Students' Perception on Lecturer Evaluation in Higher Education

Karwan Hushyar Sherwani[1] & Uma Shankar Singh[2]

[1] Department of Business and Administration, Ishik University, Erbil, Iraq
[2] Department of Business and Administration, Ishik University, Erbil, Iraq
Correspondence: Karwan Hushyar Sherwani, Ishik University, Erbil, Iraq.
Email:karwan.shwerwani@ishik.edu.iq

Received: July 11, 2015 Accepted: August 19, 2015 Online Published: September 1, 2015

Abstract: The research is descriptive in nature and is based on the concept of measuring the lecturer's performance in universities and the efficiency of the instrument provided by ministry of higher education. The research problem cited as the need of understanding student's psychology and perception on the lecturer evaluation system in higher education. For this purpose research objectives taken are, to measure the acceptance of variables getting measured for the lecturer evaluation by the instrument of higher education and to know students perception on lecturer in higher. For the purpose of concept building secondary literature reviewed and primary data is the base for outcome of this research. A self-explained instrument is created taking 21 items with 4 demographic variables. A sample size of 157 respondents considered from different universities and grades in Kurdistan. The analysis is based on reliability testing, statistical T-Test and One Way ANOVA using SPSS 20. All 21 variables are getting accepted with very significant values for acceptance shows respondent's opinion significantly varies on all 21 variables using statistical T-test. One Way ANOVA test is performed taking 84 sets prepared shows 44 sets having accepted though 40 sets rejected. At the conclusion ten variable for the performance evaluation for the lecturer is strongly recommended for the mutual development and to contribute in development process of society.

Keywords: Higher Education, Perception, Feedback, Lecturer, Student Evaluation

1. Introduction

Student evaluation has a long history and has grown in it is priority and importance over the last century in the beginnings of 1920s and now it is a common practice currently in most of the universities (Wachtel, 1998). In universities of Erbil, student evaluation has been more common from the last decade, but it is increased importance after the reformation of Kurdistan Region's Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific research's reformation package. In the reformation package, Ministry of Higher Education offered the universities the requirement to establish Quality Assurance Unit in order set standards and increase quality in universities of Kurdistan Region. Likewise, Quality Assurance Unit is responsible to conduct some forms of questionnaires and to measure the effectiveness of academic staffs in their respective university (MHESR, 2009). One of the responsibilities of Quality Assurance Unit is to manage the process of student evaluation process (MHESR, 2009). Evaluation of lecturer's performance is measured through questionnaire instruments with open qualitative comments dependent on the university policies. These data collected from these instruments are used for a range of different purposes including feedback to improve the quality of instruction or as an input to measurement process of lecturer performance or finally to response to government requirements (Palmer, 2012).

Basically, evaluation are used as a key measure of teaching quality by many higher education institutions in lecturer performance progressions and it is also used by lecturers to evaluate their reflections and contributions on teaching the students (Sulong, 2014). Potential discussions are in the literature regarding the student evaluation's validity, reliability and stability of the instruments used during the process. However, the discussion of validity, reliability and stability is due to the crucial role these data collected are playing in the success of teaching evaluation system (Chen & Hoshower, 2003). Perhaps due to initiatives associated with Assessment for Learning, there is a considerable amount of research into formative assessment (see McDowell, Sambell & Davison, 2009, for an overview) which appears justified by studies into its effects on learning.

The work of Sadler (1989) underpins much of the research; he identifies three necessary conditions for students to benefit. Students must: To take these actions, Sadler argues, students must necessarily have some of the evaluative skills of their teacher, and this can by no means be taken for granted. Effective formative feedback not only gives useful information to students, but also to teachers, who can inform and shape teaching (Gibbs & Simpson, 2004). These authors provide very useful analyses of formative assessment and the conditions under which it promotes worthwhile learning. Both models are offered to teachers as a means to evaluate their own assessment practice, and were considered when designing the FFI discussed here. Changes in higher education have led to increased numbers of students, many of whom are from non-traditional backgrounds. This has highlighted the need for reform, though the corresponding pressures on staff and on resources mean that many desirable innovations are not easy to implement (Gibbs & Simpson, 2004). The many problems associated with feedback, led them to conclude that it is 'not a pretty picture' (Gibbs & Simpson, 2004, p.11). It would seem that there are barriers to a successful feedback dialogue from both student and staff perspectives, with both groups expressing frustrations. To begin with there is evidence, and plenty of anecdotes, which suggest that some students do not, in fact, read feedback (Wojtas, 1998, cited by Duncan, 2007).

