

WCES-2010

Textile program students' evaluation of lecturers

Nuriye Çevik İşgören^a*, Erkan İşgören^b, Demet Öznaz^a, Candan Durak Ayla^a

^aMarmara University Vocational School of Technical Sciences, Goztepe Campus, Istanbul, 34722, Turkey

^bMarmara University Technical Education Faculty, Goztepe Campus, Istanbul, 34722, Turkey

Received October 28, 2009; revised December 4, 2009; accepted January 14, 2010

Abstract

It is an undeniable truth that, keep up with continuously developing technologies and education techniques is a desire. However, the competence of education staffs which haven't have sufficient structure and haven't been supported with in-service educations was always an argument subject. Students' views have important role at lecturers' performances' evaluation. Lecturers have some concerns about evaluating the education and instruction staff's competence with student surveys. This is because of the thought of students might not answer objectively. The precautions taken during the applying of the surveys can easily pass this problem.

In the survey done for this study, the necessary precautions are taken and the students are made to evaluate the lecturers from objective point of view.

In this study, the evaluation of Marmara University Vocational School of Technical Sciences Textile Program students about lecturers' teaching method and attitudes are examined. For this reason; a survey is done to the students to evaluate lecturers' attitude, and use of lesson equipment and material. The received data are statistically evaluated by using SPSS program.

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Textile-apparel education; lecture teaching method; student views; vocational school.

1. Introduction

Today, technology, knowledge and understanding of quality with the rapidly changing competitive environment experienced intensive nature of human resources in the foreground were removed. Knowledge and technology to society, domestic and foreign markets to achieve competitive advantage in business life with the required competence, quality manpower upbringing and education quality to be competitive at the requires creation. Mentioned institutions will create opportunities at the beginning of the university has or will be prominent in the level of quality control and evaluation of the higher education accreditation so makes the actual mandatory. (Yalçinkaya, 2002)

* Nuriye Çevik İşgören. Tel.: +90-216-418-2504 ; fax: +90-216-418-2505
E-mail address: nisgoren@marmara.edu.tr

For the first time in the United States emerged in the early 1900s and in 1999 in our country by HEC began pilot training programs, accreditation, work practices an important pillar of the success of the teaching staff evaluation by students constitutes. (Yalçinkaya, 2002) The students and educators about the intimate thoughts stated, they have provided teaching staff and course content to help them improve their teaching methods as well as academic administrators in decisions related to yeller element has been impressive. (YÖK, 2000; Yeşiltaş ve Öztürk, 2000; Collins, 2002).

Student assessments of teaching staff or the disclosure of the results to be released by the teaching staff of this method with warmly in determining the effectiveness of the teaching staff, how about is valid and reliable ace still being discussed. However, assessment of students and teaching staff still is one of the most widely used method Coburn, 1984; Howell ve Symbaluk, 2001).

On the other hand, faculty attitudes and behavior of the classes of applications, as well as by the students is important to know how to detect. Because of the behavior of the teaching staff in universities perception by students know, the evaluation of the quality of teaching and direction of the move is made, is an important data quality. (Aksu, Çivitçi ve Duy, 2008).

In this study, the Marmara University Technical Vocational School of Textile Science Program students, faculty members who teach in the program of classroom behavior and opinions about the application methods course were investigated. Of exercise, both by students and teaching staff evaluation studies and both the Marmara University Vocational School of Technical Sciences of accreditation can be made in a special studies contribute ace is expected. Ignored without limitations of the study, the findings obtained for all teaching staff and administrators are thought to move the guiding elements.

2. Method

Research universe, Marmara University Technical Vocational School of Textile Science Program students constituted. 125 students applied to the textile Program surveys, the students of faculty members who teach in the program scan aims to evaluate. Textile Program 67 1st class groups formed and 58 students studying at the 2nd year students study on the subject.

The courses in the program, General Courses, Textile and Apparel Courses to be taken in three groups were reviewed. 27% of the total number of courses General courses, as% of the total teaching hours 21st; textile courses total courses total courses 22% of the number, at 17% of the total class hours; apparel courses is 51% of the total number of courses, from 62% of the total course hours constituted.

Textile Program all the questions in the survey for the courses were repeated. So that all their instructors for each course separately, were taken into consideration. Questions prepare that behavior and method of the main group. Behavior in terms of the issues taken into consideration; “class can dominate”, “enter class on time and come out”, “to communicate with students”, “lesson to tell with pleasure and desire” is in the title. The issues are taken into consideration in terms of method, “to give examples from daily life”, “the student be referred to the research”, “the efficient use of the means of course”, “to give help resources” is in the title.

Likert scale was used in surveys 5s. Developed in order to collect research data through surveys of the data obtained; Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-Statistical Packages for Social Sciences-) evaluated.

3. Results (Findings)

Textile Program working in the qualifications of teaching staff and methods of behavior were evaluated in the sub-headings. Behavior in terms of teaching staff in the review is told about the first lesson able degree of interest is query. Students participating in the survey on this subject to their general courses teaching staff 31.4%, 31.5% in textiles and apparel courses teaching staff courses teaching staff ratio of 29.0% in were considered to be very good.

