58% PU and 48% IUB) of participants have shown their disagreement with the statement that there should be one evaluation method which is evaluation of teachers by students. Various reasons are

presented by interview participants. As teacher has full authority of subject results of students because of no second paper marker system in universities, some teachers keep their students happy from high marks and get highly rated performance evaluation scores. Also because, performance review report is written mainly on the basis of student evaluation and research work, those who do not deserve high rating from students, obtain a good performance review report on the basis of this high rating only because they have favored their students by giving them high subject marks. In addition to this issue, many participants emphasized that only teacher evaluation by student is not enough for evaluating teaching, other methods of evaluation like peer evaluation or lecture observation should be introduced. As this desire of multi source teacher evaluation method (in statement 14 of questionnaire) is supported by 66% percent of PU and 78% of IUB participants. Because according to participants, firstly students are not mature enough to give their opinions. Secondly, sometimes students feel pressure of their academic results and favor the teacher in his evaluation which he does not deserve. These concerns are clearly mentioned from the statements like

"I will not agree with only method of teacher evaluation which is by students because to students those teachers who put pressure and more learning stress are counted to be bad teachers and those who keep them relax throughout the semester and eventually give them good marks at the end considered to be best teachers"(Associate Professor, IUB).

"Biases and favoritism is increased by semester system in Pakistani universities. This two way favoritism between teachers and students not only affect performance of teachers but also of students. In order to control this, comprehensive pattern including all aspects of semester system have to be defined" (Dean, IUB).

Another participant accentuated the problem in different aspect said that

"Why should I be assessed by those students who do not even attend my classes? Also, teacher evaluation for most of the students is not more than filling simple forms, but they do not know what influences they make on our performance review report" (Assistant Professor B, PU).

Research

The Higher education commission (HEC) of Pakistan, as mentioned above, has taken various initiatives in order to improve higher education in Pakistan. Developing the research culture in Pakistani universities is one of the major steps taken by HEC. Previously, research in terms of articles, research papers and journals, was missing element in universities of Pakistan. Considering the high standard of research in high ranked universities all over the world, Pakistani universities are now putting their best efforts in encouraging research culture in their teachers. In order to implement this, HEC has formulated the policy for public sector universities that every promotion within teaching sector of universities will highly be depended on research publications of the person who is applying for the higher post. Also, annual character report for performance review of each teacher must be written on the basis of quality of research work done by the teacher. In addition to this, HEC is also offering full funding for national and international conferences participation to any university teacher and allocating budget for the national institutions who are publishing their own journals.

As compare to past scenario, where the teachers were recruited and promoted on the basis of higher qualification and experience, this research culture is like an organizational change especially in public sector universities of Pakistan. Teachers have welcomed this culture for their professional and organizational development but our research in IUB shows that the major issue is of proper training for this change. Most of the IUB participants expressed their desire to do high quality research work, but they mentioned that they have not been given proper training for this. They emphasized that support from senior colleagues and

department heads regarding research skills development is highly unavailable.

As one of junior Assistant Professor mentioned that

"I want to do research for my professional development, but I need guidance in choosing the area, methodologies and whole context in which I conduct my research. But no senior seem to be highly committed to develop research skills in junior staff" (Assistant Professor, IUB).

"For developing high quality research culture, sense of competition between faculty members has to be eradicated first. Because seniors often think that if we will help juniors today, they might perform better and will get our position tomorrow" (Dean, IUB).

Another, issue regarding research culture, raised by IUB participants is of busy schedule in semester system. According to them there is tight schedule in semester system consisting of regular classes, paper setting, paper marking, conducting presentations and checking assignments etc. Because of these busy activities of semester system, teachers do not have enough time to concentrate on their research work. Also, some teachers stressed that they have been over burdened because of part time lectures in their respective department due to less number of highly qualified staff (like M.Phil or PHD).

One respondent insisted that

"High quality Research needs time, and in this busy schedule of semester system, where teachers are over burden by part time teaching, it is quiet hard to produce high quality research work. This lack of timing and self pressure of professional development, then lead people towards Plagiarism" (Associate Professor, IUB).