2. Literature Review

Today, centralized administered systems of student evaluation have become normal practice in universities globally in order to collect data to monitor academic lecturers' development and quality (Stein, Spiller, Terry, Harris, Deaker, & Kennedy, 2013). In most of the tertiary universities these forms of evaluations are prepared to be confidential or anonymous to keep the privacy of students' feedback concerning the lecturers. The gathering of data for evaluation requires commitment to quality teaching and assessment of instructional effectiveness (Dilts, Haber, & Bialik, 1994). Accountability and use of standards, as new trends in higher education institutions, lead to increase in student evaluation forms of lecturers and its effectiveness (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007).

The history of student evaluation dates back to 1920s through the works of Remmers, and 1970s is considered as "Golden Age of Student Evaluations", due to researchers' support for using forms of student evaluation in higher education (Wachtel, 1998). Evaluation of Lecturers is a basic part of education process, many important decisions concerning the lecturers are based on the information gathered from this evaluation (Machingambi & Wadesango, 2011) The feedback of students, usually used in the process of determining promotion and tenure in many higher education institutions (Lindahl & Unger, 2010; Darwin, 2010). However, Wichtel (1998) identified and compared many articles support

for and oppose the use of Student Evaluation and identified factors that affect student evaluations from student's perspective and lecturer's perspective. Therefore, the validity and reliability of such evaluation is crucial. Assessing the performance of lecturers is not an easy process, because in most of the universities, lecturers are expected to engage in service, research along with teaching (Dilts, Haber, & Bialik, 1994). However, student evaluation is recommended to be triangulated with other evaluation methods to increase the validity and reliability in the evaluation of lecturers (Machingambi & Wadesango, 2011). Student's perception is continuously considered as a significant factor in evaluating lecturers (Dodeen, 2013). Currently, in Universities of Kurdistan Region, Student's feedback (Evaluation) for academic lecturer is considered as a part of Quality Assurance procedures which initiated by Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. Therefore, most of the universities either paper based or online, they conduct the centralized questionnaire written and prepare by the Quality Assurance Unit. Lecturers are evaluated from multiple dimensions, and student's feedback or evaluation is a part of it. The questionnaire consists of 11 items, and measured by 5 levels, 1-5. The evaluation of pedagogical practices and lecturers are complex social activity (Darwin, 2010), in this process there are potential impediments affect the reliability and validity of student evaluations. Accordingly, the evaluation forms of student evaluation have potential bias due to college, expected grades, and class size and some forms of evaluation are not enough to provide enough information for the improvement of lecturers (Dodeen, 2013). In addition, lack of motivation for the process of evaluation, and untrained evaluators are potential factors that hinder the success of evaluation process (Rasheed, Aslam, Yousaf, & Noor, 2011). In contrast, many researchers believe that student evaluation of lectuers are valid and effective measures of lecturing effectiviness and are geniune and unaffected by variables as potential partiality and bias to the process of evaluation (Hejase, Al Kaakour, Halawi, & Hejase, 2013).

Likewise, some researchers has verified the correlation between the expected grades in the examinations and values given by students (Diaz & Ragan, 2010; Stehle, Spinath, & Kadmon, 2012). Gender and Age are other factors affect the student evaluation especially female lecturers (Bianchini, Lissoni, & Pezzoni, 2013; Kogan, Schoenfeld-Tacher, & Hellyer, 2010). However, still some researchers think the learner is in the best position to judge the effectiveness of lecturers, (Price, Handley, Millar, & O'Donovan, 2010). A potential factor affects the perception of students of the evaluation of students is self-promotion or boastfulness of lecturers (Farreras & Boyle, 2012). Farreras and Boyle found that lecturers who praise themselves get lowest evaluation values, rather than the students give highest evaluation values to lecturers whom they have strong personality and competence attributions. Moreover, student perceptions may vary due to student's psychological natures. Some students are systematically more lenient in evaluating the lecturers; some students are more severe (Rantanen, 2013). Thus, accordingly students' rating varies depending up on course difficulty, expected grades, characteristics of the lecturer, or personal emotions of students.