Teaching staff, students of the class is queried on this subject can control the general course of the teaching staff of 31.3%, 40.5% in textiles and apparel courses teaching staff courses teaching staff 44.6% were considered to be a very good. (Table 1)

Enter the teaching staff come out of class time, students in this regard is queried general courses teaching staff 48.7%, 49.2% in textiles and apparel courses teaching staff courses teaching staff ratio of 40.0%were considered very good. (Table 2)

Of teaching staff to communicate with students, students in this regard are queried general courses teaching staff and textiles 42.5% 37.5% rate of teaching staff in lessons very well; apparel courses teaching a rate of 29.8% as the best moments have taken into consideration. (Table 3)

Tastes and desires of the course instructors with the students on this subject is queried to describe the general course of the teaching staff of 43.5%, 36.8% in textiles and apparel courses teaching staff and teaching staff in classes 26.5% considered to have taken very good. (Table 4)

Table 1. Class Can Dominate (%)

Category	Deficient	Prospering	Medium	Good	Very Good	Deficient
General course	1,0	11,9	12,4	22,5	21,0	31,3
Apparel course	0,3	6,8	6,6	14,8	26,9	44,6
Textile course	0,5	4,5	7,5	18,0	28,9	40,5

Table 2. Enter Class On Time And Come Out (%)

Category	Deficient	Prospering	Medium	Good	Very Good	Deficient
General course	1,0	5,2	6,4	12,6	26,1	48,7
Apparel course	0,4	11,9	8,8	16,8	22,0	40,0
Textile course	0,5	5,3	5,7	15,9	23,3	49,2

Table 3. Installation Of Contact With Students (%)

Category	Deficient	Prospering	Medium	Good	Very Good	Deficient
General course	1,0	8,4	10,8	16,8	20,5	42,5
Apparel course	0,4	15,1	11,9	16,6	29,8	26,2
Textile course	0,5	6,4	9,9	18,1	27,6	37,5

Table 4. Lesson To Tell With Pleasure And Desire (%)

Category	Deficient	Prospering	Medium	Good	Very Good	Deficient
General course	1,0	7,7	9,1	15,1	23,5	43,5
Apparel course	0,4	15,3	12,3	20,1	25,4	26,5
Textile course	0,5	4,1	9,7	19,9	28,9	36,8

Qualifications of teaching staff working in the textile program methods to evaluate the sub-title is received, received the first issue to examine the teaching staff to give examples from daily life is the query. Surveyed man students and teaching staff in this regard the general course of 33.7%, 35.1% in textiles and apparel courses teaching staff courses teaching staff were considered to be very good in the rate of 38.0%. (Table 5)

Be referred to the lecturer's research degree students, students in this regard is queried general courses teaching staff at a rate of 23.1% middle, 36.3% in textiles and apparel courses instructors teaching courses 34.3% rate as very good in the elements have taken into consideration. (Table 6)

The course instructors to use tools to efficiently querying students lessons in this regard generally inadequate teaching staff at a rate of 26.0%, 42.0% in textiles and apparel courses instructors teaching courses as very good in their rate of 33.0% have taken into consideration. (Table 7)

Of the teaching staff resources to give help in this regard is queried students general education courses to their staff and apparel 26.1% 25.3% rate of teaching staff in courses inadequate; textile courses of the teaching staff considered very good in the rate of 34.1% was put. (Table 8)

Table 5. To Give Examples From Daily Life (%)

Category	Deficient	Prospering	Medium	Good	Very Good	Deficient
General course	1,2	10,9	12,7	20,3	21,1	33,7
Apparel course	0,3	7,6	10,6	18,2	25,2	38,0
Textile course	0,5	6,0	14,1	20,8	23,5	35,1

Table 6. The Student Be Referred To The Research (%)

Category	Deficient	Prospering	Medium	Good	Very Good	Deficient
General course	1,0	21,1	17,2	23,1	17,0	20,5
Apparel course	0,5	13,6	11,2	19,3	21,2	34,3
Textile course	0,5	10,5	7,5	19,7	25,5	36,3

Table 7. The Efficient Use Of The Means Of Course (%)

Category	Deficient	Prospering	Medium	Good	Very Good	Deficient
General course	2,4	26,0	13,5	15,3	17,3	25,4
Apparel course	1,8	18,5	9,1	16,3	21,3	33,0
Textile course	1,9	9,3	6,1	15,1	25,6	42,0

Table 8. To Give Help Resources (%)

Category	Deficient	Prospering	Medium	Good	Very Good	Deficient
General course	1,7	24,2	14,8	15,5	20,2	23,7
Apparel course	1,1	23,7	12,3	16,7	24,4	21,8
Textile course	1,5	16,4	9,5	18,0	25,3	29,3

4. Discussion

Instructors to measure levels of success in teaching as a result of the information collected will be used for purposes which are of great importance. Students must be made as a result of evaluations made by the main goal of the teaching staff teaching should be directed to increase their success.