Almost all the interview (IUB) participants (when asked about research or teaching emphasis in their university) mentioned that more emphasis in their university is on teaching not on research. They mentioned that this is because of problems of proper time management and lack of training or guidance for enhancing research skills. But all of them agree that there is great pressure from higher authorities to setup high quality research culture. Also, it is interesting to note here that some participants mentioned their concern about emphasis on research. According to them teaching should be improved first. They emphasized that teachers in Pakistani universities context have to enhance teaching skills first and then should concentrate on research side because it is primary need of our students.

One respondent underscored that

"Yes there is huge pressure of research culture has been created from HEC, but we have to understand that the area of teaching should still be of more attention because our teachers still need to learn new teaching methodologies for their students. We are now ignoring teaching side of teacher performance and pushing them towards research culture" (Dean, IUB).

On the other side, in private sector case study university (PU) of our research presents totally opposite picture as compared to IUB. Participants showed high satisfaction regarding research area of their university. In Preston University, there is strong emphasis on research culture, as they provide consistent guidance or mentoring for research skills and ideas to their faculty members. Research skills workshops and seminars are conducted in order to improve research capabilities of their faculty members. Almost all the participants mentioned that there are clear instructions from upper management of the university that every senior teacher has to act as a mentor for their juniors in order to provide him guidance about research areas,

methodologies and new ideas. Also, it is mentioned by PU participants that for improving teachers' research performance, university has established reward system for the teachers for high performance in research area. In addition to that, university takes research projects from different private sector companies and conducts team research on proposing different solutions of their business problems. This is another difference or gain of private sector universities that they emphasize on research not only for professional development of its faculty members but also for their institutional development by increasing their organizational learning.

System Implications and Recommendations

Designing Performance Management System

Research findings revealed that proper performance evaluation system for teacher evaluation and development is highly lacking in case study universities. Specially, in public sector case study university of current research is still working with traditional old PM system without any engagement of teachers while conducting this process, which is raising problems of mistrust, lack of professional development and communication. However, in private sector university newly introduced system is working well initially but research shows clear concerns about knowledge of system that is been given to teachers, training of appraisers, communication and only method of evaluation in semester system which is teacher evaluation by students. As an initial step of improvement, proper design and training of PM designed system to heads of departments and teachers are basic steps in order to have effective staff performance.

Formalizing the Performance Policy

Universities are the places where knowledge is created and evaluated and these professors or high ranked teachers, who are knowledge contributor or evaluator, are the most suitable persons for formalization of the performance management system policy under the umbrella of best theoretical models and present context of their university. One of the major reasons of having no effective PM system in universities is because universities in Pakistan lack proper human resource department which can formulate performance strategy for university (Amna Malik, 2009). So in that case each university could form a committee consisting of high ranked and well experienced professors specifically for the task of PM policy development consisting of performance evaluation and performance development policies. Committee after detail discussion and possible encounters of all scenarios should form a written policy which should be available to all, mentioning that how the system will work and what expected outcomes of this system are.

PM System Training of Department Heads

Whatever the PM system is and whoever has made it, eventually responsibility of facilitation and process conduction comes on department heads. Because they, play role of middle management for effective performance of their staff. As research shows that in both case study universities, department heads are not trained for facilitating the performance evaluation process and this lack of system knowledge and training leads towards low motivation for conducting performance review meetings. After formalization of performance policy department heads need to be fully trained and informed by the whole system and its implications. Different training sessions, workshops and seminars could be conducted as in house training programs in university for enhancing appraisal, counseling and professional development skills of department heads. One major issue of budget constraint at this point for these training sessions can be the hurdle for this process. In order to eradicate this constraint these training programs can be conducted by members of that committee which developed the performance policy for university because they know the actual mechanism, motives

and execution process of performance policy. Considering the communication problem which is mentioned by almost all the participants of this research, training for conducting effective performance review with a positive approach to learning and development is highly needed. Department heads need to be trained for complete performance cycle by equipping them with interviewing skills for appraisal tasks, coaching and mentoring skills for teachers professional development and facilitating and feedback skills for constructive utilization of the process.