In their research Chen & Hoshower (2003), studied the student perception and motivation in teaching evaluation, they found students consider an improvement in teaching and improvement in course content and format to be most attractive outcomes of teaching evaluation. However, using the evaluatin outcomes for lecturer's tenure, promotion, or salary rise decision were less important for student's viewpoint and students motivation to participate in evaluation was influeced by consideration of their feedbacks by lecturers (Chen & Hoshower, 2003). Moreover, students perception may vary upon gender

basis, female students are more serious in evaluation process than male students and female student's and female students consider the process as more important than male students consider it (Heine & Maddox, 2009). Likewise, the students also belived that professors adjust their in class behavior at the end of semester to achieve higher evaluations, and the higher grade predicted the higher the evaluation of professors (Heine & Maddox, 2009). Furthermore, a research conducted in Lebanon by (Hejase, Al Kaakour, Halawi, & Hejase, 2013) studying the perception of students on the evaluation, the research revealed that students were positive and perceived the evaluation process as effective and appropriate to evaluate teaching. Thus, the result indicates that students are seen as responsible to assess the lecturers effectiviness. In most universities, student evaluations are conducted in the end of semester or the year. In contrast, some universities are conducting a series of evaluations to evaluate the lecturers' effectiveness, they use a form to assess the lecturer's effectiviness after 3 weeks of teaching, then in the end of the semester. Moreover, they believe that, a lecturer must understand his/her weakness and receive a priliminary feedback before the semester ends to adjust him/her self to be effective.

Given the importance of assessment to almost everyone in education, it is to be expected that it is the subject of frequent debate. Though as Gibbs and Simpson (2004) point out, much of the attention it receives is negative, often used to support claims of falling standards, disputed grades and examiner incompetence. When the issue of assessment is raised in the media or quality assurance settings, the focus is likely to be on measurement, rather than on learning, which is the concern of this study and others mentioned within it.

3. Research Problem and Objectives

Gibbs and Simpson (2004) note that for a long time assessment in higher education was characterized by a lack of transparency, and founded on tacit knowledge, "that which we know but cannot tell," (Polyani, cited by Elander, 2003, p.117). So the move over the last decade towards assessment for learning, or even assessment as teach (Boyd & Bloxham, 2009), which encourages student involvement and engagement in the process, is to be welcomed. The evaluation of lecturer's by students is one of the data's considered in many universities. There are many articles discussed the emotional, expected grades and time limitation, ethics etc. Factors affect the reliability of the information. In order to understand the student's viewpoint, we need to ask their perception about the acceptability of the evaluation questionnaire. Based on many literatures contribution in research related to students feedback or evaluation system in academic institutions, the present research is citing the research problem as the need of understanding students psychology and perception on the lecturer evaluation system in higher education.

For the purpose of reaching the solution to the problem cited above, following objectives set and the research is providing enough empirical evidences with statistical analysis fulfilling these.

- To measure the acceptance of variables getting measured for the lecturer evaluation by the instrument of higher education.
- To know student's perception on lecturer in higher education.