Faculty members, students as a result of evaluations made by the information obtained thanks to identify strengths and weaknesses in teaching will have the opportunity. In this way, they are weak areas themselves. In the next period will strengthen and increase achievement levels will be able to lecture in.

Yeşiltaş and Öztürk (2000) study of the teaching staff in the evaluation system by students in public universities in Turkey have highlighted the difficulty in implementation. In these studies, public universities In the case of a low quality of education addressed students in the school administration to increase pressure by establishing the quality of teaching cannot go to the path indicated.

Teaching staff by students to evaluate implementation of the teaching staff about the collection and evaluation of information, as well as how to interpret this information that the university is open to debate. Teachings elements by students, evaluation of the negative consequences perceived as a measure of the university and the teaching staff or students in the class or multi-disciplinary that effective teaching cannot do much plaster might think. However, research some of the universities that information regarding the status of the teaching staff in deciding what they are used as the sole source. If an academic staff member receives positive feedback or have come from all rinse past is the best instructors in the form or does not do any teaching is possible to interpret. Nevertheless, the students by teaching staff to evaluate applications elements for effective evaluation methods are not better than any that should not be forgotten.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

Marmara University Technical Vocational School of Textile Science Program of the nature of the teaching staff working in the findings of this study was interrogated to evaluate the possibility of their own teaching staff terms of importance. Lecturers in the light of the findings from this work and methods to improve their behavior will have chance.

Behavior in each group was examined separately lessons:

- General course instructors received was considered, to examine all aspects of the teaching staff were very good as it was. Here, the highest share of 48.7% with a rate “in and out of class time” received can be seen.
- Apparel course teaching staff is evaluated to investigate all matters that are considered to be the teaching staff was also very good. Here, the highest share of 49.2% with a rate “in and out during classer the” al is observed.
- Textiles courses teaching staff is evaluated “to communicate with students” about the good, while other issues were taken very well to be considered. Here, the highest share of 44.6% with a rate “stable to control faction” has received can be seen.

Each group separately in terms of methods courses were examined:

- General course instructors was evaluated “to help resource” and “efficient use course tools” issues insufficient, “the student be referred to the research” in the middle, “daily life examples dissolution” to be considered in very good were taken. Here, the highest share of 33.7% with a rate “to give examples from daily life of the” al is observed.
- Apparel course teaching staff was considered, “to give help source” in inadequate, other issues were regarded as the teaching staff was also very good. Here, the highest rate of 34.3% share Disclaimer of “students of transport to investigate the” al is observed.
- Textiles courses teaching staff in all matters received is evaluated to examine the teaching staff was seen very well as it was. Here, the highest share of 42.0% with a rate “The use of efficient means of course ace of the” al is observed.

At the end of this work by students of the teaching staff to ensure the applicability of evaluating the following recommendations have been developed with the aim of:

- All teaching staff, regardless of academic title should be evaluated.
- Assessments made by students, the University will develop the standards should be done through surveys.
- Evaluation main goal, teaching staff and teaching staff to identify the downside of success in the teaching, so the quality of education should be increased.
- Evaluation results of new teaching staff in the purchase, while the duties of teaching staff and an elongation of the academic staff rose to the top should be considered as a criterion in.
- The system can find support in the public universities using a combination of reward-punishment system is possible with. To do this successfully in various forms of teaching staff is rewarded with incentive measures taken in case is required.

References

- Aksu, M.B., Çivitçi, A., Duy, B.,(2008). “Yükseköğretim Öğrencilerinin Öğretim Elemanlarının Ders Uygulamaları ve Sınıf İçi Davranışlarına İlişkin Görüşleri”, İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt:9, Sayı:16, sy. 17-42
- Arubayi, A.E. “Students' evaluations of instruction in higher education: a review”. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, II: 1-10, (1986).
- Coburn, L., (1984). “Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance”, Princeton, NJ: ERIC Clearinghouse on Test, Measurement, and Evaluation. (ERIC No: ED289887). <http://www.ericdigests.org/pre-927/student.htm>
- Collins, A. B. (2002). “Üniversite Öğrencileri Öğretim Elemanlarının Başarısını Değerlendirebilir mi? İki İlemler ve Problemler”, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt: 35, Sayı:1–2, sy. 81–91.
- Howell, A. J. ve Symbaluk, D. G. (2001). “Published Students Ratings Of Instruction: Revealing and Reconciling The Views Of Students and Faculty”. Journal of Educational Psychology, 93, sy. 790-796.
- Murray, G .H. “The impact of formative and summative evaluation of teaching in North American university”. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 2: 117-132, (1984).
- Yalçınkaya, M., (2002). “Öğrencilerin Öğretim Elemanlarını Değerlendirmesi Arştırması: Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Örneği”, Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, sy. 105–118.
- Yeşiltaş, M. ve Öztürk, Y. (2000). “Öğretim Elemanlarının Ders Vermelerindeki Başarılarının Değerlendirilmesi Sisteminin Türk Kamu Üniversitelerinde Uygulanabilirliği Üzerine Bir Arştırma”, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt: 19, sy. 156–165.
- YÖK , (2000). “Öğrencilerin Eğitimi Değerlendirmesi”, Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, Ankara.