Increasing Motivation

Department heads training, for effective performance appraisal and staff development skills, does not guarantee their high motivation of PM process execution. As Longenecker and Fink (1990) insisted that "Knowing how to do appraisals is one thing and wanting to do is another". The feel of department heads that performance review meetings and discussion is additional job for them and they have to manage time for this overburdened job, need to be eradicated. These appraisals need to be part of department head job specifications. Moreover, heads performance should also be evaluated on his appraisals and evaluation to rate his effectiveness at evaluating their faculty members (Gray, 2002). There is no doubt, that pressure on department heads for effective communication and performance reviews conduction, have to be maintained specially in public sector universities. As research showed, that in private sector case study university department heads feels their responsibility and show high motivation because of continuous pressure from upper management. For maintaining these pressures, continuous audits in each department by external team are required in order to obtain real picture of each department situation regarding PM system. These audits can be consisting of faculty satisfaction survey about communication, performance review meetings or about professional development of teachers. Such audits can put continuous pressure on department heads to conduct formal or informal performance review meetings in effective manner. This pressure building maybe disliked specially among public sector universities, but it can be a way to create check upon check system, so that everyone would have in his mind that I have to report someone for my progress, which system is highly lacking in public sector environment.

Conclusion

It is safe to draw conclusion from the results of questionnaire and interviews, that faculty members are not highly satisfied from the current PM systems in both the case study universities. Both universities participants have shown their concerns about lack of communication, less emphasis on performance review meetings and uni-source performance evaluation system. However, Private Sector University has implemented new PM system with more emphasis on training and mentoring culture for research purposes within the university which is highly appreciated by the participants. But still in Public sector universities, because traditional system of annual report (ACR) for performance appraisal is in use, teachers are concerned about their training needs and comprehensive performance evaluation. Current research in this paper, has explored number of operational issues regarding ineffective communication between heads and teachers. The study showed that reality was far from the ideal, heads are stressed because of time pressure, teachers are less motivated because they are not been encouraged by their heads, appraisal process is ambiguous because of no clear guidance for conducting it, teachers and heads use to hesitate performance reviews for avoiding potential conflicts and incompetence of department heads because of no training for this process are hurdles in having effective communication in PM process. Also, research focuses on teaching and research problems of teachers, which show lack of training in research skills and single method of performance evaluation, are key stumbling blocks in delivering expected performance in these two areas.