4. Research Methodology

This research is based on the concept of measuring the lecturer's performance in universities and the efficiency of the instrument provided by ministry of higher education. For this purpose the descriptive method of research was adopted. For the purpose of concept building secondary literature reviewed and prepared the base concept for the research in the upper sections. Primary data is the base for outcome of this research. The first phase was devoted to collect secondary data though the second phase was for the collection of primary data by Gibbs & Simpson (2004). The literature study helped to find the dimensions to study and to prepare the self-explained instrument. The instrument is created taking 21 items with 4 demographic variables. Respondents were the students of Kurdistan from different universities and grades. The population was well understood and clustered at universities, so data collection became easier and could get on time with qualified respondents. A sample of 157 respondents has been taken for the study and to collect primary data. The sample size taken is small due the limitation for accessing students during summer vacation period, the duration of data collection. The primary data collected and further analyzed using SPSS 20 version. The reliability testing performed and the Cronbach's Alpha value supported the acceptance of questionnaire as a measuring instrument. A frequency and percentage analysis is performed for all variables with demographic data too by Elander (2003). To check the acceptability for the variables T-Test is performed and, further to know the variance in opinion of respondents One Way ANOVA is performed. The analysis is based on the output of SPSS 20 and outputs are presented in tables as research findings.

5. Research Findings and Results

The complete analysis is performed using reliability analysis, T- test and ANOVA and presented using tables. Firstly the reliability of the instrument is tested using SPSS 20, which provided the output as value 0.776 for 21 items taken in study based on literature review and presented as Table I. Since the reliability value is under the acceptance region, so instrument can get considered for the study to measure the items mentioned in this by Elander (2003).

Table 1: Reliability Statistics

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.776	21

The further analysis is performed to analyze the frequency and percentage of responses on different options taking the 4 demographic variables and 21 items variables taken for the study in this research as presented in Table II. The table shows that the most of respondents participated in the study are female with 21 to 25 age group have single status and belong to 1st grade of university education by Gibbs & Simpson (2004). The reason for this can be the random selection of clustered respondents. Further twenty variables are showing comparative much higher frequencies with agree and strongly agree options except only being in not sure. For the purpose of checking the acceptability of variable the T-Test (O'Brien, 1981) is performed on 21 variables taking the test value 3, where all 21 variables are

getting accepted with very significant values for acceptance shows respondent's opinion significantly varies on all 21 variables. None of the variable is getting rejected, as not having the significance value more than 0.05 presented in Table III by Cohen (1992). For the purpose of further analysis of variance of respondent's opinion on 21 variables, One Way ANOVA test is performed taking 4 demographic variables as factor. There are 84 sets prepared and tested taking the significance value 0.05. Out of 84, the sets having the more than 0.05 are 44 shows respondent opinion is significantly not varying on these 21 sets by O'Brien (1981). Other 40 sets are getting accepted with value less than the 0.05 shows that respondent opinion is significantly varying on 40 sets shown in Table IV below by Cohen (1992).

Table 2: Respondents Profile and Variables Description

Respondents Profile and Variables Description			
Parameters		**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Gender	Male	39	24.8
	Female	118	75.2
Age	15-20 years	35	22.3
	21-25 years	114	72.6
	26-30 years	8	5.1
	31-35 years	00	00
	36 years and more	00	00
Marital Status	Married	17	10.8
	Single	140	89.2
Class	1st Grade	99	63.1
	2nd Grade	55	35.0
	3rd Grade	3	1.9
	4th Grade	00	00
Lecturer evaluation by students	Strongly Disagree	00	00
	Disagree	13	8.3
	Not Sure	13	8.3
	Agree	78	49.7
	Strongly Agree	53	33.8
Responsible to evaluate lecturers	Strongly Disagree	8	5.1
	Disagree	14	8.9
	Not Sure	21	13.4
	Agree	86	54.8
	Strongly Agree	28	17.8
Frequency of feedback every 3 weeks	Strongly Disagree	3	1.9
	Disagree	12	7.6
	Not Sure	69	43.9
	Agree	62	39.5
	Strongly Agree	11	7.0
Frequency of feedback after end of the course	Strongly Disagree	00	00
	Disagree	27	17.2
	Not Sure	47	29.9
	Agree	73	46.5

