California State University,

Fullerton

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF THE PERFORMANCE
APPRAISAL PROCESS

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

In

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Community College Leadership

By

Nam Phan

Dissertation Committee

Assistant Professor Vita Jones, Chair
Professor Dawn Person
Expert Member Kim D. Nguyen

2014

UMI Number: 3581783

UMI

Dissertation Publishing

UMI 3581783

ProQuest

The dissertation of Nam Phan
is approved and is acceptable in quality and form
for publication on microfilm and in digital formats.

Approved by:

_____
Vita Jones, Committee Chair

_____
Dawn Person, College of Education

_____
Kim D. Nguyen, Expert Practitioner

California State University, Fullerton

2014

ABSTRACT

In recent decades, there has been increasing pressure for teacher accountability and interest in teacher evaluation throughout the world. While much research has been conducted on significant factors contributing to high student achievement, including the examination of the positive correlation between the faculty evaluation process and student success, there is a lack of research in the Vietnamese culture on faculty perceptions of the meaning and influences of faculty performance evaluation. This study addressed faculty perceptions of a particular evaluation process and their perceptions of its impact on their teaching performance. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore full-time faculty members' perceptions of the evaluation or performance appraisal (PA) process currently implemented in a private university in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The study utilized data obtained from individual, semi-structured interviews with 12 full-time faculty participants. After data analysis, the following salient findings were identified. First, faculty found a PA process that emphasized both competency and highlighted professional growth beneficial and motivating in measuring their performance and enhancing their teaching quality. Second, significant factors contributing to faculty positive perceptions of the PA process and to faculty instructional improvement included the clarity of the PA purpose, faculty involvement in the PA design and development, and the critical

role of the evaluator and his/her constructive feedback in the PA process.

Finally, faculty strongly recommended that additional types of evaluation, especially student feedback, be incorporated into the PA process and more opportunities be made available for professional development. As a result of these findings, this study could serve as a catalyst for policymakers and school leaders in improving the existing evaluation processes and in increasing their insight into how instructors perceive these policies and what factors contribute to their perceptions. In addition, the findings could stimulate further research on appraisal policy reform. Identifying key factors that instructors believe are critical in an effective evaluations process could assist the leadership in finding tools to make process meet instructors' expectations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my Chair, Dr. Jones Vita for her patience, guidance and feedback. Without her support and encouragement, I would not be able to complete this challenging task. This dissertation would also not have been possible without the valuable feedback, and suggestions by Dr. Dawn Person, Dr. Kim Nguyen, and Dr. Michelle Duffy.

Additionally, I would like to acknowledge the faculty of the Educational Leadership Department, California State University, Fullerton and all my Cohort IV colleagues for the warmth, support, and encouragement throughout my program. I will always treasure the opportunity to meet and work with you during the last three years.

I owe my deepest gratitude to my parents and to my son who have supported me and provided me unconditional love on this challenging journey. This accomplishment is dedicated to them, especially my son. I hope that my completion of the program will teach him a good lesson on the value of diligence, hard work, and academic excellence.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Student success is the ultimate goal of education and numerous studies have been conducted on key factors leading to high student achievement, including the examination of the direct relationship between teaching and student learning (Danielson, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 1997, 2000, 2002; Hanushek, 2002; Hanushek, Kain, O'Brien, & Rivken, 2005; Hanushek & Rivken, 2003; Howard & Gullickson, 2010; Rivken, Hanushek, & Kain, 2001; Sykes & Winchell, 2010). Emerging from several studies is the powerful role the evaluation process of faculty plays in aiding student achievement (Andrea, 2011; Borman & Kimball, 2005; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Dilts, Goe, Bell, & Little, 2008; Doherty, 2009; Ellett & Teddie, 2003; Glickman, 2002; Goldrick, 2002; Hanushek, 2002; Kimball, White, Milanowski, & Borman, 2004; McInnis, 1996, 2000a, 2000b; Milanowski, 2004; Odden, Borman, & Fermanich, 2004; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995, Tucker & Stronge, 2005). According to these studies, educators who believe they are being correctly evaluated not only teach better, but also are more productive in helping students succeed. Specifically, studies by Schacter and Thum (2004) and Gallagher (2004) showed a coherent correlation between teachers' high evaluation scores and students' high achievement scores. Reforms to support high student achievement have been

implemented for years. These reforms include reductions in class size; computer-based instruction; school choice (Schacter & Thum, 2004); the development of higher expectations for instructional improvement, student achievement, and student learning; and the development of effective teachers (Lam, 1998). According to Darling-Hammond (1999),

It stands to reason that student learning should be enhanced by the efforts of teachers who are more knowledgeable in their field and are skillful at teaching it to others. Substantial evidence from prior reform efforts indicates that changes in courses, testing, or textbooks make little difference if teachers do not know how to use these tools well and how to diagnose their students' learning needs. (p. 39)

Tucker and Stronge (2005) asserted, "School reform efforts are taking a variety of forms, with two of the most prominent being a focus on higher teaching standards and improved student performance" (p. 12). They also emphasized that teacher evaluation could be used as an effective measure of the relationship between teacher quality and student achievement. Additionally, all over the world the last decades have been marked by increased pressure for teacher accountability and an interest in teacher evaluation (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Ellet & Teddie, 2003; House, 1973; Knapp, 1982; Natriello, Deal, Dornbusch, & Hoag, 1977; Peterson, 2000; Stronge, 2006; Tucker & Stronge, 2005; Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, & Bernstein, 1984). The Vietnamese educational

system is no exception in regards to its interest in teacher accountability and evaluation, especially in recent years with education and training considered the first priority among national policies (Ministry of Education and Training [MOET], 2000).

Chapter 1 introduces the research study I conducted on instructor's perceptions of the appraisal and evaluation of faculty in Vietnam. The chapter begins with background on teacher evaluation. Following the background is the statement of the problem and an explanation that provides the context and necessity of the research study. The chapter concludes with an overview of the dissertation.

Background of the Problem

The economic reform implemented in Vietnam in 1986, *Doi Moi*, created opportunities, as well as challenges, for every aspect of society, including education. Since the reform, education has been regarded as the top policy priority (Le, 2009). Additionally, the educational quality of Vietnamese universities, including student outcomes, has been of serious concern to the public and the government (Kieu, 2004; Lam, 2004; Le, 2004, 2009; MOET, 1996, 2012; P. Nguyen, 2004; P. N. Nguyen, 2005; Pham, 2012, Tran, 2008). Many substantial changes began in 1987 with the reforms introduced in Vietnamese higher education "to meet the demand of the labor market in the rapidly changing economy of Vietnam" (Le, 2009, p. 217). However, institutional expansion, increasing class sizes, and the introduction of new courses have led

to a loss of direction. As a result, little improvement has been reported concerning the quality of teaching in Vietnamese higher education institutions (Berlie, 1995; Dang, 1997; Lam, 1998; Le, 2006; Nguyen & Nguyen, 2000; Nguyen & Pham, 2003; Pham, 2005).

In addition, several problems have been identified in research that are related to the quality of university teaching such as (a) quality management of teaching, (b) teaching methodologies, and (c) faculty motivation to improve teaching quality (Berlie, 1995; Dang, 1997; Dang & Ha, 2009; Lam, 1998; D. N. Le, 2006; V. H. Le, 2001; Nguyen & Nguyen, 2000; Pham, 2000; Pham, 2012). The results of these studies prompted the development of an evaluation process that has elicited much controversy in Vietnamese higher education (Dilts, Haber, & Bialik, 1994, K. D. Nguyen, 2000, 2008; T. T. Nguyen, 2008).

However, research shows that the evaluation process can motivate teaching, which can affect student success (Andrea, 2011; Dilts et al., 1994; James, 1993, 1995, 1997; McInnis, 1996, 2000a, 2000b). James (1997) asserted that an effective and fair evaluation system used by an academic organization does much to shape the culture and the quality of the academic outputs of that institution. Therefore, it is important for higher education institutions to realize that efforts to improve teaching and learning must work in collaboration with efforts to improve teaching evaluation (Kahn, 1993; Toch & Rothman, 2008).

Problem Statement

While there has been ample research on P-12 teacher assessment and evaluation models, few assessment and evaluation models have been designed for instructors at higher education institutions. Even less is known about how educators perceive the evaluation process or what components educators find important and significant to an appraisal and evaluation system.

In addition, over many years there have been debates internationally on how faculty should be evaluated (Jackson, 2001), yet few studies have focused on faculty preferences in evaluation design and administration (Barry, Chandler, & Clark, 2001). In Vietnam, because there is a special demand for high quality tertiary education for globalization, faculty evaluation has been a public concern and a topic getting a lot of attention in seminars on higher education in recent years. Currently the annual faculty evaluation is widely considered to be subjective, superficial, sometimes inaccurate, and only a formality (An, 2013; Duy, 2014; Nguyen, Griffin, & Nguyen, 2006). Therefore, effective criteria by which to assess faculty are still needed in Vietnamese higher education (Nguyen, 2004).

The problem this study addressed is the lack of information and knowledge in Vietnam about (a) the best approaches for higher education faculty performance evaluations and (b) faculty perceptions of the performance appraisal process.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore full-time faculty's perceptions of the evaluation process, or performance appraisal process as it is termed currently, implemented on campus at a Vietnamese university by (a) elucidating what meaning faculty give to the performance appraisal process; (b) inquiring into how these perceptions affect instructors' teaching performance; and (c) discussing factors that are central to the applicability of the process as a means of improving instruction. The primary means of data collection were in-depth, open-ended interviews with 12 purposefully selected instructors. The instructors are affiliated with a university (the University) in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The participants were full-time instructors who varied in gender, ages, and disciplines, and who had experienced the University evaluation process at least three times.

Research Questions

The purpose of this qualitative case study research was to explore faculty's perceptions regarding the evaluation process implemented at a Vietnamese university campus by addressing the following questions:

1. What meaning do full-time faculty at a university in Vietnam give to the performance appraisal process as determined through faculty interviews?

2.   What factors do full-time faculty at a university in Vietnam identify

as central to the applicability of the performance appraisal process

in regards to improving instruction?

Significance of the Study

This case study research explored instructors' perceptions of the

evaluation process, known as the performance appraisal process, which was

used at the time of this study on the University campus in Ho Chi Minh City. It

was believed that insights into factors that contribute to the perceptions

instructors have about the performance appraisal process could be used to make

improvements in the current evaluation process. These factors included the

influences of participants' perceptions on their teaching performance and the

identification of components of the performance appraisal process that they

perceived as central to the applicability of the process of improving instruction.

Despite "the inability of qualitative research findings to be generalized to

other communities" (Arsenault & Anderson, 1998, p. 134), the results of this

research may serve as a catalyst for policymakers and school leaders to improve

the current evaluation processes. The findings of this study may also stimulate

further research concerning appraisal policy reform. Identifying key factors that

instructors believe are critical for an effective evaluation process can assist

leadership within an institution to find tools to make the current polices meet

instructors' expectations. Egelson and McColskey (1998) stated, "If teachers and

schools are to continually improve the quality of the instructional program, then

an evaluation system designed to encourage individual teacher growth is not a luxury, but a necessity" (p. 5). It is hoped that a well-developed evaluation process will help institutions: (a) address any ineffective or unfair component of the evaluation process, (b) reduce the likelihood of frustration for administrators as appraisers and instructors as appraisees, (c) improve instructors' perceptions of the process in order to reduce the number of instances in which instructors believe they were not fairly or correctly evaluated, and (d) ultimately enhance the institution outputs.

Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) stressed the powerful role of teacher evaluation in motivating instructional performance that in turn influences students' academic success. In other words, instructors are highly motivated when they think they are evaluated correctly. As a result, these highly motivated instructors are more productive in training successful students, which will be beneficial not only to students and the institution, but also to the whole society.

Scope of the Study

The scope of the study refers to the parameters under which the study operated. Thus, the following section outlines the assumptions, delimitations, and limitations of the study.

Assumptions of the Study

For this study, the following assumptions were made. Multiple realities will emerge from participants' perspectives because the nature of reality can be different for different people and they live and recall differently. These diverse

perceptions will help construct a comprehensive picture of the social dynamic of the phenomena under investigation (Patton, 2002).

The distance between the participants and me will be minimized because of my own experience with the performance appraisal process currently implemented on campus. It is assumed that having experienced the same appraisal system as the participants, having a close relationship with them, and engaging them in interviews that probe their thinking helped me gain greater insights into how the participants perceived the evaluation process used at the time of the study. It is also assumed that the participants viewed themselves as co-inquirers in this study and will expand their perceptions about the current evaluation process.

Biases do exist because of my familiarity with the appraisal system and because my frame of reference could have influenced the way I analyzed and interpreted the data. However, I did my best to identify my biases and attempted to work from a neutral frame of reference.

Moreover, it is assumed that since participants have been purposefully selected, they represent the study population and will provide information "rich in content" (Creswell, 2007, p. 61). In addition, it is presumed that the participants' descriptions truly reflected their perceptions of the current evaluation process.

A final assumption was that the set of open-ended questions used for interviews were clear to the participants. Moreover, the questions were carefully developed based on both a broad review of theory and literature and in

consultations with my committee members. It was assumed that the questions elicited accurate descriptions of their perceptions regarding the current evaluation process

Study Delimitations

This study is bound by several delimitations, which narrow its scope. For the purpose of the study, the setting was the University where I have been working the last nine years. It should also be noted that the selected university is a private university in Ho Chi Minh City, though the results of the study may provide good information about evaluation processes currently implemented in other higher education institutions in Vietnam. The data for this study were primarily collected from face-to-face semi-structured interviews with the instructors working at the selected university regarding their perceptions of the current evaluation process. Comparisons with evaluation processes of other universities or my personal judgment about the effectiveness of these policies are not included. In addition, my experience with the University's performance appraisal system benefited me in understanding the participants' responses, and it also helped me be aware of any influence I had on the setting as well as the study population. Furthermore, as Merriam (1998) recommended, I acknowledged my need to be aware of the risk of researcher biases because of my existing relationship with the participants and because of my own experiences with the evaluation process and to take into consideration how these factors could affect the research.

A final delimitation is that the data were collected during the first semester of the 2013 - 2014 academic year only, rather than over the course of several years in order to meet the timeline designed for this dissertation. In addition, only full-time faculty who are actively teaching during this academic year were candidates for the semi-structured interviews. The purposeful and small population and the boundaries of time and place (Creswell, 2007, 2009; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009) delimits this qualitative case study because the findings drawn cannot be generalized to a larger population or be applied to a different context. However, the results of this research may serve as a catalyst for the improvement of the current evaluation process and may provide increased insights into instructors' perceptions of these policies and into the factors that contribute to their perceptions. The findings may also stimulate further research concerning appraisal policy reforms.

Study Limitations

A significant limitation in the study is in the document gathering for the literature review. Due to the lack of transparency of Vietnam's government procedures and decisions, "much of the information that is publicly available from the Vietnamese government is published in the government-controlled newspapers" (Oliver, 2002, p.10). In addition, the rationale for the University evaluation design is unknown because the person who made the initial decisions left the University many years prior and there have been many changes in staffing for that position since her departure.

Another limitation is the problem caused by the participants' unfamiliarity with consent forms. Due to their unfamiliarity with the concept of participant protection and the forms, the participants may be uncomfortable or skeptical of their confidentiality, which could affect the information provided in an interview. In addition, "people in Vietnam generally do not want to be held responsible for information they provide, especially if it might displease someone in authority" (Oliver, 2002, p. 11). Therefore, it is likely that the participants might not have been completely open about their perceptions regarding the performance appraisal process.

Furthermore, language is one of the limitations of this study. For the purpose of obtaining a thorough understanding of the explored issue, Vietnamese was used in all the interviews because of the participants' insufficient English skills. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed in Vietnamese before being translated into English for final report. However, the fact remains that unique challenges related to language, for example conceptual equivalence, could affect the study findings (Larkin, Derickz de Casterle, & Schotsmans, 2007; Temple, 2002; Temple & Young, 2004; Wallin & Alhstrom, 2006).

Generalization of research findings is also among the limitations of this case study. Stake (1998) affirmed,

> The real business of case study is particularization, not generalization. We take a particular case and come to know it well, not primarily as to how it is different from others but what it is, what it does. There is

emphasis on uniqueness, and that implies knowledge of others that the case is different from, but the first emphasis is on understanding the case itself. (p. 8)

Finally, the validity of the study is limited to the reliability of the interview questions. As cited in Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2011), "The researcher can never be sure that individuals are expressing their true attitudes, interest, values, or personalities" (p. 153). Additionally, my ability in conducting interviews may have influenced the study validity.

Definitions of Key Terms

For the purpose of this study, these terms are used and defined as follow:

Appraisal policy. The appraisal policy refers to "the systematic approach that an institution uses to determine if faculty members are being successful in meeting the performance criteria set forth by the institution" (Rector, 2009, p.11).

Formative appraisal. A formative appraisal provides instructors and professors ongoing information about the operation of a program (Guskey, 2005).

Performance appraisal (PA). A performance *appraisal* is the "total process of observing and reviewing work performance, identifying needs for improvement, and working with employees to improve their effectiveness and make full sense of their skills" (Marvin, 1982).

Performance appraisal form. This form is used to collect the appraisal data (Schuler et al., 1991).

Performance appraisal process. The performance appraisal process refers to the process involved in utilizing the appraisal information for development and evaluation. It consists of four stages: establishing some performance standards and explicitly communicating them to the employees, observing their performance, comparing their actual performance with the predetermined standards, and taking some actions (Lonsdale, Dennis, Openshaw & Mullins, 1998). This term is used interchangeably with teacher evaluation process in this study.

Professional growth / development. Professional growth/development defines a professional's continuous endeavor to increase the knowledge of his/her craft by engaging reflective process as well as collaboration, teaching and learning process (Danielson & McGreal, 2000).

Summative appraisal. A summative appraisal involves accountability and managerial decisions, for example tenure, salary and assignment (Antinello, Lare, & Waters, 2006).

Teacher evaluation in higher education. This term refers to the formative evaluation and summative evaluation that are the primary goals of educational evaluation (Adams, 1997; Blunt, 1991; Rifkin, 1995, Scriven, 1987).

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation includes five chapters. Chapter 1 provided the introduction to the study including its purpose, significance, research questions, scope of the study and definitions of terms. Chapter 2 reviews current and

seminal literature relevant to the focus of the study. Chapter 3 is an explanation of the methodology, research design, setting, sample, data collection and management, data analysis, and interpretation for the study. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study. Chapter 5 concludes the study with a discussion of interpretations and implications of the findings.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Although abundant research is available internationally on teacher assessment and evaluation models, only a few studies on teacher assessment and evaluation have been found in Vietnamese literature. In Vietnam, very little is known about the how educators perceive the teacher evaluation process implemented on their campuses or what components educators find important and significant in an appraisal and evaluation system. The problem this study addressed is our lack of information about (a) the best approaches for higher education faculty performance evaluation and (b) faculty perceptions of the performance appraisal process. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore full-time faculty's perceptions of the evaluation process, or the performance appraisal process as it is termed, that was implemented on a Vietnamese university campus at the time of this study by (a) elucidating the meaning faculty give to the performance appraisal process; (b) inquiring into how these perceptions affect instructors' teaching performance; and (c) discussing factors that are central to the applicability of the process as a means of improving instruction.