References and Further Readings

- Aguinis, H. (2007) *Performance management*, Printice Hall, London.
- Ali, T. (2007) '*Professional Development of Teachers at Higher Education in Pakistan*', paper presented at National Conference on Professional Development of Teachers in Higher Education in Pakistan, Islamabad: Pakistan, 16-18 January, pp.73-79.
- Amna Malik, M. (2009) Personal interview with Director General Learning Innovation HEC, Islamabad, Pakistan, 21 June.
- Armstrong, M. & Baron, A. (2005) *Managing Performance: Performance management in action*, CIPD, London.
- Armstrong, M. & Baron, A. (1998) *Performance Management: The new realities*, CIPD, London.
- Armstrong, M. (2006) *Key strategies and Practical Guidelines: 3rd edition*, Kogan Page, London.
- Armstrong, M. (1999) *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*, 7th edition, Kogan Page, London.
- Armstrong, M. (2000) *Performance Management: Key Strategies and Practical Guidelines*, 2nd. Edition, Kogan Page, London.
- Ashton, P. (1993) *Mentoring as means of staff development in higher education*, University of Central Lancashire, Preston.
- Awan, J.I. (2009) Personal interview with Chief Organizer of Faculty Development Programs, Islamabad, Pakistan, 21 June.
- Batool, Z and Qureshi, R.H. (2007) *Quality Assurance Manual for Higher Education in Pakistan*, Higher Education Commission, Pakistan.
- Bacal, R. (1999) *Performance Management*, McGraw-Hill, USA.
- Bayley, D.H. (1967) '*Making College Teaching a Profession*', *Improving College and University Teaching*, 15, pp.115-119.
- Bligh, D. (1975) *Teaching Students*, Exeter University Teaching Services, England.
- Boyer, E. (1987) *College: The undergraduate Experience in America*, Harper Row, New York.
- Bones, C. (1996) '*Performance Management: the HR contribution*', Paper presented at *Annual Conference of Institute of Personnel and Development*, Harrogate, October.
- Burns, R.B. (2000) *Introduction to Research Methods*, 4th Edition, Sage Publication, London.
- Cassell, C and Symon, G. (1995) *Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research: A Practical Guide*, Sage Publications, London.
- Centra, J.A. (1974) '*The relationship between student and alumni rating of teachers*', *Educational and Psychology Measurement*, 34(2), pp.321-326.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L and Morrison, K. (2007) *Research Methods in Education*, 6th. edition, Routledge, London.
- Cokins, G. (2004) *Performance Management*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken.
- Diaz Maggioni, G. (2004) '*A passion for Learning: Teacher-Centred Professional Development*', paper presented at IATEFL 2005 Conference, Alexandria.
- Doyle, K.O. (1975) *Student Evaluation of Instruction*, Lexington Books, Lexington.
- Dressel, P. (1970) '*Evaluation of the environment, the process, and the result of higher education*', in *Handbook of College and University Administration*, A.S Knowles (eds), McGraw Hill, New York.
- Eble, K.E (1976) *The Craft of Teaching*, Jossry-Bass, San Francisco.
- Fletcher, C. (2004) *Appraisal and Feedback: Making Performance Review Work*, CIPD, London.
- Fletcher, S. (2000) *Mentoring in Schools*, Kogan Page, London.
- Gabris, G. T. & Ihrke, D. M. (2001) '*Does performance appraisal contributes to heightened levels of employees burnout? The results of one study*', *Public Personal management*, 30, 157-172.
- Gage, N.L. (1974) '*Students rating of college teaching: their justification and proper use*', paper presented at the Second OCSB conference on effective teaching, October, pp.79-86.
- Greer, R., (2001) *Strategic Human Resource Management: A general managerial approach*, 2nd edition. Printice Hall; London.
- Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Basic Books, New York.
- Goldstein, R.J and Anderson R.C. (1977) '*Attitude of faculty towards teaching*', *Improving College and university teaching*, 25(2), pp 110-113.
- Gibbs, G. (1981) *Teaching Students to Learn: A student centred approach*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes.
- Gray, G. (2002) '*Performance Appraisals Don't Work*', *Industrial management*, 44, pp.15-18.
- Hartle, F. (1995). *Transforming the Performance Management Process*, Kogan Page, London.
- Hartley, J. (1994) '*Case studies in organizational research*', in *Qualitative methods in organizational research*, C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), Sage, London.
- Hoban, G. (2002) *Teacher Learning for Education Change*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Irby, D.M (1978) *Clinical faculty development*, McGraw Hill, New York.
- Jan, A.A. (2007) '*Mentoring the tool of teacher development and assessment*', paper presented at National Conference on Professional Development of Teachers in Higher Education in Pakistan, Islamabad: Pakistan, 16-18 January, pp.32-36.
- Jones, J. (2001) *Performance Management for School Improvement: A Practical guide for secondary Schools*, David Fulton Publishers, London.
- Kahn, S. (1993) '*Better Teaching through Better Evaluation: a guide for faculty and institutions*', *To Improve the Academy*, vol. 12, pp.111-126.
- Kavle, S. (1996) *Interviews*, Sage Publications, London.
- Kent, L. (1967) '*Student evaluation of teaching*', in *Improving college teaching*, Lee, C.B.T. (eds), American Council on Education, Washington D.C.
- Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (2000) '*Performance appraisal reactions: Measurement, modeling and method bias*', *Journal of Applied*

Psychology, 85, 708-723.