	Strongly Agree	10	6.4
Feedback process at our university	Strongly Disagree	10	6.4
	Disagree	18	11.5
	Not Sure	43	27.4
	Agree	43	27.4
	Strongly Agree	43	27.4
Lecturer knowledge evaluated	Strongly Disagree	11	7.0
	Disagree	15	9.6
	Not Sure	45	28.7
	Agree	60	38.2
	Strongly Agree	26	16.6
Lecturer performance evaluated	Strongly Disagree	6	3.8
	Disagree	15	9.6
	Not Sure	53	33.8
	Agree	61	38.9
	Strongly Agree	22	14.0
Course flow with the department	Strongly Disagree	1	.6
	Disagree	32	20.4
	Not Sure	62	39.5
	Agree	56	35.7
	Strongly Agree	6	3.8
Comparison of syllabus with the whole course	Strongly Disagree	00	00
	Disagree	8	5.1
	Not Sure	80	51.0
	Agree	50	31.8
	Strongly Agree	19	12.1
Comment on lecturer's class	Strongly Disagree	6	3.8
	Disagree	28	17.8
	Not Sure	35	22.3
	Agree	49	31.2
	Strongly Agree	39	24.8
Lecturer punctuality	Strongly Disagree	8	5.1
	Disagree	17	10.8
	Not Sure	40	25.5
	Agree	42	26.8
	Strongly Agree	50	31.8
Lecturer behavior evaluation by students	Strongly Disagree	7	4.5
	Disagree	14	8.9
	Not Sure	35	22.3
	Agree	59	37.6
	Strongly Agree	42	26.8
Lecturer usage of teaching aids	Strongly Disagree	13	8.3
	Disagree	3	1.9
	Not Sure	50	31.8
	Agree	56	35.7
	Strongly Agree	35	22.3

Lecturer chance to students for interaction	Strongly Disagree	00	00
	Disagree	17	10.8
	Not Sure	17	10.8
	Agree	39	24.8
	Strongly Agree	84	53.5
Feedback improves lecturer-student relationships	Strongly Disagree	7	4.5
	Disagree	16	10.2
	Not Sure	23	14.6
	Agree	65	41.4
	Strongly Agree	46	29.3
Feedback process compels to be more prepare	Strongly Disagree	2	1.3
	Disagree	19	12.1
	Not Sure	39	24.8
	Agree	77	49.0
	Strongly Agree	20	12.7
Feedback process compels to be more punctual	Strongly Disagree	11	7.0
	Disagree	11	7.0
	Not Sure	52	33.1
	Agree	65	41.4
	Strongly Agree	18	11.5
Feedback process compels to be more transparent	Strongly Disagree	2	1.3
	Disagree	16	10.2
	Not Sure	33	21.0
	Agree	79	50.3
	Strongly Agree	27	17.2
Feedback process compels to be more committed	Strongly Disagree	7	4.5
	Disagree	12	7.6
	Not Sure	47	29.9
	Agree	58	36.9
	Strongly Agree	33	21.0
Feedback process compels to the better performance	Strongly Disagree	6	3.8
	Disagree	31	19.7
	Not Sure	37	23.6
	Agree	52	33.1
	Strongly Agree	31	19.7
Feedback process compels to be more disciplined	Strongly Disagree	17	10.8
	Disagree	11	7.0
	Not Sure	49	31.2
	Agree	47	29.9
	Strongly Agree	33	21.0
Total		**157**	**100**

Table 3: One-Sample T-Test

One-Sample T-Test			
Test Value = 3			
Parameters	**t**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Result**
Lecturer evaluation by students	15.775	.000	Accepted
Responsible to evaluate lecturers	8.715	.000	Accepted
Frequency of feedback every 3 weeks	6.506	.000	Accepted
Frequency of feedback after end of the course	6.209	.000	Accepted
Feedback process at our university	6.112	.000	Accepted
Lecturer knowledge evaluated	5.465	.000	Accepted
Lecturer performance evaluated	6.364	.000	Accepted
Course flow with the department	3.252	.001	Accepted
Comparison of syllabus with the whole course	8.259	.000	Accepted
Comment on lecturer's class	6.002	.000	Accepted
Lecturer punctuality	7.404	.000	Accepted
Lecturer behavior evaluation by students	8.433	.000	Accepted
Lecturer usage of teaching aids	6.995	.000	Accepted
Lecturer chance to students for interaction	14.877	.000	Accepted
Feedback improves lecturer-student relationships	9.178	.000	Accepted
Feedback process compels to be more prepare	8.291	.000	Accepted
Feedback process compels to be more punctual	5.317	.000	Accepted
Feedback process compels to be more transparent	9.892	.000	Accepted
Feedback process compels to be more committed	7.518	.000	Accepted
Feedback process compels to the better performance	5.018	.000	Accepted
Feedback process compels to be more disciplined	4.484	.000	Accepted