For this study, the literature review is intentionally comprised of both old and current references to provide an overview of the extensive historical background related to the research topic. The literature review begins with the definition of performance appraisal (PA) in general and specifically in higher education before moving into the purposes of PA in higher education. This is followed by a description of effective PA systems, including faculty perceptions of factors contributing to the effectiveness of these systems. The performance evaluation in Vietnamese higher education concludes this literature review.

Definition of Performance Appraisal (PA)

Performance appraisal (PA) is generally defined as the "total process of observing and reviewing work performance, identifying needs for improvement, and working with employees to improve their effectiveness and make full sense of their skills" (Marvin, 1982). However, researchers have used the term PA in different ways in the literature. According to Mayfield (1964), PA is "simply an attempt to think clearly about each person's performance and future projects against the background of his total work situation," while Beach (1980) used the term to refer to "a systematic evaluation of the individual with respect to his performance on the job and his potential for development." Tiffin (1987) extended the definition by adding the source of the appraisal and defines PA as "a systematic evaluation of an employee by his supervisor or by some other qualified person who is familiar with the employee's performance on the job". Moreover, Heyle (1980), Miller (1979) and Douglas, Klein and Hunt (1985) stress

"requirements of the job" in the definition of the term PA. Amstrong and

Lorentzen (1977) considered PA a systematic process used to not only review

the employee's performance, but also to evaluate his potential for promotion. In

addition, Schuler (1984) offered yet another definition of PA as, "a formal,

structured system of measuring, evaluating, and influencing an employee's job

related attributes, behaviors, and outcomes and level of absenteeism to discover

at what level the employee is presently performing on the job" (p. 210).

In essence, PA is a goal directed process used to create a measure that

accurately assesses the level of an individual's job performance and an

evaluation system that will advance one or more operational functions in an

organization. In other words, PA serves the two fundamental goals of evaluation

and development that assist individual or institutional decision making in terms of

training and staff needs, promotion, salary, and compensation benefits (Schuler

et al. 1991). A good PA system could encourage employees to put forth their

best efforts and to take initiative at work to achieve both organizational and

personal goals. Therefore, it can be said that one of its most important goals is

to motivate employees (Nelson, 2000).

Purposes of Performance Appraisal in Higher Education

The last decades have experienced an increasing pressure for

accountability in education (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Glickman, 2002; House,

1973; Knap, 1982; Natriello, Deal, Dornbusch, & Hoag, 1977; Toch, 2008).

According to Whitaker (1998), "issues of accountability are never far from our

minds these days and it is vital to be clear about our responsibilities to share information and explanations to those with those who are concerned with the school" (p. 106). That leads to a growing interest in teacher evaluation because according to Darling-Hammond and Ascher (1992),

> Performance indicators are information for the accountability system; they are not the system itself. Accountability (that is responsible practice and responsiveness to clients) occurs only when a useful set of processes exists for interpreting and acting on the information. (p. 2)

According to Seldin (1984), "The purpose of the evaluation shapes the questions asked, the sources of data utilized, the depth of the analysis, and the dissemination of findings" (p. 127). Stronge (as cited in Mo, Corners, & McComick, 1998) stated, "If an appraisal system does not have a clear purpose, it will just be a meaningless exercise" (p. 23). Therefore, it is critically important to identify the purposes of an appraisal system. As mentioned above, existing literature has highlighted the complexity of purposes for PA (Analoui & Fell, 2002; Wilson, 2002; Wilson & Western, 2001). PA in education is not an exception. Although teacher PA is primarily intended for professional improvement as stated by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979), there are other extended purposes of teacher PA in the literature. According to Redfern (1963), the three purposes of teacher evaluation are to assess the status and quality of teaching performance, identify aspects of performance that are below standards and need improvement, and promote individual's growth. Mitzberg (1979) used the teacher appraisal process

as a measurement tool as well as a means to motivate teachers. In addition to the purpose of improving teaching quality, Holleman (1981) considered validation of the selection process and distribution of rewards and sanctions as other two common purposes of teacher evaluation. Based on his belief about effective evaluation, Duckett (1993) identified nine purposes for teacher evaluation. According to Duckett, teacher evaluation is a process to improve teaching, reward superior performance, modify assignments, protect individuals and organizations, validate the selection process, satisfy district policy and state law, improve decisions, provide a basis for career planning and contribute to morale and compensation. Likewise, DeRoche (1987) included accountability and teaching improvement in his list of purposes for teacher evaluation while McDermott (1988) emphasized the use of teacher evaluation to encourage retention of effective personnel of teacher evaluation.

However, most researchers (McGreal, 1988; Redfern, 1963; Wood & Pohlan, 1989) agree that the four major purposes of teacher evaluation are "providing an access that allows and encourages teaming of supervisors and teachers to improve and enhance classroom instructional practices; bringing structural assistance to marginal teachers; making more rational decisions about the performance levels, transfer, or dismissal of staff members; and measuring implementation of knowledge and skills gained during staff development activities" (p. 18). Due to the diversity of evaluation goals, "it is important to

consider what purposes are best served . . . before a teacher evaluation system is adopted and put in place" (Darling-Hammond et al., 1983, p. 303).

Formative Versus Summative Purposes

In higher education, research (Adam, 1997; Blunt, 1991; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Kelly & Maslow, 2005; McGreal, 1983; Rifkin, 1995; Scriven, 1987; Stronge, 2006) indicates that formative evaluation and summative evaluation are primary goals of educational evaluation. "Teacher evaluation systems ideally should foster improvement in both professional development opportunities and teaching practices" (Kelly & Maslow, 2005, p. 1). Formative evaluation provides instructors and professors ongoing information about the operation of a program (Guskey, 2005), such as student feedback on course content and classroom behavior. Instructors use this information for self-evaluating their personal and professional strengths and weaknesses (Antinello et al., 2006) and make necessary adaptions to achieve successful teaching and learning. In other words, formative evaluation is used to guide improvements in both classroom effectiveness and teacher professional development. Formative evaluation is considered internal evaluation (Christie, Ross, & Klein, 2004) because the evaluators such as principals, directors, consultants, etc. are members of the institutions (Chrysos, 2000). Unlike formative evaluation, summative evaluation, which is also known as external evaluation (Christie et al., 2004) utilizes specialists from outside the institution (Chrysos, 2000), and involves accountability and managerial decisions, for example, tenure, salary,

and assignments (Antinello et al., 2006). The distinguishing difference between formative and summative evaluation is highlighted by Stake (as cited in Scriven, 1991). Stake clarified, "When a cook tastes the soup, that's formative. When the guests taste the soup, that's summative" (p. 169).

According to Chow et al. (2002), Avalos and Assael (2006), and Stronge (2006), tensions exist between these two evaluation goals. Specifically,

> The net result of these pressures for more careful summative judgments of teachers is to put administrators under particular strain. Though "better" performance evaluation may appear to make the issues explicit and decisions objective, it may also generate as much heat as light, particularly where the various constituents to the design of evaluation do not agree. The pressure to improve teaching performance may foster more elaborate evaluation systems, but with summative thrusts getting in the way of formative efforts. (Knapp, 1982, p. 10)

When summative and formative evaluations are combined in one review, it creates tension (Mohrman, Resnick-West, & Lawler, 1990). They noted,

> To accomplish its purposes, the organization needs complete and valid data about the nature of the individual's skills and performance, but it is often not the best interest of the individual to provide such data. The conflict, then, is over the exchange of valid information. As long as the individual sees appraisal as having important influences on rewards, the potential for this conflict continues. (p. 9)

In order to integrate these two purposes in an evaluation system, views of teaching and teacher professionalism (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983; Sachs, 2003; Flores, 2005; Day, Flores & Viana, 2007) and conceptual context of evaluation criteria and standards (Avalos & Assael, 2006) should be taken into consideration.

However, there are recommendations that formative and summative evaluation approaches should be used separately (Danielson, 2001; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2007). The reason given for this division is to help teachers feel more comfortable with summative evaluation and, therefore, increase the effectiveness of giving feedback. Separating formative and summative evaluations could also result in an emphasis on coaching rather than on documenting (Milanowski, 2005). According to Cohen (1974), "one faculty evaluation scheme cannot both judge and assist. The procedure that gathers evidence for dismissal is different from that which reflects a climate of support, of communication, and of growth inducement" (p. 21). In addition, Casey, Gentile, and Bigger (1997) stated that "the two should be kept separate, and attempts to use one procedure for both purposes may be expected to negatively influence morale and performance of academic staff (p. 466).

Conversely, in 2005, Milanowski conducted his descriptive study with two evaluated groups of more than a hundred teachers from a large urban school system in the Midwest. A group of 50 teachers was evaluated by both a mentor and an evaluator while just one person functioning in both coaching and

evaluating roles assessed the other 94 teachers. The findings from Milanowski's study showed the split use of formative and summative did not make any significant difference and even "[more] developmental assistance is provided to evaluatees than to split the evaluation roles" (p. 153).

Appraisal Methods in Higher Education

Since teacher evaluation is used to measure a range of factors related to quality instruction such as teacher competency, teacher performance and teacher effectiveness, there are many different appraisal methods. The literature on teacher evaluation includes general appraisal methods (Ellett, Capie, & Johnson, 1980; Haefle, 1980; Lewis, 1982; Millman, 1981; Peterson & Kauchak, 1982), such as (a) teacher interviews, (b) competency tests, (c) indirect measures, (d) classroom observation, (e) student ratings, (f) peer review, (g) student achievement, and (h) faculty self-evaluations.

Referring to the history of performance appraisal in higher education, Gustad (1967) identified 13 most frequently used methods in his study. They were "(a) chairman evaluation, (b) dean evaluation, (c) colleagues' opinion, (d) scholarly research and publication, (e) informal student opinion, (f) grade distributions, (g) committee evaluations, (h) course syllabi and examinations, (i) student examination performance, (j) self-evaluation, (k) enrollment in elective courses, (l) systematic student rating, alumni opinions, classroom visits, and (m) long-term follow-up students" (p. 270).

Although most of the above evaluation methods have been used for some time, new tools have been added to the list to ensure quality instruction and professional learning. One of these tools is peer evaluation, including assistance in data collection, materials review, teacher collaboration, mentoring, school improvement planning and leadership. Peer evaluation, however, is controversial (Peterson, Kelly, & Caskey, 2002). According to Arreola (1995), peer evaluation has both strengths and weaknesses. One of the strengths is that both the appraiser and the appraisee are well aware of the evaluation process, institutional goals, priorities and values (Arreola, 1995). An important weakness according to a study by Lewis (1982), is the lack of respect from teachers for their colleagues' evaluations, which can lead to staff tension. Additionally, researchers do not recommend peer evaluation for guiding personnel decisions (Arreola, 1995; Haefele, 1980; Peterson & Kauchak, 1982; Thomas, 1979).

Effective Performance Appraisal Systems

It is vital to review the requirements for an effective and ethical PA system because a good procedure will provide a highly valid basis for judgment regarding the performance of individuals, the effectiveness of the total organization, and the evaluation of all learning and developmental endeavors (Davis, 1997; Delahaye, 2000; Mullins, 1996). As suggested by Cascico (2003), Davis (1997), Dipboye and de Pontbriand (1981), Nelson (2000), and Schuler et al. (1991), the review of effective PA requirements below will be presented in two parts that are relevant to the PA form and the PA process respectively.

The Performance Appraisal Form

A PA form is used to collect the appraisal data (Schuler et al., 1991). In order to increase its reliability and validity and to reduce the resistance caused by inherent conflicts, the following requirements should be taken into consideration. First, the purposes of evaluation and development of PA need to be emphasized separately at different times. Second, the specified performance criteria must be job relevant and important. Third, there must be a separation of current and potential performance. Fourth, multiple appraisals involving self-appraisal, peer appraisal, appraisal by superiors and by subordinates should be incorporated. Fifth, the tendency to give all the appraisees favorable or unfavorable ratings or to evaluate all of them as average should be avoided. In addition, the entire evaluation must be based on all dimensions of performance, not just one aspect, nor should it be influenced by the appraisers' own personal values instead of those of the organization. Finally, appraisals that are about development rather than control are strongly recommended. "If the performance management system is not primarily a development system," Egan (1995) claimed, "it will be perceived as an imposed control system."

The Performance Appraisal Process

A PA process involved in utilizing the appraisal information for development and evaluation consists of four stages: (a) establishing some performance standards and explicitly communicating them to the employees, (b) observing their performance, (c) comparing their actual performance with the

predetermined standards, and (d) taking some actions (Lonsdale, Dennis, Openshaw, & Mullins, 1998). In order to facilitate effective operation, it is argued that the appraisal process should be participative and constructive. In other words, the appraisees should have opportunities to analyze their job responsibilities, the quality of their performance, and the problems they encountered on the job prior to the performance appraisal. Then, during the appraisal they should be encouraged to voice their opinions, discuss and seek the solutions to some current job problems and set mutually agreeable goals (Neal, 1988). In addition, high priority should be given to selecting the right people and training them to provide the feedback. Finally, it is important that the "performance improvement is prospective and ongoing" (Cascio, 2003, p.358). In doing so, the appraisees' progress towards the determined goals can be communicated and assessed regularly. Additionally, frequent informal conversations between appraisers and their employees about how they are performing could increase the effectiveness of the feedback. As Cascio (2003) puts it, "Feedback has maximum impact when it is given as close as possible to the action" (p. 358).

Faculty Perceptions on Factors Contributing to Effectiveness of the Performance Appraisal Process

Existing literature discusses the factors contributing to perceived effectiveness of PA (Beer, 1985; Flores, 2005; Fullan, 2001; Smyth & Vandenberghe, 2001; Stronge, 2010; Tuytens & Devos, 2008). In order to

achieve both the developmental and accountable aspect of evaluations, Stronge and Tucker (2003) suggested three essentials Cs for a quality teacher appraisal system— communication, commitment and collaboration. These components help to create "the synergy that can elevate evaluation to a meaningful dialogue about quality instruction for students" (Stronge & Tucker, 2003, p. 10). In other words, factors contributing to a quality appraisal system include how the appraisers and appraises see the appraisal process and their relationship (Chow et al., 2002), how the appraisal policy is processed and its nature as well as purposes, and the quality of the training provided to stakeholders participating in the evaluation process, especially the evaluators and the evaluated. Nevo (1994) stated "Teachers who understand how teaching is being evaluated could not only improve their self-evaluation; they could also benefit in preparing themselves for being evaluated by others or demonstrating the quality of their skills and performance to designated audiences" (p. 109-110).

Research has shown that constructive and quality feedback is perceived to be critical to an effective PA (Danielson, 1996; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Feeney, 2007; Frase, 1992; Marshall, 2005; Marzano, Pickering & Pollock, 2011; Rindler, 1994). Ovando (2005) added, "Feedback refers to relevant information provided to those engaged in the teaching-learning process regarding their performance so that they may introduce modifications, correct errors or engage in professional development that will lead to enhanced teaching and learning" (p. 173).

Perceived fairness of an appraisal process determines its effectiveness (Bretz, Mikovic, & Real, 1992; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Cardy and Dobbins (1994) stated, "With dissatisfaction and feelings of unfairness in process and inequity in evaluations, any performance appraisal system will be doomed to failure" (p. 54). A performance appraisal process is perceived as fair when it is unbiased, accurate, representative of all stakeholders' voices and ethical standards (Levethal, 1976; 1980). Fairness is significantly related to (a) the frequency of evaluation (Landy, Barnes, & Murphy, 1978), (b) participative performance appraisal - two-way performance interview communication, (c) the ability to appeal an evaluation rating (Alexander & Ruderman, 1987; Greenberg, 1986a; Statton, 1988; Yale, 1980), (d) rater's qualification (Murphy & Cleveland, 1991; Tang & Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996), (e) the relevance of job dimensions (Murphy & Cleveland, 1991), and (f) clarification of performance expectations and standards (Bies & Moag, 1986; Greenberg, 1986b).

The rewarding factor of an evaluation policy is considered important to the person evaluated. Rewarding includes personal and professional development, being valued by their employers and receiving physical acknowledgement of their achievements, for example, a promotion and/or a pay increase (Greenberg, 1986a). In addition, from the employees' perspective, effective evaluations are the ones that are not too challenging or not threatening to the development of their self-identity and worth in their job (Beer, 1985). According to Beer (1985),

Subordinates are likely to be very ambivalent about receiving negative

feedback. They are likely to want to discuss negative aspects of their

performance so they can improve and develop, but will not want to

jeopardize promotions, pay, or their own self-image. (p. 318)

Therefore, managers and subordinates who have mixed feelings about

performance appraisal tended to reduce or avoid dealing with the negative

aspects of the procedure (Beer, 1985). Another key determinant of an effective

PA process is the engagement of employees in the design and development of

the PA (Macey, Schneider, Barbera, & Young, 2009). Mone and London (2010)

asserted that a PA that is designed to encourage employee involvement would

result in higher performance levels. According to Konovsky (2000), the more

involvement employees get into the process, the more fairness they can

perceive. He stated, "Individuals view procedures as most fair when control is

vested in the participants" (p. 493).

Performance Evaluation in Vietnamese Higher Education

In Vietnamese Confucian-heritage culture, teachers have a special status

(Hua, 1998; Nguyen, 2003) because they are believed to be the primary source

of knowledge and knowledge carriers for their students. In addition, teachers are

the moral models students are expected to follow. This traditional status has

somehow affected the performance evaluation (Tran, 2004; Vu, 2004).

According to Decrees 34 and 36/2000/QD-BGD&DT (2000), moralities and

competencies are considered two main criteria for assessing teachers in

Vietnam. Moralities include teachers' personalities and their values as well as perspectives about teaching and learning. Competencies are defined as teachers' professional and content knowledge and teaching techniques they employ in the classroom. However, the goal of professional development has been emphasized in studies of teacher evaluation in Vietnam recently (Ha, 2005; B.G. Tran, 2005; T.T.M. Tran, 2005). Specifically, the goals of evaluating teachers include improving teaching quality (T.T.M. Tran, 2005) and instructional performance (B.G. Tran, 2005), as well as to provide solutions to professional enhancement (Ha, 2005).

According to Nguyen (2004), Vietnamese universities still do not have any official criteria or standards by which to assess faculty. Therefore, in order to meet the demands of changing society, new teaching and learning contexts, and globalization, it is obvious that Vietnamese higher education institutions are in special need of official criteria and standards to assess university instructors and their professional performance (Nguyen et al., 2006). According to Nguyen (2003), there haven't been any transparent or accountable teachers' moral and professional quality measures for centuries, except for some common requirements stipulated by the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) and the country's education law. Therefore, moralities and professional ethics strands should be key components of any standards or criteria for faculty evaluation. In her study, Le (2003) proposed that research, facilitation of

students' autonomy, and respect and rapport with students and colleagues be used as evaluation criteria for university teachers.