- Koontz, H., & Wehrich, H. (2005) *Essentials of Management: An International Perspectives*, 6th edition, McGraw-Hill; New York.
- Lockett, J. (1992) *Effective Performance Management: A strategic guide to getting best from people*, Kogan Page, London.
- Longenecker, C.O and Fink, L.S. (1990) 'Why performance appraisals still fail', *Journal of Compensation and Benefits*, 6, pp.36-41.
- Lucas, A.F. (1989) 'Maximizing impact on the organization: teach chairs faculty development skills', in *A Handbook for New Practitioners*, E. Wadsworth (eds), New Forum Press, Stillwater Ok, pp157-161.
- Maria, D. (2000) *Performance Management in Theory and Practice: An Organizational Case Study*, MSC thesis, University of Manchester.
- McMaster, D.M. (1986). *Performance Management: Creating the Conditions for Results*, Palace Press, Singapore.
- McGreal, D.M. (1988). 'Evaluation for enhancing instruction: Linking teacher evaluation and staff development', in *Teacher evaluation six prescriptions for success*, S.J. Stanley and W.J. Pophan (eds), Association and curriculum development, Alexandria,.
- Memon, M.A. (2007) 'Professional Development of Teachers at Higher Education institutions in Pakistan: Some Alternatives', paper presented at National Conference on Professional Development of Teachers in Higher Education in Pakistan, Islamabad: Pakistan, 16-18 January, pp.104-111.
- Melnick, M and Adams, P, (1975) 'Teaching improvement program in post secondary education', In *Reform, Renewal, Reward*, Allen, D.W (eds), University of Massachusetts.
- Miller, R.I. (1974) *Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation*, Jossey Bass, San Francisco.
- Miller, D.M and Pine, G.J. (1990) 'Advancing Professional Inquiry for educational improvement through action research', *Journal of staff development*, 11(3), pp.56-61.
- Miller, R.I. (1972) *Evaluating faculty performance*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Miles, M, and Huberman, M. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis*, 2nd. Edition, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Morton, R.K. (1961) 'Evaluating College Teaching', *Improving College and University Teaching*, 9, pp.122-123.
- Moses, I. (1985) 'Academic development limits and the improvement of teaching', *Higher Education*, 14, pp.75-100.
- Nicholls, G. (2002) *Developing Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, Routledge, London.
- Nicholls, G. (2001) *Professional Development in Higher Education: new dimensions and directions*, Kogan Page, London.
- Ozmon, H. (1967) 'Publication and Teaching', *Improving College and University Teaching*, 15, pp.196-107.
- Pambookian, H.S. (1972) *The effect of feedback from students to college instructors on their teaching behaviour*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Peterson, K.D. (2000) *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices*, 7th edition, CA: Corwin, Thousand Oaks.
- Preston University Website (2009) Introduction to University, Preston University [Online], Available: <http://www.prestonpak.edu.pk/main.aspx?id=4&menuid=345>.
- Rashid, M. (2009) Personal interview with Dean Faculty of Education, Islamabad, Pakistan, 17 June.
- Reddy, Y.K. (2006) *University Administration*, 1st. edition, Omega Publications, New Dehli.
- Robson, C. (2002) *Real World Research*, 2nd. Edition, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Safdar, M. (2009) 'Public and Private Universities in Pakistan', *The News [Pakistan]*, 12 May.
- Sayer, S and Harding, A.G. (1975) 'The assessment of teaching effectiveness, end or mean?', paper presented at First International Conference for Improving University Teaching, University of Maryland.
- Sapsford, R. (1999) *Survey Research*, Sage, London.
- Sheikh,S.H. (2007) 'Evaluation of the Teachers by the High Ups, By the Students, By the Peers and Self Assessment', paper presented at National Conference on Professional Development of Teachers in Higher Education in Pakistan, Islamabad, Pakistan,16-18 January, pp.18-21.
- Skerritt, O.Z. (1992) *Professional Development in Higher Education: A Theoretical Framework for Action Research*, Kogan Page, London.
- Skelton, A. (2005) *Understanding Teaching Excellence in Higher Education: Towards a Critical approach*, Routledge, London.
- Seldin, P. (1980) *Successful faculty evaluation programs: A practical guide to improve faculty performance and promotion/tenure decisions*, Conventry press, Curgers.
- Seldin, P. (1975) *How Colleges Evaluate Professors*, Blythe Pennington Ltd, New York.
- Smyth, W.J. (1985) 'Developing a critical practice of clinical supervision', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 17(1), pp.1-15.
- Stafyarakis, M. & Eldridge, D. (2002) HRD and Performance Management, MSc in Human Resource Development Reading 5, IDPM University of Manchester.
- Stronge, J.H. (2006) *Evaluating Teaching*, 2nd. Ed, Corwin Press, California.
- Stronge, J.H. (1995) 'Balancing individual and institutional goals in educational personnel evaluation: A conceptual framework', *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, vol 21, pp.131-151.
- Tahir, A. (2007) 'Professional Development of Teachers at Higher Education in Pakistan', paper presented at National Conference on Professional Development of Teachers in Higher Education in Pakistan, Islamabad: Pakistan, 16-18 January, pp.73-79.
- Vonk, J.H.C. (1995) 'Mentoring Students and Beginning Teachers', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(5), pp.551-537.
- Walters, M. (1995) *The Performance Management Handbook*, Institute of personnel and development, London.
- White, A. (1995) *Managing for performance: How to get best out of yourself and your team*, Piatkus, London.
- Wilson, J. P. (2005) *Human Resource Development*, 2nd edition, Kogan Page, London