Table 4: One Way ANOVA

One Way ANOVA				
Parameters	**Factor**	**F Value**	**Sig.**	**Result**
Lecturer evaluation by students	Gender	.289	.592	Rejected
	Age	1.032	.359	Rejected
	Marital Status	5.110	.025	Accepted
	Class	3.874	.023	Accepted
Responsible to evaluate lecturers	Gender	8.509	.004	Accepted
	Age	.697	.500	Rejected
	Marital Status	3.000	.085	Rejected
	Class	2.583	.079	Rejected
Frequency of feedback every 3 weeks	Gender	.598	.440	Rejected
	Age	2.025	.135	Rejected
	Marital Status	26.925	.000	Accepted
	Class	.140	.869	Rejected

Frequency of feedback after end of the course	Gender	7.864	.006	Accepted
	Age	1.552	.215	Rejected
	Marital Status	.314	.576	Rejected
	Class	5.385	.005	Accepted
Feedback process at our university	Gender	4.431	.037	Accepted
	Age	5.681	.004	Accepted
	Marital Status	13.128	.000	Accepted
	Class	10.235	.000	Accepted
Lecturer knowledge evaluated	Gender	.321	.572	Rejected
	Age	2.205	.114	Rejected
	Marital Status	7.064	.009	Accepted
	Class	.744	.477	Rejected
Lecturer performance evaluated	Gender	.014	.907	Rejected
	Age	8.653	.000	Accepted
	Marital Status	11.392	.001	Accepted
	Class	.645	.526	Rejected
Course flow with the department	Gender	.102	.750	Rejected
	Age	6.078	.003	Accepted
	Marital Status	.044	.835	Rejected
	Class	3.144	.046	Accepted
Comparison of syllabus with the whole course	Gender	2.936	.089	Rejected
	Age	23.150	.000	Accepted
	Marital Status	16.504	.000	Accepted
	Class	1.275	.282	Rejected
Comment on lecturer's class	Gender	.009	.923	Rejected
	Age	1.421	.245	Rejected
	Marital Status	4.471	.036	Accepted
	Class	1.621	.201	Rejected
Lecturer punctuality	Gender	5.024	.026	Accepted
	Age	1.113	.331	Rejected
	Marital Status	2.229	.137	Rejected
	Class	3.715	.027	Accepted
Lecturer behavior evaluation by students	Gender	.170	.681	Rejected
	Age	26.590	.000	Accepted
	Marital Status	16.582	.000	Accepted
	Class	4.352	.015	Accepted
Lecturer usage of teaching aids	Gender	.234	.629	Rejected
	Age	26.237	.000	Accepted
	Marital Status	20.777	.000	Accepted
	Class	.160	.853	Rejected
Lecturer chance to students for interaction	Gender	9.061	.003	Accepted
	Age	4.193	.017	Accepted
	Marital Status	.372	.543	Rejected
	Class	1.865	.158	Rejected
Feedback improves lecturer-student relationships	Gender	56.296	.000	Accepted
	Age	1.402	.249	Rejected