In another study, Nguyen et al. (2006) provided a modified conceptual model of performance standards for Vietnamese faculty. Vietnamese university instructors' performance is currently assessed based on a combination of different criteria postulated by Vietnam's Educational Law (2005), University Education Charter (2003), and The Government Resolution on Substantial and Comprehensive Renewal of Vietnam's Tertiary Education in the 2006-2020 Period (2005). Nguyen et al. (2006) suggested also using conceptual competence-based frameworks for teacher evaluation in Vietnamese universities that can "from far and wide offer a substantial view essential to the design of a set of teaching standards and assessment criteria for lecturers in Vietnam" (p. 8). Those models include the 1984 Texas Education Agency Appraisal Model, Indiana State University Model (1998), OECD 2005 England's Standards, and Vietnam's Primary Teacher Standards. The 1984 Texas Education Agency Appraisal Model requires teachers to have instructional strategies, classroom management and organization, presentation of subject matter, an effective learning environment, and professional growth and responsibilities. The "comprehensive, systematic, campus-wide" instructor evaluation model established a decade later by Indiana State University listed six "components of effective college teaching," (Texas Education Agency Appraisal Model, 1984) such as teacher's content expertise, course design, instructional delivery,

instructional relationships, course management and professional development. According to OECD 2005, teachers are evaluated on their professional values and practice; knowledge and understanding; and teaching. Teachers are assessed based on three major criteria, including personality and ideology, knowledge and pedagogy in Vietnam's Primary Teacher Standards funded by the World Bank (Griffin, Nguyen, & Gillis, 2004).

Performance Appraisal at the University

At the University, instructors are evaluated once at the end of the academic year with the use of the Faculty Evaluation Form (see Appendix D). The person who is directly in charge of the faculty evaluation annually at the University is the dean or the head of each department, but the department head more often than not is responsible for assigning the assessment. The evaluation process consists of two parts: goal setting and evaluation. At the beginning of the academic year, instructors write down the assignments they expect to accomplish during the year and the level of completion they want for every item on the evaluation checklists. In the evaluation meeting with the department head at the end of the year, they review and negotiate the rating results. The current performance appraisal implemented at the University evaluates faculty based on five key criteria: (a) teaching and supervision (60% out of 100% faculty member designated weight), (b) professional development (5%), (c) research activity (5%), (d) university/faculty involvement (20%), and (e) community service (10%). The key approach used in the University is self-evaluation. Student feedback

was used as a reference and classroom visits only occur when the department receives negative feedback from students.

Gaps in the Literature

In the review of literature for this study, a few gaps were identified. First, while there is ample research on teacher assessment and evaluation models, there is little research on assessment and evaluation models designed for instructors at higher education institutions. Even less research focuses on how educators perceive the evaluation process implemented on their campuses, what components educators think are important and significant to an appraisal and evaluation system, and faculty perceptions of the campus evaluation design and administration (Barry et al., 2001). Second, while so much research on faculty evaluation has been done internationally, very few of these studies can be found in the Vietnamese literature, even though faculty evaluation and high quality of tertiary education are public concerns and important topics in seminars on higher education.

Summary

The literature review of this study discussed the significant roles of PA in higher education internationally and in Vietnam specifically. It also highlighted the need for research focusing on faculty perceptions of evaluation specific to an accurate assessment of quality teaching as measured through performance appraisal process.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The literature review discussed the special demand for effective faculty assessment in Vietnamese higher education (Nguyen, 2003; Nguyen et al., 2006). The problem this study addressed was the lack of information and knowledge about (a) the best approaches for higher education faculty performance evaluation and (b) faculty perceptions of the performance appraisal process.

The purpose of this research was to explore Vietnamese full-time faculty's perceptions regarding the performance appraisal process implemented on a university campus in Vietnam. In order to address this purpose, I posed the following questions:

1. What meaning do full-time faculty at a Vietnamese university give to the current performance appraisal process as determined through faculty interviews?

2. What factors do full-time faculty at a Vietnamese university identify as central to the applicability of the performance appraisal process in regards to improving instruction?

Qualitative Research

According to Creswell (2009), "Worldview assumptions the researcher brings to the study" should influence the study design" (p. 6). In this research project, I adopted ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological assumptions.

Ontological Assumption

According to Merriam (1998) and Erickson (1990), qualitative research assumes that reality is varied, numerous, and understandable only through interpretation of people's perceptions and interactions. "Realities are apprehendable in the form of multiple, intangible mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific in nature . . . and dependent for their form and content on the individual persons or groups holding the constructions" (Guba & Lincoln, 1992, p. 111). Therefore, I assumed that multiple realities would emerge from the participants' perspectives because the nature of reality (ontology) can be different for different people, and they live and recall differently. As supported by Patton (2002), their differing views help to construct a comprehensive picture of the social dynamic of the phenomena under investigation.

Epistemological Assumption

This study was also based on constructivist principles. From this perspective, "it is impossible and undesirable for researchers to be distant and objective" (Hatch, 2002, p. 15). Individual constructs of perceptions can only be

discovered through interactions between the researcher and the participant due to the variable and personal nature of social interaction (Denzin, 1997). "The logic behind the researcher-as-instrument approach is that the human capacities necessary to participate in social life are the same capacities that enable qualitative researchers to make sense of the action, intentions, and understandings of those being studied" (Hatch, 2002, p. 7).

As an instructor who has experienced the appraisal policies currently implemented on the campus, I assumed that a natural rapport with the participants was already established. It was also assumed that sharing the same appraisal system with the participants, having a close relationship with them, and engaging them in multiple interviews that probed their thinking would help me gain better insights into how the participants perceived the current appraisal policies. Additionally, it was assumed that the participants would become co-inquirers in this study and would also expand their self-perceptions about the current evaluation process.

Axiological Assumption

Denzin and Lincoln (2005) stated, "Research is an interactive process shaped by his or her [the qualitative researcher's] own personal history, biography, gender, social class, race, and ethnicity, and by those of the people in the setting" (p. 6). Creswell (2009) added, "Inquirers explicitly identify reflexively their biases, values, and personal background, such as gender, history, culture, and socioeconomic status, that may shape their interpretations formed during a

study" (p. 177). Holding these in mind I assumed that biases did exist because of my background with the appraisal system and my reference frame may influence the way in which I analyzed and interpreted the data.

Methodological Assumption

The inquiry process is inductive. I did not have hypotheses or prior theories to be disapproved or validated to start my study. Instead, I was flexible as I reflected on the data following Creswell's (2009) description of emergent design,

> Qualitative research is emergent rather that tightly prefigured. Several aspects emerge during a qualitative study. The research questions may change and be refined as the inquirer learns what to ask and to whom it should be asked. (p. 181)

In addition, I believed that "hypotheses are formed after the researcher begins data collection and are modified throughout the study as new data is collected and analyzed (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, 2006, p. 264). Accordingly, I decided to leave any contextual factors or variables intact and study them in their natural setting as emphasized by Erlandson, Harris, Skipper and Allen (1993).

One strength of using a qualitative method is the "holistic account" (Creswell, 2009, p. 176) that provides a detailed and in-depth examination of the issue under study. "This involves reporting multiple perspectives, identifying many factors involved in a situation, and generally sketching the larger picture

that emerges" (Creswell, 2009, p. 176). Another strength of the qualitative

research is its emergent design. The research framework and directions can be

quickly changed or shifted as new information emerges.

However, there are several limitations of qualitative research. Since the

researcher's role is vital in gathering data, the quality of research heavily

depends on the researcher's individual skills and is easily affected by the

researcher' biases. Because the researcher collects the data, the researcher is

required to be present during data collection, which can influence the

participants' responses. Another limitation is that data analysis is time

consuming since data is collected in the natural setting and there is a large

volume of data to be analyzed. Finally, findings of qualitative research cannot be

generalized "to individuals, sites or places outside of those under study"

(Creswell, 2009, p. 193).

Creswell (2009) described research designs as "plans and procedures

that span the decisions from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data

collection and analysis," (p. 3). I sought to explore faculty's perceptions about

the current appraisal policies implemented within a Vietnamese university setting

by asking the following questions: What factors contribute to the perceptions of

instructors on the current evaluation process? Do these perceptions affect

instructors' teaching performance? Therefore, a qualitative case study approach

served this study well. As stated by Maxwell (2005), five major research

purposes typically found in qualitative studies are: (a) to understand meaning(s);

(b) to understand a particular context; (c) to identify unanticipated phenomena and influences; (d) to understand processes; and (e) to develop causal explanation. "We also conduct qualitative research because we need a complex, detailed understanding of the issue" (Creswell, 2007, p. 40). Qualitative research focuses on understanding the participants' perspectives (Merriam & Associates, 2002).

Research Design

A qualitative case study is "an intensive holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomena, or social unit" (Merriam, 1988, p.16). This type of research design was appropriate because I intended to "construct descriptions of total phenomena within their various contexts and to generate from these descriptions the complex interrelationships of causes and sequences that affect human behavior toward, and belief about, phenomena" (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993, p. 3) by "entering the field of perceptions of participants; seeing how they experience, live, and display the phenomenon; and looking for the meaning of the participants' experiences" (Creswell, 2007, p. 31). In this study, I sought to gain comprehensive insight into faculty's perceptions about the university evaluation process using rich, detailed qualitative data through in-depth open-ended face-to-face interviews with them.

According to Richards and Morse (2007), a qualitative case study is "not to reproduce reality descriptively but to add insight and understanding and to create theory that provides explanation and even prediction" (p. 54) by exploring

"how things happen and why" (Anderson, 2001, p. 153). Because a case study focuses on the process rather than the outcomes and can directly influence educational practice (Merriam, 1998), it was important for me to interpret the information as it was collected by making inferences and building hypotheses about the events rather than simply recording data (Yin, 2009),

Yin (2009) also asserted that a case study is the preferred design when examining contemporary ideas. This study used collected data from instructors to interpret their perceptions about the current appraisal policies. Appraisal policies are a great concern to the public and the government because of the special demand to improve the quality of education provided by Vietnamese universities (Kieu, 2004; Lam, 2004; Le, 2004; Nguyen, 2004).

In this study, detailed data was collected from in-depth, open-ended interviews with 12 selected instructors in a university throughout the academic year 2013-2014. This design allowed me to examine the central phenomenon within a bounded system from as many perspectives as possible (Creswell, 2007; Yin, 2009). The purposeful and small population and the boundaries of time and place (Creswell, 2007, 2009; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009) allowed me to spend a substantial amount of time in the natural setting of the study (Merriam, 1998). However, that was also a limitation of this qualitative case study because the findings drawn from this study cannot either be generalized to a larger population or be applied to a different context. Despite "the inability of qualitative research findings to be generalized to other communities" (Arsenault &

Anderson, 1998, p. 134), the results of this research may serve as a catalyst for the improvement of the current evaluation process and provide increased insight into the perceptions of instructors regarding the process. Additionally, uncovering factors that contribute to their perceptions may also stimulate further research.

Research Methods

The following outlines the details of this qualitative case study. More specifically, I will discuss the setting, participants, and instrumentation. In addition, the data collection procedures, analysis, reliability, validity, and role of the researcher are explained.

Setting

Yin (2009) suggested that a defined set of operational criteria to select qualified candidates be established before data collection. Feasibility and accessibility are among the main criteria set in choosing the setting and sample for this study because one's availability and convenience often direct the research sample (Hatch, 2002). This research study was conducted at the highest ranking and one of the largest private universities in Vietnam, which is located in the center of dynamic Ho Chi Minh City. The University, founded in 1991, now has more than 300 teaching staff and four departments: finance and commerce, science and technology, polytechnic, and linguistics and culture. These departments train students at university, college, and high school vocational training levels and technicians and students in international

cooperation programs. The teaching staff includes experienced professors and lectures who have graduated from domestic and foreign universities. One-third of the faculty members have earned either a Ph.D. or an Ed.D. degree and the rest have earned master's degrees. The University has a higher rank than other private universities because of its student-centered training methodology with an underlying philosophy of "committed to excellence." The mission of the University is to graduate students who are able to "be employed, maintain their job performance, and be capable of performing in the wider global work force" (Hoa Sen University, 2011).

In addition, I have worked at this university since 2003. However, conducting a study in one's own school brings both advantages and disadvantages. The most important advantage was that participants demonstrated a strong desire to participate and good involvement because of the trusting relationship between the participants and me. Additionally, my experience with the University's evaluation process helped me to gain a better understanding of the participants' responses and to be aware of any influence I had on the setting and the study population. However, I realized that I needed to be self-reflective about the information I collected and to be aware of the risk of researcher bias because of my relationship with the participants and my experiences with the evaluation process (Merriam, 1998). Mears (2009) added "Research from within the setting becomes more challenging, for it requires overcoming your personal lens in order to understand from other's point of view"

(p. 83). In order to ensure the credibility of the study, these biases were bracketed. According to researchers, biases can be minimized, not only through rigor and rich, descriptive details, as a result of regularly noting my feelings, thoughts, and perceptions in field notes and journal entrees (Creswell, 2009; Mills, 2007; Gay et al., 2011; Yin, 2009), but also by exposing and interpreting the data observed and using "professional knowledge as an educator and researcher to ensure clarity of concepts, purpose and method before and after observational data collection" (Moyles, 2002, p. 173). As suggested by Janesick (2004), I recorded in the self-reflective journal what are considered interpretations rather than observations.

Sample

According to Miles and Huberman (1994), qualitative researchers usually work with a smaller number of participants as "qualitative methods permit inquiry into selected issues in great depth with careful attention to detail, context and nuances" (Patton, 2002, p. 227). A qualitative case study inquires about a contextualized phenomenon within specific boundaries (Merriam & Associates, 2002; Hatch, 2002). Therefore, purposeful sampling is appropriate for a qualitative case study research (Creswell, 2007; Eisenhardt, 2002; Maxwell, 2005; Merriam, 1988, 2001). "Purposeful sampling is based on the assumption that one wants to discover, understand, gain insight" (Merriam, 1988, p. 48); and the goal of purposeful sampling is to select "information-rich cases" (Patton, 2002, p. 169), which can increase the opportunity "to identify emerging themes"

(Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993, p. 82) and allow the researcher to learn a great deal about the experience studied (Creswell, 2007; Merriam & Associates, 2002; Patton, 2002).

In this qualitative case study research project, 12 full-time instructors from different schools of the University were selected for individual face-to-face interviews, which were approximately 40 to 60 minutes long. For "quality assurance" (Creswell, 2007, p. 19), I also included a criterion sampling strategy. Moustakas (1994) emphasized that the most important criterion to use in choosing participants is selecting those who have experienced the phenomenon to serve as sample cases. The instructors selected for the research project had first-hand knowledge and at least three-years experience with the evaluation process that was currently being implemented on campus. Maykut and Morehouse (2001) highlighted the importance of variability when using the purposeful sample method. In order to gain variability, participants were diverse in gender, age, disciplines, academic experiences, and experiences with the University evaluation process.

According to Morse (2000), factors such as the study's design and scope as well as study conditions determine the number of participants. It is more beneficial to have fewer interviewees and to spend time preparing and analyzing than it is to interview many subjects (Kvale, 1996). Twelve full-time instructors were selected for this project because I believed that this was "an adequate number of participants to answer the question posed at the beginning of the

study" (Merriam, 1998, p. 64) and that this number of participants was "sufficient to reach a saturation point or that point where data gathering becomes redundant" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

To create the list of the selected participants, I first used a referral method to gather a larger group of participants and then narrowed that group to a smaller one with the consultation from some of the my colleagues in the University who have been working at the University for a long time, but who were not on my participant list. Final participants were determined based upon the previously discussed selection criteria (Gay et al., 2006; Kvale, 1996). I wanted to make sure that the selected participants represented the study population and would provide information "rich in content" (Creswell, 2007, p. 61). After the selection process, I sent an email to all the 14 participants asking for confirmation that they would participate in this study. Two of the 14 faculty instructors who were invited to participate in the study declined. One was not comfortable with being interviewed or recorded. The other instructor was concerned about whether the information shared in the interviews would be kept confidential and was afraid of the consequences if the information should become public knowledge.

Data Collection and Management

As defined by Bogdan and Bilken (2007), data are "the rough materials researchers collect from the world they are studying; they are the particulars that form the basis for analysis" (p. 73).

According to Yin (2009), three key principles in guiding data collection are using multiple sources of evidence, creating a case study databases, and maintaining a chain of evidence. I used personal interviews to collect multiple University full-time instructor perspectives regarding the current PA process implemented on campus. The data from this case study were organized using Atlas.ti, a qualitative data analysis software program. I also took notes throughout the data collection process for clarification and reflection and to document the coding process and examine emerging themes.

The interviews were face-to-face and about 45 to 60 minutes long. When more data or clarification for previous responses was needed, face-to-face re-interviews were conducted as a "zigzag process—out to the field to gather information, analyze the data, back to the field to gather more information, analyze the data, and so forth" (Creswell, 2007, p. 57). All the interviews were conducted in Vietnamese. I used Vietnamese to collect data from the participants because Vietnamese is their native language as well as my own. I thought it would be challenging and impossible (for some participants) to describe complex thoughts, ideas, perceptions, and experiences, which are the focuses of my study in English—their foreign language. In addition, the use of Vietnamese in the interviews with the participants could have helped to reduce any anxiety and to avoid possible language-related problems (Spradley, 1979).

I met the interviewee in either the participant's personal office or a conference room at a time chosen by him/her to minimize interruptions to the

interview process and so that a non-threatening nor judgmental environment was created. In this way, the chances that the interviewees would openly and honestly reflect their perceptions were optimized and informative interviews were generated. According to Bogdan and Bilken (2007), " Good interviews are those in which the subjects are at ease and talk freely about their points of view. Good interviews produce rich data filled with words that reveal the respondents' perspectives" (p. 95).

Additionally, participants were asked for permission to audiotape their interviews. Throughout the interview, open-ended questions were asked to elicit the participants' perceptions of the current PA process as recommended by Merton and Kendall (1946). Probing questions were also asked for clarification, illustration and to keep interviewees focused on the topic (Rubin & Rubin, 2007). All interviews were tape-recorded and then transcribed. One drawback of tape recording is that visual aspects of the interview such as facial expressions and gestures are not captured (Kvale, 1996; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Therefore, I recorded field notes on my interpretations of the visual aspects of the interview right after each interview was conducted.

Instrumentation

Data for qualitative studies are gathered through words or images and are collected from a small number of individuals or sites (Creswell, 2007). Case study data collection uses observations, interviews, and documents to provide evidence (Yin, 2009). Among these techniques, interviews are recommended to

novice researchers (Cherry, 2000; Tellis, 1997). The purpose of interviewing is "to access the perspective of the person being interviewed" (Patton, 2002, p. 278). Moreover, there are three forms of interviews: open-ended or semi-structured, structured and focused. Semi-structured interviews allow some structure but also give room for flexibility.

For this research, multiple semi-structured interviews were employed with 12 full-time instructors in a university located in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. In-depth, semi-structured interviews were used for the following reasons. First, semi-structure interviews allowed me to ask additional unprepared questions in order to clarify the participant's response or to obtain specific information on the topic (Morse & Field, 1995; Berg, 1998). Using this approach also enabled me to do further inquiry based on the participants' insights into some occurrences (Yin, 2009). In addition, semi-structured interviews allowed me to compare data collected across participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Another reason for employing semi-structured interviews in this project was for their usefulness "when direct observation of the subject is not possible" (Creswell, 2007, p. 150).

According to Kvale (1996), the interviewer becomes the instrument in qualitative research in which interviews are the primary form of data collection. "The personality, style and beliefs of the interviewer" are important to the relationship between the interviewer and interviewee (Rubin & Rubin, 2005, p. 79). An effective interviewer uses an approach that conveys an attitude that the participants' views are valuable and useful (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Weiss (1995, as cited in Burke, 2002) defined in-depth interviewing as qualitative interviewing, and he emphasized the difference in the structure of qualitative interviewing compared to that of an ordinary conversation in terms of the participants' roles in an interview. The person who wants to gather information is supposed to provide direction while the other person takes the responsibilities for proving content (Morgan, 1988). Therefore, as a researcher, my duties are promoting a trusting relationship with each participant, being an attentive listener, creating an interview protocol, asking open-ended questions and providing participants prompts when needed in order to "gather descriptive data in the subjects' own words so the researcher can develop insight on how subjects interpret some piece of the world" (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 96).

Creswell (2007) emphasized, "The investigator writes research questions that explore the meaning of that experience for individuals and asks individuals to describe their everyday lived experiences" (p. 54). In order to promote the participants' descriptions of their perceptions regarding the current PA process through face-to-face semi-structured interviews, a set of open-ended questions were carefully developed based on both a broad review of theory and literature and on consultations with my committee members (see Appendix A). As suggested by Spradley (1979), five types of descriptive questions were used. These five types of questions were: (a) grand-tour questions; (b) mini-tour questions; (c) example questions; (d) experience questions; and (e) native-language questions. Before being used for the actual study, the interview

questions were given to two of my colleagues who have experienced the phenomenon under investigation. They were asked for feedback on the clarity and efficiency of the questions. These two reviewers were also asked to suggest additional questions and to identify which questions may need to be removed. Finally, some changes, for example, rewording and reordering the questions, were made based on their review.

Human Subjects

At the beginning of the interview, participants received a consent form informing them of the purpose of the study and offering assurances that what was said during the interview would be kept confidential (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). This form also stated that participation in the study was voluntary and participants could terminate their participation at any time (see Appendix B). The consent form that assured that what was said during the interview would be kept confidential (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007) was obtained from each participant "neither by coercion nor by force" (Wilkinson, 2001) at the beginning of the (first) interview (see Appendix B). Anderson (1998) advised,

> Confidentiality information implies that the identity of the individual will remain anonymous. It assumes as well that the reader of the research will not be able to deduce the identity of the individual. Information may be quoted and reported, but the identity of the individual should be protected. (p. 20)

Private data and features identifying the subjects and the setting were never used on any interview documentation in the study. Protecting the subjects' privacy by changing their names and identifying features is important when reporting interviews (Kvale, 1996). Therefore, participants' names were not used in this research project. The findings of the study were shared with the participants to ensure that individual identities were concealed. Participants were also asked for permission to audiotape their interviews and all details of the study were disclosed with clarity and without any deceptions regarding the purpose, the process, and the findings of the study (Creswell, 1998). However, according to Stake (2005),

> In-depth interviewing may have unanticipated long-term effects. What are the residual effects of an interview with a teacher who articulates, for the first time perhaps, anger and frustration with his position? Or the administrator who becomes aware of her own lack of career options through participation in a study of those options? Or the adult student who is asked to give reasons for failing to read? Painful, debilitating memories may surface in an interview, even if the topic appears routine or benign. (p. 214)

Participants had the option to discontinue their participation at any time during the study and withdraw or change their responses. Merriam (1998) cautioned, "Interviewing—whether it is highly structured with predetermined questions or semi structured and open-ended—carries with it both risks and

benefits to the informants" (p. 214). Therefore, I made all possible efforts to ensure that a reasonable degree of anonymity was achieved for all participants and that no unusual risks happened to any participant by: (a) obtaining voluntary, informed consent for all respondents; (b) labeling recordings by number and pseudonym rather than name and guaranteeing deletion after three years; (c) removing or changing all identification information for the institution as well as the participants; and (d) limiting access to all coded transcriptions to the participants, the dissertation chair, and me. In spite of all the efforts, anonymity as defined by Dench, Iphofen, and Huws (2004), "anonymity means that respondents could not be identified (including by researchers)" (p. 71) was not completely guaranteed in this study. That is because the study was conducted at the University where I have worked for the last nine years; therefore, I know all the participants rather well.

To promote the trustworthiness of the study, transcriptions of individual data were sent to each participant for member checking (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 1995; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Park & Lee, 2010). The participants were asked to affirm the accuracy of the transcripts, to clarify any misunderstanding, and to offer comments. Transcriptions of all the interviews were coded for analysis using Atlas-ti within 24 hours of the interview because Hatch (2002) affirmed "beginning formal data analysis early will improve the quality of the research" (p. 149). A peer debriefer was also employed to make sure the final themes were accurately translated into English. All recordings, transcripts, field

notes, codes, and the research journal were labeled, organized systematically, kept confidential in a computer file as well as a back-up hard drive and placed in a locked drawer. All data will be deleted three years after the research reaches a successful conclusion.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

According to Hatch (2002), data analysis in qualitative studies is "a systematic search for meaning" (p. 148). Wolcott (1994), Furney (1997), Holliday (2002) and Glesne (2006) also emphasized the need to find meaning and sense in data analysis. In order to make data sensible and accessible (Glesne, 2006), a qualitative researcher is responsible for organizing the data, searching for patterns, identifying typologies, discovering relationships between and across the data, developing generalizations, making interpretations, and sharing descriptive findings (Creswell, 1998; Hatch, 2002; Merriam & Associates, 2002).

As stated previously, data analysis should be conducted as soon as data are collected because, as Hatch (2002) pointed out, "Beginning formal data analysis early will improve the quality of the research" (p. 149). In addition, Merriam (2001) affirmed,

> Without ongoing analysis, the data can be unfocused, repetitious, and overwhelming in the sheer volume of material that needs to be processed. Data that have been analyzed while being collected are both parsimonious and illuminating. (p. 162)

In this research, data analysis was immediately conducted after data collection. Data were analyzed inductively and coding was utilized as qualitative coding is an integral part of data analysis (Park & Lee, 2010). While Merriam (2001) stated that coding is a strategy that assigns some forms of designations to "various aspects of data" (p. 164), Coffey and Atkinson (1996) believed coding is a process to condense data into analyzable units "assigning tags or labels" (p. 26). In addition, coding was important when I reviewed the collected data because it allowed me to differentiate and combine the retrieved data and my reflections on the information (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Jorgensen (1989) suggested, "As different ways of arranging materials are explored, you may find it useful to consult or revisit existing literature and theories related to your problem" (p. 110). Costas (1992) reiterated,

> Researchers who attempt to build on the discoveries of research conducted in situations and on topics similar to the ones they are investigating may refer to research or published works in the relevant area. Categories are then derived from statements or conclusions found in the literature of other researchers who investigated a similar phenomenon. (p. 258)

In order to answer my research questions: (1) What meaning do full-time faculty at a Vietnamese university give to the current performance appraisal process as determined through faculty interviews? and (2) What factors do full-time faculty at a Vietnamese university identify as central to the applicability of

the performance appraisal process in regards to improving instruction?, I started the data analysis process by creating codes based on information from the literature review. Holliday (2007) pointed out, "The themes themselves, although emergent, are also influenced by questions or issues that the researcher brought to the research" (p. 97). Therefore, codes were also based on the research questions posed in the study.

All interviews were transcribed in Vietnamese and loaded into Atlas.ti for analysis. Atlas.ti is a qualitative research tool that can be used to "associate codes or labels with chunks of text, sounds, pictures, or video; to search these codes for patterns; and to construct classifications of codes that reflect testable models of the conceptual structure of the underlying data" (Lewis, 2004, p. 439). Using Atlas.ti, I carefully read word by word and then assigned initial codes and emerging codes during the data analysis (Stake, 1995) to phrases and chunks in each interview. After repeating the same process with all the interviews, I looked for common themes across the cases and "group[ed] summaries into a smaller number of sets, themes, or constructs" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 69).

Reliability, Validity, and Trustworthiness

According to Kirk and Miller (1986), validity in qualitative research deals with the quality of data collection while reliability is about the degree of consistency of data collection. Validity is obtained when the research truly reflects "what the participants think, feel and do and the processes that influence their thoughts, feelings and action" (Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006, p. 273).

Therefore, "validity is a goal rather than a product; it is never something that can be proven or taken for granted" (Maxwell, 2005, p. 105). Reliability is "the probability that an observation if repeated at a different time by the same person, or at the same time by another competent observer, will give the same result" (Gorden, 1980, p. 39). These "criteria of truthfulness" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 290) consist of credibility (internal validity), transferability (external validity), dependability (reliability), and confirmability (objectivity) (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

According to Patton (2002), "The credibility of qualitative inquiry is especially dependent on the credibility of the researcher because the researcher is the instrument of data collection and the center of the analytic process" (p. 146). Therefore, the researcher has "to do one's best to make sense out of things" by "returning to the data over and over again to see if the constructs, categories, explanations, and interpretations make sense, if they really reflect the nature of the phenomena" (p. 477).

In achieving trustworthiness for this study, I utilized member checking, probing questions, researcher's self-reflection, protocol, triangulation, peer debriefing and back translation. First, member checking was used by sharing interview transcripts, interpretations and findings with the participants for confirmation of the accuracy and credibility of collected data. I was also open to all participants' contributions and recommendations to the study (Creswell, 2007, 2009; Glesne, 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Park & Lee, 2010; Stake, 1995). Each participant was emailed a copy of the transcription for review and feedback.

I did not receive any feedback from the 12 participants about the accuracy of the transcriptions.

Second, probing questions were used as a strategy to keep all collected data objective and free of bias. Instead of using my own experiences to interpret the data or influence participants' answers, I used probing questions when clarification or illustrations were needed (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Third, I kept a self-reflective journal to write down my biases and for self-reflection to make sure all of my biases were bracketed and to help me identify and control any possible influence on data collection, interpretation and findings of the study.

Fourth, the protocol strengthened the research reliability of this study by helping me avoid unexpected problems and concentrate on the topic. "Protocol is a major way of increasing the reliability of case study research and is intended to guide the investor in carrying out the data collection from a single case" (Yin, 2009, p. 79). Fifth, the triangulation was used to support the trustworthiness of the study. According to Miles and Huberman (1984), "Triangulation is supposed to support a finding by showing that independent measures of it agree with it or, at least, don't contradict it" (p. 5). To triangulate data, it is essential to use multiple methods (Smith & Kleine, 1986) or data from various sources (Yin, 2009). For this study, although interviews were the primary source of data collection, I selected participants who were varied in the experiences they had with the appraisal policies implemented on campus, who came from different disciplines, who varied in the length of time they had spent at the university, and

differed in gender. In addition, my use of a self-reflective journal in the analysis and interpretation process helped with the elimination of my biases and reduced potential conflicts (Campbell & Fiske, 1959).

Sixth, peer debriefing was used. According to Creswell (2009), "this process involves locating a person (a peer debriefer) who reviews and asks questions about the qualitative study so that the account will resonate with people other than the researcher" (p. 192) and "who keeps the researcher honest" (p. 208). For this study, I asked a colleague from my department who has a Ph.D. and experience with the appraisal policies at the University to take the role of a peer debriefer so that the accuracy of the account could be enhanced. The person helped ensure the accuracy of data analysis and data interpretation. This person also helped me deal with translation-related problems by having discussions about the uses and meanings of words identified as problematic (Brislin, Lonner, & Thorndike, 1973; Whyte & Braun, 1968).

Finally, back translation was used in combination with consultation with my colleague who is bilingual for translation-related problems. Back translation is a technique used in cross-cultural research that looks for equivalents through the translation of the words from Vietnamese to English, independent translation of these English words back into Vietnamese and "the comparison of the two versions of items in the source language until ambiguities or discrepancies in meaning are clarified or removed" (Ercikan, 1998, p. 545; Warwick & Osherson,

1973, p. 30). Brislin et al. (1973) suggested using multiple methods in order to

offset the weakness of one method with the strength of the other.

Role of Researcher

I am the primary "instrument of data collection and the center of the analytic

process" (Patton, 2002, p. 461). Therefore, in this study I am both a participant

and an observer (Creswell, 2009; Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2004;

Merriam, 1998). Erlandson et al. (1993) identified four types of observers that a

researcher can be: complete observer, observer-participant, participant-

observer, and complete participant. In this study, I chose to play the role of a

participant-observer. Taking this role in the study allowed me (a) to build trust

and rapport with informants and to be able to access "the meaning of social

action through empathetic identification" (Schwandt, 2001, p. 186); (b) to gain

insights into participants' perspectives and interpretations, which is believed to

"come from inside, not the outside" (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p. 19)

and to construct meanings collaboratively with them; and (c) to have "a thorough

knowledge of the backgrounds of the participants and the context in which they

exist" (Eichelberger, 1989, p. 9). In addition, the role of participant-observer

allowed me to acknowledge the biases that I brought into the study due to my

own experiences with the current appraisal policies. As Agar (1996) advised,

> If you do document your learning with some procedure that publicly
>
> displays some of the experiences you had that led to the conclusion, and

that potentially might have falsified that conclusion, you can at least show

that your bias was supported by something somebody did or said. (p. 99)

In addition, data for this study were collected from individual interviews so

I was careful not to influence the participants' responses (Mears, 2009). I

provided participants with the opportunity to openly and honestly reflect on their

perceptions without prompts. I met the participants in either their personal offices

or in a conference room at a time chosen them. This helped to minimize

interruptions to the interviews and to create a non-threatening environment.

Additionally, the interview protocol was utilized and no personal feedback on the

participants' answers was made nor were any personal thoughts on the

interviewed topic given. According to Bogdan and Bilken (2007), "Good

interviews are those in which the subjects are at ease and talk freely about their

points of view. Good interviews produce rich data filled with words that reveal

the respondents' perspectives" (p. 95).

Hitchcock and Hughes (1989) highlighted, "There are several serious

strains in conducting fieldwork because the researcher's own emotions, attitudes,

beliefs, values, characteristics enter the research; indeed, the more this happens

the less will be the likelihood of gaining the participants' perspectives and

meanings" (p. 56). Due to the existing relationship with the participants and my

experiences with the PA process, it was likely that potential biases existed. In

order to put these possible biases aside, I needed to be aware of what biases

might exist. For example, as a former faculty member, I might expect the

participants to share some unsatisfactory comments about the PA process. I might also expect the participants to be enthusiastic and open to innovations in the PA process.

Chapter Summary

This study aimed to explore faculty's perceptions regarding the current evaluation process being implemented on a Vietnamese university campus. In order to investigate this phenomenon "in terms of the meanings people bring to them" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 3) in a real-life context (Yin, 2009), a case study design was utilized. Participants were 12 full-time instructors from a high-ranking private university in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam who varied in age, gender, disciplines, and experiences with the current PA process. The primary source of data for this study was collected from individual, face-to-face semi-structured interviews conducted in Vietnamese. Data were inductively analyzed using Atlas ti., a qualitative software. Member checking, probing questions during interviews, a reflection journal, protocol, data triangulation, peer debriefing and back translation were utilized to enhance the trustworthiness of the study.

63

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to explore full-time faculty' s perceptions of

the University performance appraisal (PA) process by (a) elucidating the

meaning faculty give to the performance appraisal process; (b) inquiring into how

these perceptions affect instructors' teaching performance; and (c) discussing

factors that are central to the applicability of the process as a means of improving

instruction. This chapter presents the findings for the following research

questions:

1. What meaning do full-time faculty at a university in Vietnam give to

    the performance appraisal process as determined through faculty

    interviews?

2. What influences do full-time faculty at a university in Vietnam identify

    as central to the applicability of the performance appraisal process in

    regards to improving instruction?

A qualitative methodology was used to investigate faculty perceptions of

the PA process. Qualitative research was conducted because "we need a

complex, detailed understanding of the issue" (Creswell, 2007, p. 40). Moreover,

a qualitative study focuses on understanding the participants' perspectives

(Merriam & Associates, 2002). The primary data sources to answer the research questions posed in the study were recorded one-on-one interviews with 12 full-time faculty members from four University departments. Furthermore, I used a hand-written, self-reflective journal to note preliminary reactions and interpretations. I also listed questions to address and verify for clarification from interview data. After the initial 12 face-to-face interviews were conducted, five follow-up interviews were arranged to clarify information from the initial interviews. I recorded biases in a self-reflective journal and used them to triangulate the collected data by separating the self-reflective data from the faculty narrative data. The self-reflection was designed to control for biases and the possible influences on the data collection, interpretation and findings of the study.

One of the biases I recorded was the frustration I had with the constant changes in the PA form. This frustration was also noted by one of the participants in an interview. This participant expressed the difficulty of using forms that changed from year to year. Her frustration came from having so many forms saved on her computer that sometimes she got confused and did not know which was the correct form in use. This bias was supported by the literature on the benefit of consistency and changes in the effectiveness of the PA process. Danielson (2001) indicated that consistency could be an obstacle to effective PA process. Numerous studies have cautioned that innovative changes could lead

to loss, anxiety and struggle (Fullan, 2007; Kotter, & Cohen, 2002; Marzano, Zaffron, Zraik, Robins, & Yoon, 1995).

Faculty perceptions and experiences were transcribed and reviewed by the participants. The participants were asked to affirm the accuracy of the transcripts, clarify any misunderstanding or offer comments. Five follow-up interviews were arranged to clarify information from the initial interviews.

Transcriptions of interviews were coded utilizing inductive analysis in the Vietnamese language using Atlas-ti within 24 hours of the interviews. Trustworthiness, member checking, self-reflection, protocols, data triangulation, peer debriefing and back translation were components of the data analysis process. Upon the completion of data analysis, major and minor themes were identified and recorded in English. The findings related to each research question are discussed elsewhere in this chapter.

This chapter includes several sections. The first section presents a summary of the descriptive data, followed by an analysis of the data and the process for organizing the categorical themes. The final section presents a summary of the findings.

Descriptive Data

The setting of this study was a private university located in the center of Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam ("the University"), which serves more than 3,000 students each year in programs in different levels, including university, college, short-term training, and so forth. The teaching staff includes experienced

tenured professors and lecturers who are graduates from domestic and foreign universities. One-third of the faculty members hold either a Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree and the two-thirds have master's degrees. The University is considered high ranking because of its student-centered training methodology and an underlying philosophy of "commitment to excellence." The majority of graduates are able to "be employed, maintain their job performance, and be capable of performing in the wider global work force" (Hoa Sen University, 2011).

Two of the 14 faculty instructors who were invited to participate in the study declined. One was not comfortable with being interviewed or recorded. The other instructor was concerned about whether the information shared in the interviews would be kept confidential and was afraid of the consequences if the information should become public knowledge. The 12 participants who agreed to participate worked in four departments: (a) economics and commerce, (b) science and technology, (c) polytechnic, and (d) linguistics and culture. Each participated in an individual one-hour, face-to-face interview. Five participants completed a follow-up interview to clarify information. The 12 faculty members who participated in the study were diverse in gender, age, discipline, academic experiences, and involvement with the University PA process (see Table 1). All participants worked for the University for over three years. In addition, they came from diverse backgrounds. Several worked for the University immediately after their graduation, while others relocated from other universities or enterprises. Two participants formerly worked in University executive positions and four of the

participants had earned Ph.D. degrees from universities abroad. To minimize

interruptions, all of the interviews were conducted in either the participants'

personal offices or a conference room at a time chosen by the participant. Care

was given to create a non-threatening environment. Participants stated the

interview process was conducive to open and honest reflection of their

perceptions.