	Marital Status	2.127	.147	Rejected
	Class	3.142	.046	Rejected
Feedback process compels to be more prepare	Gender	1.688	.196	Rejected
	Age	10.866	.000	Accepted
	Marital Status	12.858	.000	Accepted
	Class	.821	.442	Rejected
Feedback process compels to be more punctual	Gender	7.566	.007	Accepted
	Age	2.141	.121	Rejected
	Marital Status	2.821	.095	Rejected
	Class	.574	.565	Rejected
Feedback process compels to be more transparent	Gender	.152	.697	Rejected
	Age	9.043	.000	Accepted
	Marital Status	19.333	.000	Accepted
	Class	18.585	.000	Accepted
Feedback process compels to be more committed	Gender	.057	.812	Rejected
	Age	8.372	.000	Accepted
	Marital Status	3.378	.068	Rejected
	Class	2.146	.120	Rejected
Feedback process compels to the better performance	Gender	1.882	.172	Rejected
	Age	5.044	.008	Accepted
	Marital Status	15.774	.000	Accepted
	Class	.115	.891	Rejected
Feedback process compels to be more disciplined	Gender	5.468	.021	Accepted
	Age	16.069	.000	Accepted
	Marital Status	8.423	.004	Accepted
	Class	1.082	.342	Rejected

6. Managerial Implication

The above analysis shows that all the twenty one variables namely "Lecturer evaluation by students, Responsible to evaluate lecturers, Frequency of feedback every 3 weeks, Frequency of feedback after end of the course, Feedback process at our university, Lecturer knowledge evaluated, Lecturer performance evaluated, Course flow with the department, Comparison of syllabus with the whole course, Comment on lecturer's class, Lecturer punctuality, Lecturer behavior evaluation by students, Lecturer usage of teaching aids, Lecturer chance to students for interaction, Feedback improves lecturer-student relationships, Feedback process compels to be more prepare, Feedback process compels to be more punctual, Feedback process compels to be more transparent, Feedback process compels to be more committed, Feedback process compels to the better performance, Feedback process compels to be more disciplined" taken for the study is good and must get evaluated for a lecturer. Further the One Way ANOVA result says that the study must get further executed on the mass scale to get clearer picture. This study can get used by lecturer to understand the system and can be helpful in the process of self-introspection. This can be a guide to students to understand the process and variables to participate in a fairer lecturer evaluation system. Ministry of higher education can use as a critical view of researcher on the whole process for the academic development of the Kurdistan.

7. Conclusion

The research concludes that the ministry of higher education has a very strong intension to strengthen the higher education in Kurdistan. For this purpose the lecturer evaluation is a good step. The study done here considering twenty one variables, out of which eleven are from the actual instrument ministry of higher education is using for lecturer evaluation and the rest ten are taken from other literatures. So it is strongly recommended to consider the following ten "*Lecturer punctuality, Lecturer behavior evaluation by students, Lecturer usage of teaching aids, Lecturer chance to students for interaction, Feedback improves lecturer-student relationships, Feedback process compels to be more prepare, Feedback process compels to be more punctual, Feedback process compels to be more transparent, Feedback process compels to be more committed, Feedback process compels to the better performance, Feedback process compels to be more disciplined"* variable for the performance evaluation for the lecturer. Since the whole purpose of the evaluation should be to boost the lecturer for better performance for the mutual development and to contribute in development process of society.

References

Bianchini, S., Lissoni, F., & Pezzoni, M. (2013). Instructor characteristics and students' evaluation of teaching effectiviness: evidence from an italian engineering school. *European Journal of Engineering Educaion*, 38(1), 38-57.

Boyd, D., & Bloxham, S. (2009). Editorial: Assessment Special Edition. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 3(1), 1-2.

Chen, Y., & Hoshower, L. B. (2003). Student Evaluation of Teaching efectiviness: an assessment of student perception and motivation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education: Carfax Publishing*, 28(1), 71-88.

Cohen, J. (1992). Statistics a power primer. *Psycholog Bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159.

Darwin, S. (2010). Exploring critical conceptions of student-led evaluation in Ausralian higher Education. *Research and Development in Higher Education: Reshaping Higher Education* (pp. 203-212). Melbourne: Higher Education Research and Development society of Australasia.

David, H. A., & Gunnink, J. (1997). The paired t Test Under Artificial Pairing. *The American Statistician*, 51(1), 9-12.

Diaz, H. M., & Ragan, J. F. (2010). Do student evaluation of teaching depend on the distrubution of expected grade? *Education Economics: Taylor and Francis Group*, 18(3), 317-330.

Dilts, D. A., Haber, L. J., & Bialik, D. (1994). *Assessing what professors Do: An Introduction to Academic Performance Appraisal in Higher Education* (1st ed.). Westport: GreenWood Press.

Dodeen, H. (2013). Validity, Reliability, and Potential Bias of Short Forms of Student's Evaluation of Teaching: The Case of UAE University. *Educational Assessment: Taylor & Francis Group*, 235-250.

Duncan, N. (2007). Feed-forward: improving students' use of tutors' comments. *Assessment and evaluation in Higher Education*, 32(3), 271-283.

Elander, J. (2003). Student assessment from a psychological perspective, Psychology. *Learning and Teaching* , 3(2), 114-121.

Farreras, I. G., & Boyle, R. W. (2012). The effect of faculty self-promotion on student evaluations of teaching. *College Student Journal*, 46(2), 314-322.

Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2004). Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, 1, 3-31.

Heine, P., & Maddox, N. (2009). Student perceptions of the Faculty course evaluation process: an exploratory study of gender and class differences. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 3, 1-10.

Hejase, A. J., Al Kaakour, R. S., Halawi, L. A., & Hejase, H. J. (2013). Students' Perception of Student evaluation of teaching (SET) Process. *International J. Soc. Sci. and Education*, 3(3), 565-575.

Kogan, L. R., Schoenfeld-Tacher, R., & Hellyer, P. W. (2010). Student evaluations of teaching: Perceptions of facult based on gender, position, and rank. *Teaching in Higher Educaion*, 15(6), 623-636.

Lindahl, M. W., & Unger, M. L. (2010). Cruelty in Student Teaching Evaluations. *Taylor & Francis Group Routledge*, 57, 71-76.

Machingambi, S., & Wadesango, N. (2011). University Lecurers' Perceptions on Students Evaluation of Their Instructional Practices. *Anthropologist*, 167-174.

McDowell, L., Sambell, K., & Davison, G. (2009). Assessment for learning: a brief history and review of terminology, Improving student learning through the curriculum. *16th International Improving Learning Symposium*, (p. 64). Oxford.

MHESR. (2009). *A Road map to Quality: Reforming the sytem of Higher Education and Scientifc Research in the Kurdistan region of Iraq.* Erbil: Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, Kurdistan Regional Government.

O'Brien, R. G. (1981). A Simple Test for Variance Effecs in Experimenal Designs. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89, 570-574.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2007). A call for qualitative power analyses: Considerations in qualitative research. Quality & Quantity: International Journal of Methodology, 41(1): 105-121.

Palmer, S. (2012). The performance of a student evaluation of teaching system. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(8), 975-985.

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

Rantanen, P. (2013). The number of feedbacks needed for reliable evaluation. A multilevel analysis of the reliability, stability, and generalisability of students' evaluation of teaching. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(2), 224-239.

Rasheed, M. I., Aslam, H. D., Yousaf, S., & 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. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(9), 3735-1744.

Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119-144.

Sawilowsky, S. S., & Clifford, B. R. (1992). A More Realistic Look at the Robustness and Type II Error Properties of the t Test to Departures From Population Normality. *Psycholoical Bulletin III*, 2, 352-360.

Stehle, S., Spinath, B., & Kadmon, M. (2012). Measuring Teaching Effectiviness: Correspondence Between Student's Evaluations of Teaching and Different Measures of Student Learning. *Research in Higher Education: Springer*, 53(8), 888-904.

Stein, S. J., Spiller, D., Terry, S., Harris, T., Deaker, L., & Kennedy, J. (2013). Tertiary teachers and student evaluation: never the twain shall meet? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(7), 892-904.

Sulong, M. S. (2014). Lecturers' perception on teaching evaluation: selection of research instruments. *The Online Journal of Quality in Higher Education*, 1(2), 36-44.

Wachtel, H. K. (1998). Student Evaluation of College Teaching Effectiveness: A Breif Review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 23*(2), 191-211.