Table 1

Demographic Background of Faculty Participants (N = 12)

Demographics	*N*	%
Gender		
Male	5	41.7
Female	7	58.3
Academic Title		
Master degree	8	66.7
Doctorate degree	4	33.3
Years working at the University		
3-5 years	5	41.7
6-10 years	7	58.3
Disciplines		
Economics and Commerce	3	25
Science and Technology	3	25
Polytechnic	3	25
Linguistic and Culture	3	25

Findings by Research Question

Emergent themes for each of the two research questions are presented in the following sections.

Research Question 1

The first research question was: What meaning do full-time faculty at a university in Vietnam give to the performance appraisal process as determined through faculty interviews? From the analysis of the interview data, two major themes for the first research question evolved and were analyzed; (a) the overall meaning faculty attributed to the PA process, and (b) the factors contributing to faculty perceptions of the PA process. Data from interviews revealed that the overall meaning of the PA process fell into two minor themes, positive and negative. Ten minor themes contributing to faculty perceptions also emerged from the data.

Overall meaning faculty attributed to the performance appraisal process. When asked about their perceived overall meaning of the PA process currently implemented on campus, the participants eagerly and openly shared their perspectives. The participants noted both positive and negative features of the PA process. Eight of the participants perceived the PA process as a helpful and relevant tool; conversely, four participants expressed their dissatisfaction with the PA process.

Positive faculty meaning attributed to the performance appraisal process. In the interviews, the majority of the participants (*n* = 8) attributed a

positive meaning to the PA process and stated they were satisfied with their recent evaluative ratings. These eight participants perceived the PA process as a helpful and relevant tool to accurately evaluate faculty performance and to enhance their instruction. In their view, the PA process was helpful because the rubrics were clear and the rating results were valuable input for instructional improvement. One instructor said, "I think the current PA is helpful and relevant. I agree with the results of the PA process." Another instructor stated, "My ratings correctly reflect how well I do my job in an academic year and bring me reasonable rewards." Likewise, another noted, "I strongly agree with the rating results because the rating rubrics are clear." Yet, another instructor asserted, "I am happy with the University PA process because the expectations are clear and relevant. Evaluation results helped me improve my instructional performance." One mentioned, "I think the University evaluation instrument is up-to-date, and it has proved the University's best effort in adapting new faculty evaluation approaches in the world."

Negative faculty meaning attributed to the performance appraisal process. During the interviews, four participants attributed negative connotations to the PA process. The participants stated it was unfair to use the same criteria to evaluate the specific assignments of faculty in different departments. The participants also highlighted the time-consuming feature of the PA process and believed the PA process added stress to their already overloaded work. It was notable that the four participants who made negative

comments came from different departments. One instructor stated, "The same rating rubrics are often used in different departments and do not accurately reflect the unique specifics of the assignments in each department. Therefore, the instrument does not accurately measure all the data." Participants expressed the difficulty of using forms that changed from year to year. A faculty member from the science and information technology department added that she now had so many forms saved on her computer that sometimes she got confused and did not know which was the correct form to use. Other respondents commented: "I think the PA process is time-consuming and useless. I do not see its benefits. I still do my job well without being evaluated. I would prefer not to participate in the PA process if it is not required." "In my opinion, the evaluation results are very subjective because they are mainly based on the evaluator's decision." Also, "I have to admit that the University performance appraisal added stress to my workload." Finally, "The evaluation checklists are vague. They cannot measure all the details that I did in an academic year."

In conclusion, when asked about the overall meaning of the current PA process implemented on campus, the participants made both positive and negative comments. In addition to reporting the overall meaning of the PA process as either positive or negative, the participants further noted specific factors that contributed to their perceptions of the PA process.

Factors contributing to the faculty perceptions of the performance appraisal process. During the interviews, each instructor was asked what

factors contributed to their perceptions regarding the meaning of the PA process currently implemented at the University. Faculty perceptions of factors contributing to the PA process were categorized into ten minor themes: (a) faculty perceptions of the PA purposes, (b) faculty perceptions of the PA criteria, (c) faculty perceptions of the PA implementation, (d) faculty perceptions of the PA procedures, (e) faculty perceptions of the PA self-reflection component, (f) faculty attitude toward the PA process, (g) perceptions of faculty involvement in the PA design and development, (h) faculty perceptions of the role of the evaluator in the PA process, (i) faculty perceptions of the benefit of feedback and communication in the PA process, and (j) faculty perceptions of the fairness of the PA process.

Faculty perceptions of the performance appraisal purposes. The participants had a variety of perceptions of the PA purposes and their responses were divided into three groups: (a) the summative purposes of the PA process, (b) the formative purposes of the PA process and (c) the combination of both purposes of the PA process. Half of the responses ($n = 6$) perceived the PA process as a tool to assure that the University was holding instructors' accountable. The number of participants (*Kellan = 3*) who considered the PA process as a useful way to enhance their teaching ability and professional growth was the same as the number of participants reported that the PA process accomplished both summative and formative goals ($n = 3$). The first group of participants believed that the University used the PA process mainly for

summative purposes, to ensure accountability. One faculty participant stated, "A data measure is used to evaluate the quality of the training and provide evidence for measuring an instructor's competency in considering his/her merit pay." Similarly, an instructor from the linguistics and culture department said, "In my opinion, the University evaluates instructors primarily for accountability and making managerial decisions."

Three participants emphasized the formative goals of the University PA system. More specifically, one participant acknowledged, "The evaluation results help me self-reflect on my strengths and weaknesses in my performance so that I can modify my instructional practices to benefit student learning." Correspondingly, another faculty participant affirmed that, "Evaluation ratings inspire instructors to grow professionally."

Three of responses regarding the purposes of the PA process were about the use of the process to accomplish both formative and summative goals. One example from this group of responses was, "I think the University PA process not only measures whether I am meeting the standards but also is used as a guide to grow professionally and enhance my teaching quality."

Faculty perceptions of the performance appraisal criteria. Faculty participants were asked how they perceived the meaning of the criteria of the PA process. The current PA process implemented at the University evaluates faculty based on five key criteria: (a) teaching and supervision (60% out of 100% faculty member designated weight), (b) professional development (5%), (c)

research activity (5%), (d) university/faculty involvement (20%), and (e) community service (10%) (see Appendix D). I found that there were more positive comments from the participants about the PA criteria than there were negative comments. Positive comments were made about the relevance and usefulness of the PA criteria in increasing faculty performance levels and the training quality. Specifically, most of the participants (*n* = 8) believed these criteria were relevant because they had been updated compared to those of the previous academic years. The participants also believed these criteria were useful because the current PA process correlated with the current and updated evaluation approaches used in other institutions. Additionally, these criteria were perceived as helpful in improving teaching and learning quality as well as in assuring that the University was holding teachers accountable. However, a few (*n* = 4) respondents did not completely agree with the criteria. Two participants thought the criteria were too vague to measure the detailed assignments of an instructor. One participant responded, "I think these criteria can measure only the quantity not the quality. For example, I can spend the whole year or even more on researching a study. If the results cannot be seen when the evaluation is due, how can my work be measured?" The other two participants expressed their concerns about using the same evaluation criteria to evaluate faculty members in different departments. "Each department has unique specifics. So, I wonder if differentiation in the evaluation form by department will more accurately measure the work of instructors? Additionally, how can a universal form be used

to evaluate something that is not universal like teaching?" Moreover, there were opinions about adding more criteria or omitting a criterion as well as about changing the rankings of criteria in the current evaluation instrument for better results. One faculty participant noted, "I think more criteria should be incorporated in the evaluation, for example student ratings. Student ratings should be a criterion, not a reference for evaluating instructors. Now only negative student ratings are taken into consideration and classroom observation will occur accordingly." On a different note, another faculty asserted, "Evaluation criteria for faculty members should include only those for better teaching quality. I do not see the benefit of community service in helping improve my instructional performance. I even have to say that criterion has added stress to my workload." Another participant responded similarly, "I have been already overloaded with all the teaching assignments. I do not think I have time and energy for community services."

Additionally, the participants in the semi-structured interviews had some suggestions about the weights of the criteria in the current faculty evaluation form. For example, there were opposing ideas about the emphasis on professional development and research activities. One instructor from the economics and finance department commented, "Personally, I think the University would need more faculty members with high qualifications like Ph.D. and Ed.D. to fulfill its long-term plan on being one of the best private universities in Vietnam and integrating with the world. Therefore, the PA should put more

emphasis on faculty professional development and research." Likewise, another participant responded, "The scale of professional development in the current evaluation instrument does not encourage faculty to advance their qualifications."

Faculty perceptions of the performance appraisal implementation. There were more positive comments (*n* = *10*) about the implementation of the University PA process from the participants. The positive comments were attributed to the University clear policy and guidelines. Specifically, the participants appreciated the good timeline, the goal setting at the beginning of the school year, and the end-of the-year evaluation. The responses of participants varied in their degree of specificity. For example, regarding the participants' discussions that the PA process strictly follow the University policy on evaluation, one interviewed instructor said, "All instructors are evaluated once at the end of the academic year by their department head. There is a clear timeline for the evaluation implementation. The department head, I think, is well aware of the guidelines and follow them." Another instructor explained,

> Annually, we have a two-part process: goal setting and evaluation. At the beginning of the academic year, each instructor writes down the assignments they expect to accomplish during the year and the level of completion they want for every single item in the evaluation checklists. In the evaluation meeting with the department head at the end of the year, they assess these assignments and negotiate the results.

Additionally, another respondent noted, "The University always has the PA

purpose and use explained clearly to the faculty members. A calendar of due

dates are also made known to the instructors."

However, a couple of interviewed faculty stated that the current policy was

not implemented effectively. More specifically, one faculty commented, "It is an

obligatory formality and everyone just wants to get it done." Yet another

asserted, "Overall, the implementation is not consistent. My supervisors do not

take it seriously enough, and they always seem to rush on it. I think they should

change the way they evaluate my performance."

Faculty perceptions of the performance appraisal procedures. The

procedures utilized in the PA process are self-evaluation and the

dean/department head evaluations using a faculty evaluation form. The self-

evaluation was in the form of goal setting that occurred at the beginning of the

year. The dean/department head evaluations occurred at the end-of-the year

annual meeting. Other procedures used in the performance appraisal process

included student feedback and classroom visits when the department received

negative feedback from students.

During the interviews, all the participants honestly shared that they did not

feel completely satisfied with the PA procedures and expressed the desire to use

additional sources of information channels in the PA procedures. They made a

number of comments about the need for the University to apply other measures

such as committee evaluations, final grades distribution in courses, student

examination performance, and long-term follow up of graduates. For example, one participant stated, "Personally, I think the University needs a more well-rounded tool to accurately measure the faculty teaching performance. Therefore, I strongly recommend more sources of data for evaluating faculty should be utilized." The participants also emphasized that student ratings should be one of the key elements of the evaluation process. In addition, there were suggestions about regular classroom observations by colleagues and professional conversations for improving the PA approach. The reasons the respondents gave for these beliefs were that both the University and the faculty would have more sources to obtain information for evaluating teaching performance, which would result in a more accurate and beneficial evaluation process for the instructor.

Faculty perceptions of the performance appraisal self-reflection component. One of the factors that most participants valued about the evaluation process was the chance to self-reflect on the data the evaluation provided. The participants appreciated the opportunity to identify their own strengths and weaknesses they made adaptation to improve their instructional performance. The self-reflection opportunity occurred during the goal setting at the beginning of the rating period as well as during the evaluation meeting with the head of the department at the end of the academic year. In addition, instructors were encouraged to self-reflect on what they had done and what they were doing in their teaching assignments during the school year based on their

prior evaluation. It became evident from the interviews that as a result of the self-reflection component, the majority of faculty members ($n = 10$) perceived the PA process as having a powerful and direct impact on their performance and professional growth. One participant noted, "I always look back at the rating results to identify my strengths and weaknesses and modify my practices." Similarly, another participant stated, "The goal setting stage of the PA process encourages me a lot in improving myself and developing my profession."

Conversely, two participants did not perceive self-reflection as an important factor contributing to the meaning of the PA process. The reason they gave to support their perceptions was that they did not value the PA process. They thought it was just obligatory paperwork they had to complete, which they would opt not to do it if they were not required to. One response was, "I do not see any benefit of the evaluation. It has no influence on my teaching practices. I still do my job well no matter [whether] I am evaluated or not."

Faculty attitude toward the performance appraisal process. Various comments from faculty members regarding their attitudes toward the PA process, and the reactions I observed from them, demonstrated their willingness to express their opinions. Nine out of the 12 instructors expressed positive attitudes regarding the PA process while three expressed negative attitudes. The reasons that were highlighted for the positive attitudes included the value of the PA process in fostering their professional growth, improving their instructional practices, and increasing their professional confidence. A faculty member

avowed, "I strongly believe the PA process has modified my teaching practices because the ratings results have indicated my strengths and weaknesses in teaching." On the same note, another participant stated, "I value the professional development section in the evaluation instrument. It inspired me to get higher qualifications." Yet, another participant echoed these sentiments, "I have received better and better rating results recently, which has encouraged me a lot and increased my self-esteem because I know I have been doing my job well and the University appreciates my dedication." The supportive purposes, the clear expectations of the criteria, the consistency of the guidelines and implementation and the perceived fairness of the PA process added to their positive attitude. One instructor from the polytechnics department shared, "I am satisfied with the PA process because my efforts were recognized and rewarded fairly." Another respondent from the linguistics and cultures department commented, "I believe the PA process is to assist instructors in growing professionally and providing students quality training." Moreover, another participant assured, "The supervision does not invade my privacy and every criterion is aimed to support me teaching better, not to hurt me professionally."

In answering the question about faculty's attitudes toward the PA process, three of the respondents had contrasting points of view. They did not see the benefits or the impact of the evaluation on their teaching. They shared the same negative attitude of "I still do my job well without being evaluated. The evaluation process is tiring and stressful." Notable comments on this question came from

two male faculty members who were near the age of retirement. One of them

said,   •

> The professional development is really a stress to me and a threat to my
>
> job security. I am going to retire in a couple of years so I do not see the
>
> necessity to get my Ph.D. Besides, I still do my teaching job well and do
>
> not get any complaints from the students. However, in recent meetings,
>
> the University did emphasize that any faculty member without a Ph.D.
>
> would not be qualified for teaching any more. That upsets me a lot.

The other respondent added, "I do not find the University evaluation supportive in

my profession, but I have a feeling it is used as tool to catch instructors'

mistakes."

Perceptions of faculty involvement in the performance appraisal

design and development. The PA instrument used at the time of this study was

a revised edition of the original one that was introduced in the 2004-2005

academic year. The rationale for the University evaluation design was unknown

because the staff that made the initial decision left the University many years

prior, and there were many changes in staffing since her departure. However, all

the changes made to the evaluation instrument were based on the yearly

University strategic plan and updated literature on faculty evaluation. The

positive comments on the perceived faculty involvement in the design and

development of the PA process were a consistent theme in the interviews. All

twelve of the respondents expressed their strong belief that faculty involvement

in the design and development was critical for the PA process to be effective. In addition, they shared the same perceptions on their lack of power and passive involvement in the development of the PA instrument. Faculty reported that although they attended an annual departmental meeting to discuss their expectations and suggestions about the PA process and instrument right, few of their ideas were implemented. Therefore, respondents all agreed that the current PA implemented on the campus was completely a top-down procedure. The participants were only involved in the goal-setting stage that occurred prior to the PA process. During this stage, instructors wrote down the goals they wished to accomplish in the coming academic year next to each item in the evaluation checklists. These goals would be reviewed and evaluated at the evaluation meeting with the department head at the end of the school year. A couple of instructors also spoke about the lack of motivation to get involved in the design and development of the PA process. They explained that they were overloaded with their teaching assignments, and they did not think they had either the time or energy to become involved. For example, one faculty indicated,

I am already overloaded with my teaching assignments, mentoring students, supervising students' projects, as well as doing the administrative tasks. I do not think I am interested in participating in the PA design and development. Moreover, I do know that my participation is just a formality and my ideas are put in practice.

Faculty perceptions of the role of the evaluator in the performance

appraisal process. The person who was directly in charge of the faculty

evaluation annually at the University was the dean or the head of each

department. The department head often assigned the ratings. When asked

about their supervisors during the interviews, nine of the participants indicated

that they were highly appreciative of the role of the evaluator in the PA process,

while three did not. They shared their satisfaction about their ratings, which they

attributed to their evaluator's professional skills, expertise, sensitivity, and

respect for their work. They emphasized the hard work of their evaluator, valued

their professional relationship, and appreciated the constructive conversations

during the annual evaluation meetings. An instructor commented, "I think my

department head is a good evaluator. He always takes the PA process seriously

and provides me with the support and guidance I need." One faculty from

economics and finance complimented his department head,

> I trust my supervisor. He himself is a good faculty member and leader.
>
> He also understands the evaluation procedures and criteria thoroughly. In
>
> addition, he always gives me chances to openly discuss or get
>
> explanations about rating decisions during the evaluation meetings.
>
> Therefore, I completely agree with the ratings I have had so far.

Additionally, an instructor from the polytechnic department said, "My supervisor

understands the requirements and difficulties of my work, and he is qualified to

evaluate it. I respect his assessment." Similarly, a faculty participant noted, "The

appraiser always spends time with me, not only discussing my evaluation ratings thoroughly, but also having constructive professional conversation with me, which makes the evaluation really beneficial to me." Yet, another asserted, "My supervisor is open and comfortable with all the disagreements I might have with his evaluation." Moreover, an instructor from the science and technology department noted,

> I appreciate my supervisor's sensitivity in supervision and providing
> feedback. He always treats me with dignity and never gives negative
> comments on my work. We have a good professional relationship. I can
> feel that he wants me to succeed.

Conversely, three participants expressed their displeasure with their supervisor. One faculty member complained, "My rater did not take the PA process seriously enough. He just wanted to get the obligatory paperwork done." Another instructor from the economics and finance department added, "I do not agree with the ratings I have had. I think they are so subjective. The supervisor made all decisions about the ratings without giving me a chance to speak up even when I believed they were unfair or incorrect."

He continued, "The evaluation meeting was a waste of time and it was boring and useless talking to my supervisor because he did not give me what I expected from him." The last respondent of this group said, "What I really need from the evaluation meeting is the explanations for my supervisor's rating

decisions as well as his constructive guidance and encouragement for performance improvement, but he has never had time for me."

Faculty perceptions of the benefit of feedback and communication in the performance appraisal process. During the interviews, another contributing factor to their perceptions of the PA process that the participants shared was the feedback they received in the PA process. There were two kinds of feedback instructors received in the PA process: (a) the oral and written feedback from the department head at the annual evaluation meeting, which was the official standard of evaluation, and (b) the student feedback, which was provided to the instructors and used as a reference of evaluation. At the University annual evaluation meeting, the instructors and their department heads reviewed the checklists of their evaluation. The instructors received both verbal and written feedback from their supervisors. The participants shared a variety of opinions about the administrator and student feedback they received. However, there were more participants who believed that constructive and timely feedback was beneficial to faculty instructional improvement and professional growth than those who did not. Most of the participants ($n = 8$) believed the feedback was positive, specific and helpful. One participant noted, "I appreciate my supervisor's feedback. It clearly shows his care and respect for what I have done. Moreover, his feedback has guided and encouraged me to perfect my teaching performance." In the same manner, another participant stated, "The department head is very sensitive and polite. He never gives me negative

feedback. His feedback is always detailed and constructive. He wants to see me succeed and our students learn better." Furthermore, the annual evaluation meeting was conducted in a collaborative atmosphere, where the faculty member could freely asked questions and express their concerns. One respondent commented,

> The professional talk with my supervisor during the annual evaluation meeting was really beneficial to my instructional improvements. The supervisor shared with me his instructional expertise, guidance, and encouragement. I was completely comfortable joining these conversations with him.

Another shared the same belief; "I enjoyed the face-to-face verbal feedback the supervisor gave me during the evaluation meeting. It was so helpful in reflecting and improving my teaching. I believe my supervisor is an effective provider of professional development with his constructive feedback." In addition to the constructive and timely feedback, the participants also emphasized the two-way communication they perceived in the current PA process. One participant stated,

> I appreciate the two-way communication in the setting-goal stage and the annual evaluation meeting with my department head. This kind of communication provides me chances to clarify the evaluation criteria as well as to raise issues that prevent me from achieving theses criteria. This kind of communication also makes me feel that the University respects me.

On the other hand, a few respondents (*n* = *4)* perceived the feedback as "too subjective," "inaccurate and not fair," "rude and hurtful", and "not helpful". One comment made was:

My supervisor did not spend adequate time talking with my, about my ratings. He spoke very little and just gave me back my evaluation paperwork without any explanation. He just wanted to get this obligatory process done as quickly as possible.

An instructor from the economics and finance department also remarked,

I had a bad experience attending the previous evaluation meeting with my evaluator. He was so impolite and his rude comments made me embarrassed. It seemed to me that he tried to figure out every minor error I made during the year. In addition, he did not explain his ratings decisions to me.

During the interviews, participants also made various comments on student feedback. Since they worked at a private university, students' feedback was considered significantly important. At the end of each course, and without the presence of the instructor, students were asked to anonymously assign their ratings to their instructors by completing paper and pencil surveys. The student feedback form included four sections of questionnaires and three sections of open-ended questions. The questionnaires were about (a) course information, (b) lecturer teaching methodology, (c) lecturer performance and relationship with students, and (d) course assessments. The open-ended questions asked what

students liked and disliked most about the course and their recommendations for improvement. Data were collected, analyzed and reported to both the department and the instructors. Data were then stored and managed by a unit at the University responsible for quality assurance and inspection. However, at this time, student ratings were not officially used as a criterion of faculty evaluation but for reference purposes only. They provided additional information when considering an instructor's effectiveness and as evidence when classroom observation was recommended. In their responses to questions about student feedback, most of the participants stated that they appreciated the student ratings and considered them as valuable input to modifications and adaptations made to their teaching styles, material use, testing, and so forth. They also recommended that the University incorporate student feedback into the official criteria of evaluating faculty.

However, there were some participating instructors who disagreed with the student ratings. The comments made were "Students did not take the evaluation process seriously. So, I do not think their feedback is reliable," or "Some instructors seemed to lower their requirements and did not treat the students strictly enough so that they could get good feedback from the students. Some students tended to give good feedback for lenient instructors." Significantly, one faculty expressed his frustration about student feedback. He said,

I think students are not knowledgeable enough to assess my teaching. Besides, students gave their ratings anonymously so they did not take the process seriously at all. They got the assessment on their instructors done without paying attention to the content of the feedback form and did it very subjectively and emotionally. It is even worse when these careless ratings harm my career and my reputation.

Faculty perceptions of the fairness of the performance appraisal. Regarding the perceived fairness of the current PA process, the participants' responses were mixed. The positive and negative responses varied among the participants. Seven positive responses were recorded in which the explanations for the perceived fairness included the PA criteria and outcomes. These participants believed the University's PA process was fair for the following reasons. First, the PA criteria were clear and faculty members knew exactly what the University expected from them. In addition, the University provided detailed evaluation rubrics, which resulted in accurate ratings. One faculty member shared, "Personally, I think the University PA process can measure what I do in my job——to an extent." Another faculty member commented, "I strongly agree with the criteria of the evaluation rubrics. I think they are clear and specific. I know what the University expects from me and appreciate the University's recognition of my hard work." Secondly, whenever instructors felt that ratings were inaccurate or biased, they could challenge them through an appeal process. More specifically, a participant stated, "My voice can always be

heard when an inaccurate or unfair evaluation is detected. The University policy is very clear and detailed about the process to appeal a rating if you disagree with it." Thirdly, faculty members were happy with the administrative outcomes of the ratings such as merit pay, promotion, pay rise, and/or a bonus for good performance. Faculty participants made comments such as "The University rewards my dedication fairly," and "I think I have received reasonable rewards for all the good work I did during a school year."

However, there were also negative comments ($n = 5$) made about the fairness of the PA process. Negative comments included the role of supervisors in the evaluation process as well as the vague and irrelevant criteria. For example, one faculty member from the science and technology department said, "The supervisor made all decisions about the ratings without giving me a chance to speak up even when I believed they were unfair or incorrect." Another instructor commented,

> Each department has unique specifics. So, I wonder if the differentiation
> of the evaluation form by department will more accurately measure the
> work of every instructor? Additionally, how can a universal form be used
> to evaluate something that is not universal, like teaching?

Research Question 2

The second research question was, "What influences do full-time faculty at a university in Vietnam identify as central to the applicability of the performance appraisal process in regards to improving instruction?" In the

second research question, I explored the influences of the University

performance appraisal on faculty members' instructional improvement as

perceived by the participants. The narrative data the participants shared during

semi-structure interviews were categorized into two major themes: (a) the

positive influences of the PA process on improving instruction, and (b) the

negative influences of the PA process on improving instruction.

Positive influences of the performance appraisal process on

improving instruction. When asked about the influences of the current PA

process on instructional improvement, most of the comments (*n = 8)* were

positive. The positive influences of the PA process on improving instruction

perceived by faculty participants included the following four minor themes: (a)

positive influences of professional development on instructional improvement, (b)

positive influences of self-reflection on instructional improvement, (c) positive

influences of instructional improvement feedback, and (d) positive influences of

student ratings on instructional improvement.

Positive influences of professional development on instructional

improvement. Faculty believed the professional development component of the

PA process favorably impacted instruction. Professional development, which

was one of the key criteria on the University's PA, included enrollment in Ph.D. or

Ed.D. programs, seminar and workshop presentations, in-service training

programs, foreign educational travel, professional presentations, professional

publications, and curriculum innovations. Even though there were concerns

about the weight of professional development compared to other criteria in the PA process, the majority of the participants (*n* = *8)* emphasized the important effect it had on improving their teaching. The participants believed the professional development embedded in the PA process motivated them and made them more confident and knowledgeable in their field. Participants believed the confidence and knowledge they gained by attending Ph.D. or Ed.D. programs, interacting with educational professionals, and participating in seminars and workshops enhanced their instructional practices. One respondent said,

> I myself would not see the necessity of getting higher qualification if I was not reminded again and again each year in the PA process. This reminder had influenced me to get my Ph.D. Now I can obviously see the benefits of attending the program for my students and myself as an educator.

Another faculty asserted, "The evaluation process motivated me to advance in my profession and boosted my self-esteem as well as my skills so that I could teach my students better."

Positive influences of self-reflection on instructional improvement.
Most of the participants (*n* = *7)* shared that there was a positive influence on instructional improvement as a result of the self-reflective component of the PA. After participants reflected on their strengths and weaknesses, they made adaptations to improve their instructional performance. In addition, self-reflection of positive evaluator ratings increased instructors' self-esteem and motivation.

One respondent said, "I feel really good about all the ratings I have received so far. Self-reflecting on all the good feedback I have received in the previous and current PA make me more motivated in improving my performance." Another faculty participant asserted, "The rating results helped me to self-reflect and recognize my strengths and weaknesses in my teaching. Thanks to them, I knew what I did well and what I failed in facilitating my students' learning." Other participants agreed with the above response and added that self-reflection during the evaluation cycle and on the rating results provided them with information to challenge their teaching in order to serve students better. For example, a faculty member from the linguistics and culture department commented,

I have never used the same lesson plan for a lecture in different classes. That is because of my self-reflection. Self-reflection enables me to alter my teaching methodology, use support materials and modify my lesson plan to fit the students' needs the best.

Positive influences of instructional improvement feedback. Faculty considered feedback as a useful tool of the PA process to improve instruction. During the interviews, the majority of the participants ($n = 7$) emphasized the usefulness of receiving constructive written and oral feedback from their supervisors in improving their instructional performance. The instructors viewed the feedback as valuable. Some instructors characterized the feedback as input regarding communicative teaching methods, student-centered learning, and teaching, mentoring students and so forth from "a trusted and skillful expert who

had deep knowledge and experience in the field." Three participants perceived

the feedback as specific and detailed suggestions for them to advance their

practice. In addition, the participants also emphasized their appreciation of the

encouragement and inspiration for teaching improvement that they found in their

evaluator's written and oral feedback. One participant from the polytechnic

department claimed, "My supervisor gave me very good feedback in the previous

evaluation meeting. That made me confident of my teaching competency and

encouraged me to do better." "My department head is an experienced

professional. His feedback was a precious guidance and encouragement in the

improvement of my instructional performance."

Positive influences of student ratings on instructional improvement.

Faculty believed student ratings were a vital component of the PA process that

impacted teaching outcomes. At the University, the process of getting feedback

from students regarding their instructors' teaching was strictly administered. As

stated previously, students anonymously rated their instructors at the end of the

semester in their classrooms without the presence of the instructors by

completing paper and pencil surveys. The student feedback form included four

sections of questions and three sections of open-ended questions (see Appendix

C). The questionnaires were about (a) course information, (b) lecturer teaching

methodology, (c) lecturer performance and relationship with students, and (d)

course assessments. The open-ended questions asked what students liked and

disliked most about the course and their recommendations. Data were collected,

analyzed and reported to the department and the instructor. However, at the time of this study, student ratings had not been officially used as a criterion of faculty evaluation, but only as reference. They provided additional information about considering an instructor's capacity and evidence when classroom observation was needed. Despite all these facts, the majority of participants emphasized the powerful impact of student ratings on their teaching practices. Ten of the faculty participants emphasized that student ratings results were valuable input that they used to improve their overall quality of their teaching and their treatment of students. Participants shared that they had used student evaluations to refine instructional objectives, modify or improve teaching content and methods, modify mid-term and/or exams, alter or update course textbooks; and to choose supplementary materials. Specifically, an instructor from the polytechnic department responded with, "I always value the ratings my students give me because they are reliable data for me to plan changes and make modification in my instruction." Another participant made a statement, "Most of the students take the evaluation process seriously; therefore, I always try my best to adapt my lectures to their requirements by correcting my weakness and boosting my strengths."

Negative influences of the performance appraisal process on improving instruction. There were four participants who perceived the appraisal process as either having no influence or a negative influence on their instruction. Two participants did not see any influence of the PA process on

improving their instruction while the other two highlighted the negative influences. One of the two instructors who believed that the PA did not impact their teaching said, "I still did my job well without being evaluated. I always improved my lectures because of the increasing demand of my students, not due to being evaluated." The other two instructors mentioned there were the negative impacts of the PA on their teaching. One participant from the economics and finance department stated, "The PA process has added more stress to my work that is already overloaded. Community service is an example. Therefore, I do not have time to invest in developing my lessons." Another participant from the linguistics and culture department agreed and added,

> The rewards between the accomplishment levels for the criteria are not obviously different. Therefore, there is no motivation at all for me to get *exceptional performance* if my rewards will be the same as someone who is ranked in *professional level performance*.

Another negative influence was a lack of motivation for faculty members to improve their instruction because student ratings were not an official criterion of the PA process. In essence, low student ratings did not affect an instructor's job security or tenure.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to investigate faculty perceptions regarding the evaluation process at the University. Twelve full-time instructors participated in the study. Through the use of face-to-face interviews

with open-ended questions I sought to provide the reader with detailed descriptions of participants' perceptions of the evaluation process.

The data collection for this study lasted approximately one month (see Appendix E). The researcher met with the faculty members for the first time in mid-September 2013. Data collection began at that time and ended October 20, 2013. After the completion of the analysis of data from interviews and the researcher's self-reflective journal using Atlas.ti, emergent themes were identified. The research questions were used to organize the findings and present them for review.

The first question investigated the meaning faculty members gave to the University PA process that was being used at the time of the study. Throughout the interviews, the faculty participants made both positive and negative comments on the overall perceptions they had regarding the evaluation process and the factors contributing to their perceptions.

The second question reviewed the influences of the influence of the PA process on improvements in participants' instructors' instruction. Interview data were analyzed and themes were categorized into the positive and negative influences of the PA process on improving instruction.

This chapter described the faculty's perceptions regarding the PA process implemented at a private university in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The analysis of the data and the process for organization of categorical emergent themes were discussed in this chapter. The findings offered insights into the perceived

PA process at the University. Professional development, self-reflection, feedback, and student ratings were considered as having powerful impacts on instructors' efforts to improve their teaching practices. Chapter 5 concludes the study with a discussion of the findings, implications and recommendations for future research and practice.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Research has been conducted on significant factors contributing to high student achievement, including examination of the positive correlation of the faculty evaluation process as an aid to student success (Andrea, 2011; Borman & Kimball, 2005; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Dilts, Goe, Bell, & Little, 2008; Doherty, 2009; Ellett & Teddie, 2003; Glickman, 2002; Goldrick, 2002; Tucker & Stronge, 2005). According to these studies, educators who believe they are being correctly and fairly evaluated are more productive not only in improving instruction but also in helping students succeed. In recent decades, there is an increasing pressure for teacher accountability and interest in teacher evaluation throughout the world (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Ellet & Teddie, 2003; Knapp, 1982; Peterson, 2000; Stronge, 2006; Tucker & Stronge, 2005). In Vietnam, since the economic reform implemented in 1986, *Doi Moi*, education has been regarded as the national top policy priority (Le, 2009). The quality of teaching, in general, and the quality of teaching provided by Vietnamese university faculty, specifically, have been of great concern to the public and the government. Moreover, there is also a special demand for high quality of tertiary education for globalization.

However, there is a lack of research in the Vietnamese culture on faculty perceptions of the meaning and influences of performance evaluations. The existing research suggests faculty would like to have more input in the process of faculty evaluations. This study addressed faculty perceptions of a particular evaluation process and their perceptions of its impact on their teaching performance. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore full-time faculty members' perceptions of the evaluation or performance appraisal (PA) process currently implemented in a private university in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. In order to investigate how the University faculty perceived the PA process, the study addressed two research questions:

1. What meaning do full-time faculty at a university in Vietnam give to the performance appraisal process as determined through faculty interviews?

2. What influences do full-time faculty at a university in Vietnam identify as central to the applicability of the performance appraisal process in regards to improving instruction?

This qualitative case study utilized data obtained from individual semi-structured interviews with12 full-time faculty participants. Data of faculty perceptions and experiences were transcribed and analyzed in Vietnamese using Atlas.ti. Upon the completion of data analysis, major and minor themes were categorically reported in English.

This chapter began with a concise review of the study problem, purpose statement, research questions, and methodological approach. The next sections discuss the findings and consider the implications for the University, policy makers, and future researchers that were drawn from this study. Recommendations based on the literature review of teacher evaluation and findings from the study conclude the chapter.

Interpretations and Implications

The analysis of the interview data with 12 full-time faculty members revealed findings that offered insight into their perceptions of the PA process at the University. The results indicated that overall there were positive faculty perceptions of the PA process ($n = 8$). Professional development, self-reflection, feedback, and student ratings were considered significant influences in improving teaching practices. The results are listed by finding as there was an overlap between findings for each of the two research questions. The following section highlights the six findings determined through the analysis. Implications for policy, practice and further research are also discussed.

Finding 1

Participants perceived the PA process positively. According to Danielson (2001), the attitudes of both the evaluators and instructors affect the effectiveness of the evaluation process. More specifically, when instructors considered the evaluation process as an obligatory formality, it was likely that the evaluation process would not prove beneficial in improving their instructional

practices and professional growth. In the current study, the majority of the faculty participants ($n = 8$) positively perceived the PA process as "helpful and relevant", "fair", and "up to date." Participants believed the PA process employed "clear rating rubrics" and was "strictly implemented." They also attributed their overall satisfaction of the PA process to the "reasonable rewards" and "constructive, timely feedback" they received from the ratings. Conversely, four of the participants expressed their overall dissatisfaction with the University PA process. The reasons for their displeasure with the PA process were the "one-size-fits-all" form used for every faculty regardless of department, the vague rating criteria and the subjective assessments. In addition, the participants did not value the PA process because they did not see its benefit in supporting their professional growth, but instead felt that it added stress to their workload and noted that it seemed like the goal of the PA process was to find their mistakes.

While the data showed that a majority of the faculty participants appreciated the University PA process ($n = 8$), the data also indicated that the purpose of the PA was clear and understood by the participants and that the majority of them believed that the University PA process was used to assure University accountability and make managerial decisions rather than foster faculty members in growing professionally and enhancing their teaching. The highest rate of responses from the participants about the purposes of the PA process was about summative goals ($n = 6$). Four participants thought the process was targeted at formative goals while only two mentioned the

combination of both summative and formative purposes of the current PA

process. Research emphasizes that the clarity of purpose primarily determines

the effectiveness of appraisal systems (Meyer, Kay, & French, 1965; Williams,

DeNisi, Blencoe, & Cafferty, 1985). In past research, clarity of purposes

motivated employees (Murphy, Balzer, Kellam, & Amstrong, 1984) and produced

accurate ratings (Ilgen & Fredman, 1983).

Additionally, there were also frequent comments among the participants

that more emphasis on the formative goals of the PA process would be helpful.

Moreover, faculty members valued the use of the PA process for personal and

professional development rather than obligatory paperwork. This sentiment was

supported by Johnson-Hall (2008) who emphasized that teachers would opt not

to participate in the evaluation system if its goals were unrealistic and not tied to

performance. Shinkenfield and Stufflebeam (1995) stated, "As professional

people, teachers themselves must engage in evaluation for both professional

development and accountability" (p. 8). However, existing literature also

indicated that accountability, which focuses on the needs of the organization, and

professional growth, which focuses on the individual, rarely exist together in an

appraisal (Middlewood, 2002). Therefore, the findings of this study raised the

possibility for future research to explore a PA process that emphasizes both

competency and highlights professional growth. Additionally, in the future, the

University should use research-based activities to strengthen the factors

contributing to the effectiveness of the PA process that were shared by faculty

participants. For example, the purposes of the evaluation should be clearly communicated to faculty members as a part of the PA process. In addition, the evaluation should be effectively linked to professional development and rewards. The limitation of this finding is that these perceptions came from faculty participants, not administrators who may have very different points of view (Moomaw, 1977).

Finding 2

The second finding indicated that faculty involvement in the evaluation process motivated faculty to perform at higher levels. In recent years, the faculty felt that the PA criteria process had changed positively when compared with those of the previous academic years. The participants commented that the updated criteria in use at the University correlated with the current and updated evaluation approaches used in other institutions and were helpful in improving teaching and learning quality and in assuring University accountability. Among the negative comments about the University criteria of evaluation, the most notable was that the evaluation criteria were too vague and numerous to accurately measure the detailed assignments of an instructor.

In addition, a few participants expressed their concerns about using the same evaluation criteria to evaluate faculty members in different departments. The participants reported that the "one-size-fits-all" evaluation form could not precisely capture all the unique specifics of their departmental assignments. Due to these negative responses, the faculty participants felt the PA process was

discouraging and unfair. Also, the participants mentioned the stress and overload that they experienced from the current PA process. According to Medley and Coker (1987), an evaluation process that lacks specificity is neither accurate nor reliable in judging teacher performance, and results in little improvement in performance. Schuler et al. (1991) added that one important component of an effective PA form was the specified and relevant evaluation criteria.

In order to make the criteria more relevant to the faculty, some faculty participants mentioned their involvement in the PA process design and development. The participants believed they needed more active roles in that process so that the process would represent and accurately measure their work. At the University, the only involvement that most of the participants experienced was the goal-setting stage right before the evaluation cycle started. During this stage, instructors paired the goals they wished to accomplish in the upcoming academic year with items in the evaluation checklist. These goals would be reviewed at the evaluation meeting with the department head at the end of the school year. The majority of participants ($n = 7$) favored the goal-setting stage because they could establish realistic and feasible workload targets for the evaluation cycle by taking into consideration the available resources and constraints.

The existing literature demonstrates a positive correlation between goal setting and employee performance and the organizational value of employee

involvement in goal setting (Brown & Latham, 2000; Korsgaard & Robinson,

1995; Nemeroff & Wesley, 1979). Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) emphasized

the importance of an informal and individualized process for goal setting for

professional development. In other words, instructors should actively choose

their own professional development and identify their goals. The use of goals

has the potential to increase or decrease employee performance. Specifically,

establishing goals encourages employees to try their best and reach higher

levels of performance (Brown & Latham, 2000). The researchers also note that

when goals are vague and numerous, they can cause conflict (Lewis, 1998),

which results in employee stress and overload (Marsden & French, 2002).

However, the findings of this study revealed that although the faculty set their

own goals, they actually selected these goals from limited lists established by the

University. Brown and Benson (2005) asserted, "Participation is a management

device in which control is enhanced by creating the impression that control has

been devolved to employees (p. 117). The implication is clear: A satisfactory PA

process should include faculty involvement. According to Seldin (1984), "The

purpose of evaluation shapes the questions asked, the sources of data utilized,

the depth of the analysis, and the dissemination of findings" (p. 127). In other

words, faculty should be encouraged to participate in all aspects of the PA

process. Another implication includes the fact that the PA process should be

designed with specialized rubrics differentiated by content area. Gallagher

(2004) found that the evaluation instruments with content specificity improve the overall effectiveness of teacher evaluation.

Finding 3

Participants reported their desire for multiple sources of evaluation information to be incorporated into the PA process. During the interviews, all participants commented that they would like the University to apply additional types of evaluation such as committee evaluation, final grades distribution in courses, student examination performance, and/or long-term follow up of graduates to the PA process. The participants also emphasized that student ratings should be one of the key elements of the evaluation process. In addition, the participants mentioned that regular classroom observations by colleagues and professional conversations would improve the PA approach process. There are two possible interpretations regarding these specific findings. First, the participants valued the self-assessment and evaluator's feedback in the current PA process. They considered self-assessment as a beneficial component. Research documents reflection and self-evaluation in the evaluation process as important factors contributing to teachers' professional development because they "encourage teachers to continue to learn and grow throughout their career" (Mathers, Olivia, & Laine, 2008, p. 6).

The second interpretation is the need for more channels of information to increase the accuracy, fairness, and objectivity of the current PA process as well as to measure diverse aspects of professional growth such as teacher

competency, teacher performance, and teacher effectiveness. This finding is supported by the variety of appraisal methods studied in the existing literature on teacher evaluation, including: (a) teacher interviews, (b) competency tests, (c) indirect measures, (d) classroom observation, (e) student ratings, (f) peer review, and (g) student achievement (Ellett et al., 1980; Hafele, 1980; Lewis, 1982; Millman, 1981; Peterson & Kauchak, 1982). In addition, Centra (1977) stated that evaluating faculty from a variety of sources helped with the clarity of the PA purposes. The most frequently suggested information source for evaluation was student ratings, which was used only as a reference in the current PA process.

Faculty requested additional types of evaluation in the PA process. This study supports the literature on alternative evaluation. The University would benefit by developing and extending the current PA process or seeking a different PA design. Future action research could explore what types of additional appraisal methods should be incorporated to enhance the effectiveness of the current PA.

Finding 4

Participants perceived the evaluator as the most important contributing factor to the effectiveness of the current PA process. In interviews, the majority of the faculty participants (n = 9) expressed positive remarks about their supervisor or evaluator. They shared their satisfaction about their ratings, which they attributed to their evaluator's professional skills, expertise, sensitivity, and respect for their work. They emphasized the hard work of their evaluator, valued

the professional relationships they had with the evaluator, and appreciated the constructive conversations that occurred during the annual evaluation meetings. On the other hand, three participants expressed their displeasure with their supervisor. While there were mixed perceptions regarding the role of evaluator in the PA process, the majority of participants agreed on the value of constructive and timely feedback from the evaluator. The participants also believed that the feedback they received during the annual evaluation meetings was valuable encouragement and was useful in improving their instruction.

Research emphasizes the critical role of evaluator's constructive feedback in enhancing teacher satisfaction and commitment, improving their performance and helping them grow professionally (Boudreau, 2000; Feeney, 2007; Marshall, 2005; Marzano et al., 2001; Ovando, 2005). Specifically, Ovando (2005)'s study revealed that teachers found their evaluator's meaningful and detailed feedback useful. Likewise, Stiggins and Duke (1988) asserted, "A continuous cycle of feedback . . . is needed to promote teacher development" (p.22). Throughout the interviews conducted for this study, participants highlighted that the feedback was important to them, but it appeared that they preferred positive and high-quality feedback rather than negative and disrespectful criticism. Particularly, in a Vietnamese context, harsh or negative feedback from evaluators can either threaten faculty's self-esteem or lower faculty's professional and mistrust. Therefore, evaluators were expected to play two roles in the PA process. They were not only judges who made assessments on faculty teaching performance

but also coaches who provided faculty with advice and support in improving their teaching (Kay, Meyer, & French, 1965). Moreover, the evaluators should discuss poor performance results with great care and a sense of responsibility.

The interview data also revealed the trust that faculty members placed in their supervisors. According to the literature, in subjective systems of performance appraisal and in appraisal systems for summative purposes like the University PA system, trust in evaluators is critically important (Kleiman, Biderman, & Faley, 1987; Lawler, 1971). Trust in evaluators increases the effectiveness of the system (Lawler, 1971), enhances the employees' acceptance of the PA process (Gabris & Ihrke, 2000), and positively correlates with educator performance (Goris, Vaught, & Pettit, 2003). The faculty participants labeled their trust in their supervisors as "the fair and accurate ratings the supervisor made," "the enjoyable and constructive conversation with the supervisor during the annual evaluation meeting," or "the good professional relationship with the supervisor." This meant that the evaluators were perceived as capable and knowledgeable about curriculum, content, instruction, as well as in providing suggestions and support for improvement. Another interpretation drawn from the negative comments made by faculty participants was that their supervisors needed more training in order to be more effective in evaluating and coaching faculty members. Research shows that training is significantly important to evaluators. Mujis (2006, as cited in Mathers, Olivia, & Laine, 2008) stated,

Lack of training can threaten the reliability of the evaluation and the objectivity of the results. Not only do evaluators need a good understanding of what quality teaching is, but they also need to understand the evaluation rubric and the characteristics and behaviors it intends to measure. (p. 10)

This finding indicates the need for evaluators to be diligent in giving faculty every opportunity to receive constructive and high quality feedback in order to promote professional growth and self-improvement through the PA process. The University also needs to be sure that faculty as well as evaluators are thoroughly trained because "everyone involved in the evaluation should know how to use evaluation instruments to acquire useful, objective data, interpret results, and use those to advantage" (Stiggins & Duke, 1988, p. 24). A limitation of this finding includes the fact that all of the perceptions were collected from the faculty members, not the evaluators themselves. Therefore, for future research, supervisors' perceptions regarding their roles in the PA process should be investigated.

Finding 5

This finding was based on the faculty belief that student feedback should be an official criterion of evaluation in the PA process. Currently, student ratings are used to give additional information about an instructor's teaching capacity and are acquired through classroom observations. Ten of the faculty participants emphasized the insightful impact of student ratings on their teaching practices.

They asserted that student ratings results were valuable data for them to improve their overall teaching quality and their treatment of students. The participants also stated student ratings helped them to refine instructional objectives, to modify teaching content and methods; to modify exams; to alter or update course textbooks; and to choose supplementary materials. However, in existing literature there were mixed findings about the use of student ratings in improving teacher instruction. While Cohen (1980) stated, "student ratings are a valuable source for improving instruction at the college level" (p. 339), Rotem and Glasman (1979, as cited in Yao & Grady, 2005) asserted, "Feedback from student ratings does not seem to be effective for the purpose of improving performance of university teachers" (p. 507).

Faculty stated the inconsistent findings based on student feedback and the reliability, validity, and procedures impacted teaching effectiveness negatively (Hooper & Page, 1986; Lori, Regina, & Peter, 2000). They also stated positive student ratings improved their instruction (Centra, 1993; Jacobs, 1997). The data also revealed that nearly all of the participants ($n = 10$) strongly recommended incorporating student feedback into the official criteria of the PA. The participants also encouraged the use of student ratings for formative rather than summative purposes. This sentiment was supported by Nasser and Fresko (2002)'s study. In their study, they found that only 8 to 23 percent of the instructors agreed with the use of student ratings for accountability and managerial decisions. The negative comments made by two faculty participants

on student feedback also reflected their doubts about the University using student feedback in making personnel decisions.

In 2002, Nguyen and McInnis conducted a study with 140 department heads and faculty at a university in Vietnam regarding using student feedback as a part of the faculty evaluation. The study findings revealed that department heads and faculty had very contrasting opinions on student ratings. While most of the faculty participants were comfortable with student ratings, department heads did not completely support the use of student ratings as an official criterion for faculty evaluation. They suggested the application of student ratings in the evaluation be used with "extreme caution" due to the fear that student ratings could "threaten the privileged position held by teachers in Vietnamese society" (p. 156).

Future research at the University should investigate the solutions for some faculty's skeptical attitudes about student ratings and the best achievable application of student ratings in the PA process. Additionally, future research can examine faculty perceptions at multiple Vietnamese higher institutions regarding the influences of student ratings on instructional improvement. The findings of this study also reinforce the literature by Nguyen and McInnis (2002), which found that "Vietnamese university appraisal policies could use student evaluation for teachers' decision-making on a formal basis to a limited extent" (p. 157).

Finding 6

This finding considers participants' perceptions of professional

development as having an influential impact on improving their instructional

performance. During the interviews, the faculty mentioned that professional

development, self-reflection, student ratings and feedback from the evaluator

were positive influences of the PA process on their improving their instruction.

However, they considered professional development as the component that had

the strongest impact on their teaching. This belief is supported by existing

research by Kelly (1999) and McLaughlin and Pfeifer (1988). According to these

researchers, feedback and self-reflection could not support teachers effectively in

improving their instruction without professional development. Professional

development supports teachers in utilizing feedback and self-reflection to make

the changes needed to enhance their teaching. The interview data reflected a

strong emphasis from faculty participants about the opportunities for professional

development from the PA process. These opportunities included conferences,

workshops, seminars, programs for higher qualifications, in-service training

programs, foreign educational travel, professional presentations, professional

publications, and curriculum innovation. Fullan (1998) considered a professional

development opportunity as:

> A new kind of task focused, continuous professional development,
>
> combining a variety of learning formats and a variety of trainers and other
>
> support personnel, is evolving and proving its effectiveness in bringing

about changes in practice. . . . There is also some evidence that alternating practice and training in short sessions over a period of several months can go a long way in bringing about change. (p. 78)

The participants highlighted the benefits gained from professional development in their teaching practices and quality. They also expressed their desire to use the PA process for more formative purposes. Research and literature support the significance of professional development offered in appraisal processes. Fullan (1998) wrote,

Research on change and research on appraisal systems have arrived at the same conclusions, namely, that appraisal, to a large extent, involves changes in teacher behavior and that these are best achieved through on-going, goal-directed professional development. Such development focuses on collective tasks, is managed actively by principals and district leadership, generates valid and useful information, is supported and driven by an improvement-oriented value system, and is facilitated by implementation planning at the school and district level. (p. 79)

However, the participants cautioned that professional development should not be mandated, which often results in stress and posed a threat to job security. Specifically, two participants expressed their concern about their future with the University if they did not earn a Ph.D or an Ed.D degree. Future research conducted at the University could seek insights into effective professional

development opportunities that would boost faculty motivation to grow professionally.

The findings have implications for a revamped appraisal design. In order to promote faculty professional growth, the PA needs to be designed so that faculty self-reflection is increased and the evaluation criteria are decreased. Additionally, evaluators and instructors require time to implement the PA process consistently as well as time to collaborate and provide feedback. Additional funding would be required for this to come to fruition.

Limitations of this Study

There were several limitations to this study. The first limitation was the unknown rationale for the initial choice of the PA process at the University. This limitation arose from the constant changes in personnel in the human resources department of the University. The second limitation was that participants' gender, age, academic title, and years of teaching experience were not taken into consideration during the data analysis because of the time constraints of the study. Differences in age, gender, academic title and years of experienced may affect the faculty's perception of the PA process.

A third limitation of the study was the lack of multiple sources of data to validate the findings, such as administrators' perceptions regarding the University current PA process and the student achievement data. Perceptions of the University PA process from both administrators and faculty members may result in more multifaceted insights into the process because of differing perspectives

(Moomaw, 1977). In addition, the student achievement data could be used to validate faculty's perceptions of the influences of the PA process on improving their instruction. Fourth, findings drawn in the study primarily came from interviews with the participants. Therefore, participants' subjectivity was also considered as a limitation of the study.

Another limitation of the study was that it was conducted at a single private university with 12 full-time faculty participants during the 2013-2014 academic year. The University has its own PA process, which is not the same as those used in other public and private higher educational institutions in Vietnam. Therefore, the study findings do not generalize to other universities and colleges. Finally, The University is also where I have worked for nearly 10 years, and I am familiar with both the PA process and the participants. Although a self-reflective journal was used in every interview and most of the participants were chosen from departments outside my own department, biases were not completely eliminated.

Recommendations

According to Creswell (2007, 2009), Merriam (1998), and Yin (2009), the purposeful and small population and the boundaries of time and place delimits this qualitative case study as the findings drawn cannot either be generalized to a larger population or be applied to a different context. However, I propose the following recommendations primarily drawn from the literature review for leaders and policy makers as well as for future research.

Recommendations for Leaders and Policy Makers

Faculty evaluation has been a public concern and a popular topic of seminars in higher education in Vietnamese culture. In spite of this concern, there is a lack of information and knowledge about the best approaches for higher education faculty performance evaluation (Nguyen, 2004). According to Rice (2003),

> Education policy makers and administrators would be well-served by recognizing the complexity of teacher quality and adopting multiple measures along many dimensions to support existing teachers and to attract and hire new, highly qualified teachers. The research suggests that investing in teachers can make a difference in student achievement. In order to implement needed policies associated with staffing every classroom—even the most challenging ones with highly qualified teachers, substantial and targeted investments must first be made in both teacher quality and education research. (p. 3)

It was evident from the literature that the PA process has an influence on instructional practices. Therefore, it is recommended that leaders and policy makers review their existing PA processes and make changes to promote instruction quality. For example, leaders and policymakers may design a study that investigates the influences of using multiple data sources for performance appraisal, such as portfolios, peer evaluation, and classroom observation.

Stiggins and Duke (1998) emphasized that not only evaluators, but also instructors, should make use of valuable data from the evaluation process and utilize the data to improve. Therefore, continued training is important to the evaluation process. That leads to another recommendation for leaders and policymakers. In order to achieve best results from the evaluation process, school leaders and policymakers need to implement ongoing training programs on evaluation for both administrators and teaching staff.

The literature review indicates that a poorly designed PA forms can significantly alter the effectiveness of the PA process (Edgan, 1995). Therefore, it is recommended that when designing/developing a new PA process or modifying the existing PA process, each university should form a committee made up administrators, faculty members, and board members to enhance the buy-in, understanding, and support of the process (Danielson, 1996). The committee's responsibilities should include formulating the PA policies and communicating the purposes and procedures of the PA process to faculty before its implementation. To achieve the best results, the committee also needs to review the PA process each year and make adjustments as necessary.

Recommendation for Future Research

In order to fill the gap in Vietnamese literature on best practices, future research should be conducted in multiple universities in Vietnam to explore faculty and administrators perceptions of the impacts of the existing faculty evaluation systems on teaching improvement and professional growth. The

existing literature demonstrates a positive correlation between goal setting and employee performance and the organizational value of employee involvement in goal setting (Brown & Latham, 2000; Korsgaard & Robinson, 1995; Nemeroff & Wesley, 1979). The majority of faculty participants in this study ($n = 7$) highly valued the goal-setting stage because they could establish realistic and feasible workload targets for the evaluation cycle by taking into consideration the available resources and constraints. Therefore, future research should investigate the nature and quality of faculty involvement in the PA process, for example, the role of individual characteristics on the effectiveness of the involvement process.

According to Shinkenfield and Stufflebeam (1995), "As professional people, teachers themselves must engage in evaluation for both professional development and accountability" (p. 8). However, existing literature also indicated that accountability, which focuses on the needs of the organization, and professional growth, which focuses on the individual, rarely exist together in an appraisal (Middlewood, 2002). Therefore, the findings of this study raised the question for future research to explore a PA process that emphasizes both competency and highlights professional growth.

Centra (1977) stated that evaluating faculty from a variety of data sources helped with the clarity of the PA purposes. Additionally, the existing literature on teacher evaluation supports the utilization of various appraisal methods in the PA process in order to increase the accuracy, fairness, and objectivity of the process

and to measure diverse aspects of professional growth, such as teacher competency, teacher performance and teacher effectiveness. Examples of the appraisal methods found in the literature include (a) teacher interviews, (b) competency tests, (c) indirect measures, (d) classroom observation, (e) student ratings, (f) peer review, and (g) student achievement (Ellett et al.,1980; Hafelfe, 1980; Lewis, 1982; Millman, 1981; Peterson & Kauchak, 1982). Therefore, future research could explore what types of additional appraisal methods should be incorporated to enhance the effectiveness of the current PA implemented in universities in Vietnam.

Summary of the Dissertation

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore full-time faculty's perceptions of the evaluation process, or performance appraisal process, as it is termed, being implemented on a Vietnamese university campus at the time of this study by (a) elucidating what meaning faculty gave to the performance appraisal process; (b) inquiring into how these perceptions affected instructors' teaching performance; and (c) discussing factors that are central to the applicability of the process as a means of improving instruction. The following salient findings were identified. First, faculty found a PA process that emphasized both competency and highlighted professional growth beneficial and motivating in measuring their performance and enhancing their teaching quality. Secondly, significant factors contributing to faculty positive perceptions of the PA process as well as to faculty instructional improvement. These factors included

the clarity of the PA purpose, faculty involvement in the PA design and development, and the critical role of the evaluator and his/her constructive feedback in the PA process. Finally, faculty strongly recommended additional types of evaluation, especially student feedback, be incorporated into the current PA process and more opportunities for professional development be provided.

As a result of these findings, this study could serve as a catalyst for policymakers and school leaders to improve the existing evaluation processes and to seek insights into how instructors perceive these policies and what factors contribute to their perceptions. The findings of this study could also stimulate further research on appraisal policy reform. Identifying key factors that instructors believe are critical for an effective evaluations process could assist t leadership within an institution to find the tools that would make the current polices meet instructors' expectations. Moreover, this study made a significant contribution the gap in the existing Vietnamese existing literature on faculty evaluation. Egelson and McColskey (1998) affirmed, "if teachers and schools are to continually improve the quality of the instructional program, then an evaluation system designed to encourage individual teacher growth is not a luxury, but a necessity" (p. 5).

REFERENCES

Agar, M. H. (1996). *The professional stranger: An informal introduction to ethnography* (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Adams, J. V. (1997). Student evaluation: The ratings game. *Inquiry, 1*(2), 10-16.

Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research, 1*, 177-198.

An, K. (2013). Student evaluation: Only a formality. *Petro Times*. Retrieved from http://www.petrotimes.vn

Analoui, F., & Fell, P. (2002). Have been appraised? A survey of the university administrative staff. *International Journal of Educational Management, 16*, 1-11. Retrieved from http://dandini.eemeraldinsight.com

Anderson, G. (1998). *Fundamentals of educational research* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Routledge /Falmer.

Anderson, G. (2001). *Fundamentals of educational research* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Routledge/Falmer.

Antinello, J., Lare, D., & Waters, F. (2006). The value of teacher portfolios for evaluation and professional growth. *NASSP Bulletin, 90*(2).

Arreola, R. A. (1995). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Arsenault, A., & Anderson, G. (1998). Qualitative research. In G. Anderson (Ed.), *Fundamentals of educational research* (2nd ed., pp. 119-135). London: Falmer Press.

Avalos, B., & Assael, J. (2006). Moving from resistance to agreement: the case of the Chilean teacher performance evaluation. *International Journal of Educational Research, 45,* 254-266.

Beer, M. (1985). Note on performance appraisal. In M. Beer and B. Spector (Eds.), *Reading in human resource management* (pp. 312-331). New York: The Free Press.

Berg, B. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Berlie, J. (1995). Higher education in Vietnam: Historical background, policy, and prospect. In A. H. Yee (Ed.), *East Asian higher education: Traditions and transformations.* London: Pergamon.

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiations in Organizations, 1,* 43-55.

Blunt, E. (1991). *A short guide to evaluating teaching.* Tucson: University of Arizona Assessment and Evaluation Research.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Borman, G. D., & Kimball, S. M. (2005). Teacher quality and educational equality: Do teacher with higher standards-based evaluation ratings close student achievement gaps? *Elementary School Journal, 106*(1), 3.

Brislin, R. W., Lonner, W., & Thorndike, R. M. (1973). *Cross-cultural research methods.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Brown, M., & Benson, J. 2005. Managing to overload? Work overload and

performance appraisal processes. *Group & Organization Management,*

30(1), 99-124.

Brown, T. C., & Latham, G. P. (2000). The effects of goal setting and self-

instruction training on the performance of unionized employees. *Relations*

Industrielles, 55(1), 80-96.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation

by the multitrait-mulitimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*(2), 81-105.

Cardy, R. L., & Dobbins, S. G. (1994). *Performance appraisal: Alternative*

perspectives. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing.

Cascio, W. F. (2003). *Managing human resource: Productivity, quality of work*

life, profits (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Casey, R. J., Gentile, P., & Bigger, S. W. (1997). Teaching appraisal in higher

education: An Australian perspective. *Higher Education 34,* 459-482.

Centra, J. A. (1977). The how and why of evaluating. In J.A. Centra, *Renewing*

and evaluating teaching (pp. 77-79). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation.* San Francisco, CA: Josey-

Bass.

Cherry, A. (2000). A research primer for the helping professions: Methods,

statistics and writing. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.

Chow, A. P. Y., Wong, E. K. P., Yeung, A. S., & Mo, K. W. (2002). Teachers'
perceptions of appraiser-appraisee relationships. *Journal of Personnel
Evaluation in Education, 16*(2), 85-101.

Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data:
Complementary research strategies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cohen, A. (1974). Evaluation of faculty. *Community College Review 2*(2), 12-21.

Cohen, A. (1980). Effectiveness of student-rating feedback for improving college
instruction: A meta-analysis of findings. *Research in Higher Education, 13,*
321-341.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*
(6th ed.). New York: Routledge.

Costas, M. (1992). Qualitative analysis as a public event: The documentation of
the category development process. *American Educational Research
Journal, 29,* 253- 266.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among
five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design. Choosing among
five approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed
methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cunningham, W. C., & Gresso, D. W. (1993). *Cultural leadership: The culture of
excellence in education.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2001). *New trends in teacher evaluation: Educational leadership.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2009). *Revisiting teacher learning: A framework for learning to teach.* Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/summer09/vol66/num09/A-Framework-for-Learning-to-Teach.aspx

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Dang, B. L. (1997). Vietnam. In G. A. Postiglione, & C. L. Mak (Eds.), *Asian higher education* (pp. 70-83). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Dang, V. H, & Ha, T. D. (2009). *Teaching theory in tertiary education.* Ha Noi: University of Pedagogy Publisher.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching.* Kutztown, PA: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Target time to teachers. *Journal of Staff Development, 20*(2), 31-36.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analyst Archives, 8*(1), 1-44.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2002). Research and rhetoric on teacher certification: A response to "Teacher Certification Reconsidered," *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10*(36). Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n36.html

Darling-Hammond, L., & Ascher, C. (1992). *Creating accountability in big cities schools.* New York: Sage.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 53*(3), 258-328.

Davis, J. R. (1997). Assessing what professors do: An introduction to academic performance appraisal in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*(1), 112-124.

Day, C., Flores, M. A., & Viana, I. (2007). Effects of national policies on teachers' sense of professionalism: Findings from an empirical study in Portugal and in England, *European Journal of Teacher Education, 30*(3), 249-266.

Delahaye, B. L. (2000). *Human resource development.* Milton, Queensland: John Wiley & Son Australia Ltd.

Dench, S., Iphofen, R., & Huws, U. (2004). *An EU code of ethics for socioeconomic research.* Retrieved from http://www.respectproject.org/ethics/412ethics.pdf

Denzin, N. (1997). *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dilts, A. D., Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis.* Washington, D.C.: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Dilts, A. D., Haber, J. L., & Bialik, D. (1994). *Assessing what professors do: An introduction to academic performance appraisal in higher education.* London: Greenwood.

Dipboye, R. L, & de Pontbriand, R. (1981). Correlates of employee reactions to performance appraisals and appraisal systems. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 66*(2), 248-251.

Doherty, J. (2009). *Perceptions of teachers and administrators in a Massachusetts suburban school district regarding the implementation of a standards-based teacher evaluation system* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ.

Duckett, W. R. (1993). Planning for the evaluation of teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan, 79,* 3.

Duy, A. (2014). Faculty evaluation: Easy to generate negatives. *Dan Tri.* Retrieved from http://www.dantri.com.vn

Egan, G. (1995). A clear path to peak performance. *People Management, 1*(10), 34-37.

Eichelberger, R. T. (1989). *Disciplined inquiry: Understanding and doing educational research.* New York: Longman.

Ellett, C. D., & Teddlie, C. (2003). Teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness and school effectiveness: Perspectives from the USA. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 17*(1), 101-128.

Ellett, C. D., Capie, W., & Johnson, C. E. (1980). Assessing teaching performance. *Educational Leadership, 38*(3), 219-220.

Ercikan, K. (1998). Translation effects in international assessments. *International Journal of Educational Research, 29,* 543-553

Erickson, F. (1990). Qualitative methods. In R. Linn & F. Erickson (Eds.), *Quantitative methods, qualitative methods* (pp. 77-194). New York: Macmillan.

Erlandson, D. A., Harris, E. L., Skipper, B. L., & Allen, S. D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Feeney, E. (2007). Quality feedback: Essential ingredient for teacher success. *Clearing House, 80*(4), 191-198.

Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (3rd ed). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Flores, M. A. (2005). Teachers' views on recent curriculum changes: tensions and challenges. *Curriculum Journal, 16*(3), 401-413.

Frase, L. E. (1992). Constructive feedback on teaching is missing. *Education,*
113(2), 176-181.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). New York:
Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Furney, K. (1997). Transition policies, practices, and promises: Lessons from
three states. *Exceptional Children, 63*(3), 343-355.

Gabris, G. T., & Ihrke, D. M. (2000). Improving employee acceptance toward
performance appraisal and merit pay systems. *Review of Public Personnel*
Administration, 20(1), 41-53.

Gallagher, H. A. (2004). Vaughn Elementary's innovative teacher evaluation
system: Are teacher evaluation scores related to growth in student
achievement? *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(4), 79-107.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2011). *Educational research:*
Competencies for analysis and applications (10th ed.). Upper Saddle
River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. Boston:
Pearson Education.

Glickman, C. (2002). *Leadership for learning: How to help teachers succeed.*
Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Glickman, C., Gordon, S., & Ross-Gordan, J. (2007). Supervision and
instructional leadership: A developmental approach (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn
& Bacon.

Goldrick, L. (2002). *Improving teacher evaluation to improve teaching quality.*

Issue Brief. Education Policy Studies Division, National Governors

Association Center for Best Practices. Retrieved from

http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/1202IMPROVINGTEACHE

VAL.pdf

Goris, J. R., Vaught, B. C., & Pettit, J. D. J. (2003). Effects of trust in superiors

and influence of superiors on the association between individual-job

congruence and job performance/satisfaction. *Journal of Business and

Psychology, 17*(3), 327-343.

Greenberg, J. (1986a). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance

evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 340-342.

Greenberg, J. (1986b). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance

appraisal evaluations. In R. J. Leweiki, B. Shepard, & M. Bazerman (Eds.)

Negotiations in organizations (pp. 25-41). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Griffin, P., Nguyen T. K. C., & Gillis, S. (2004). *Developing and validating primary

school teacher standards in Vietnam.* Paper presented at the Annual

Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education,

University of Melbourne.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1992). Competing paradigms in qualitative

research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative

research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gustad, J. W. (1967). Evaluation of teaching performance: Issues and

possibilities. In C. B. T. Lee (Ed.), *Improving College Teaching,* (pp. 265-

281). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Ha, T. T. (2005). Consultancy and promotion of school comprehensive inspection

and inspection of teachers' pedagogic performance. *Educational Review,*

108(2), 6-8.

Haefele, D.L. (1980). How to evaluate thee, teacher—let me count the ways. *Phi*

Delta Kappan, 67(5), 349-352.

Hanushek, E. A. (2002). Teacher quality. In L.T. Izumi & W. M. Evers (Eds.),

Teacher quality, (pp. 1-12). Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., O'Brien, D. M., & Rivken, S. G. (2005). *The market*

for teacher quality. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic

Research. Retrieved from www.nber.org/papers/w11154.

Hanushek, E. A., & Rivken, S. G. (2003). How to improve the supply of high

quality teachers. In D. Ravitch (Ed.). *Brookings papers on education*

policy: 2004 (pp. 7-25). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings.* Albany, NY:

State University of New York Press.

Hitchcock, G., & Hughes, D. (1989). *Research and the teacher.* London:

Routledge.

Hoa Sen University (2011). *Hoa Sen Overview.* Retrieved from

www.hoasen.edu.vn.

Holleman, H. (1981). *A key respondent investigation of teacher attitudes about teacher evaluation in Durham County Schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of North Carolina.

Holliday, A. (2002). *Doing and writing qualitative research.* London: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Holliday, A. (2007). *Doing and writing qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Hooper, P., & Page, J. (1986). Measuring teaching effectiveness by student evaluation. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 56-64.

House, E. (1973). *School evaluation: The politics and process.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Hua, V. A. (1998). *Traditions of revering teachers and scholarship.* Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam: Nha Xuat Ban Tre.

Indiana State's *Arreola model for developing a faculty evaluation system.* Retrieved from http://www.cedanet.com/indiana.html

James, R. (1993). *Effective undergraduate and postgraduate teaching and learning in the University of Melbourne: A code of good practice.* Melbourne: University of Melbourne Press.

James, R. (1995). In search of staff development: A study of academic staff appraisal. *Higher Education Research and Development, 14*(2), 185-199.

James, R. (1997). Academic staff development and organizational learning: Policy for staff development and appraisal in Australian higher education

(Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Melbourne: University of Melbourne Press.

Janesick, V. J. (2004). *Stretching exercises for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kahn, S. (1993). Better teaching through better evaluation. *To Improve The Academy, 12*(1), 111-126.

Kay, E., Meyer, H., & French, T. (1965). Effects of threat in performance interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 49*, 311-317.

Kelly, C. (1999). The motivational impact of school-based performance awards. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 12*(4), 309-326.

Kelley, C., & Maslow, V. (2005). *The effects of teacher evaluation on equity and system change in large, diverse high schools.* Paper presented at the April 2005 conference of the American Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Kieu, H. (2004). What tertiary model to adopt? In *Renovating Vietnam higher education.* Retrieved from http://www.thanhnien.com.vn/TinTuc/GiaoDuc/2004/11/1/33449

Kimball, S. M. (2002). Analysis of feedback, enabling conditions and fairness perceptions of teachers in three school districts with new standards-based evaluation systems. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 16*, 241-268.

Kimball, S. M., White, B., Milanowski, A. T., & Borman, G. (2004). Examining the

relationship between teacher evaluation and student assessment results

in Washoe County. *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(4), 54-78.

Kleiman, L. S., Biderman, M. D., & Faley, R. H. (1987). An examination of

employee perceptions of a subjective performance appraisal system.

Journal of Business and Psychology, 2, 112-121.

Knapp, M. S. (1982). *Toward the study of teacher evaluation as an organizational*

process: A review of current research and practice. Paper presented at

the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association,

New York.

Konovsky, M. (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on

business organizations. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 489-511.

Korsgaard, M. A., & Robertson, L. (1995). Procedural justice in performance

evaluation—The role of instrumental and non-instrumental voice in

performance appraisal discussions. *Journal of Management, 21*(4), 657-

669.

Kotter J. P., & Cohen, D. S. (2002). *The heart of change.* Boston, MA: Harvard

Business School Press.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing.*

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lam, T. (1998). Twenty years of reform in HE system in Vietnam: Initial

achievements and new challenges. *Vietnamese Studies Review, 3,* 26-32.

Lam, Q. T. (2004). 3C approach in tertiary teaching and learning. In the article

series *Educational reform—The call from life*. Retrieved from

http://www.tuoitre.com.vn/Tianyon/Index.aspx?ArticleID=55187&ChannelI

D=13

Landy, E. F., Barnes, J. L., & Murphy, K. R. (1978). Correlates of perceived

fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation. *Journal of Applied

Psychology, 65,* 355-356.

Larkin, P. J., Dierckx de Casterlé, B., & Schotsmans, P. (2007). Multilingual

translation issues in qualitative research: Reflections on a metaphorical

process. *Qualitative Health Research, 17,* 468–476.

Lawler, E. E. (1971). *Pay and organizational effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-

Hill.

Le, D. N. (2006). *Quality accreditation in higher education.* Paper presented at

ISO and Quality Accreditation Higher Education Workshop, Dalat,

Vietnam.

Le, N. T. (2004). Improving the quality of tertiary education: Easy or hard? In the

article series *Educational reform – The call from life.* Retrieved from

http://www.tuoitre.com.vn/Tianyon/Index.aspx?ArticleID=55187&ChannelI

D=13

Le, T. T. T. (2003). *Perceptions of good English teachers in Vietnam.*

(Unpublished doctoral thesis). La Trobe University, Australia.

Le, V. C. L. (2009). Education reform in lower secondary education in Vietnam. In

Y. Hirosato & Y. Kitamura (Eds.), *The political economy of educational*

reforms and capacity development in Southeast Asia (Vol. 13). London:

Springer Science + Business Media B. V.

Le, V. H. (2001). *Dialogical and Collaborative Learning in Vietnamese Culture:*

An approach to teaching introductory physics courses (Unpublished

doctoral dissertation). University of Melbourne.

LeCompte, M., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in*

educational research (2nd ed.). San Diego: Academic Press.

Lewis, A. (1982). *Evaluating educational personnel.* Arlington, VA.: American

Association of School Administrators.

Lewis, P. (1998). Managing performance related pay based on evidence from

the financial services sector. *Human Resource Management Journal,*

8(2), 66-77.

Lewis, R. B. (2004). NVivo 2.0 and ATLAS.ti 5.0: A comparative review of two

popular qualitative data-analysis programs. *Field Methods, 16*(4), 439-

464.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2006). *Methods in educational*

research: From theory to practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lonsdale, A., Dennis, N., Openshaw, D., & Mullins, G. (1998). Academic staff

appraisal. *Australian Higher Education*. Canberra: Australian Government

Publishing Service.

Lori, R. K., Regina S., & Peter W. H. (2010). Student evaluations of teaching:

Perceptions of faculty based on gender, position, and rank. *Teaching in*

Higher Education, 15(6), 623-636.

Marsden, D., & French, S. (2002). Performance pay in the United Kingdom. In M.

Brown & J. S. Heywood (Eds.), *Paying for performance: An international*

comparison (pp. 115-147). New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Marshall, M. (2005). It's time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation. *Phi*

Delta Kappan, 86, 727-730.

Marshall, C, & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.).

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction*

that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student

achievement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum

Development.

Marzano, R. J., Zaffron, S., Zraik, L., Robbins, S. L., & Yoon, L. (1995). A new

paradigm for educational change. *Education, 116*(2), 162-173.

Mathers, C., Olivia, M., & Laine, S. (2008). *Improving instruction through effective*

teacher evaluation: Options for states and districts. Washington, D.C.:

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCQT).

Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maykut, P. S., & Morehouse, R. E. (2001). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide.* Philadelphia, PA: Routledge/Falmer.

McDermott, K. (1988). *What is the role of the administrator as an evaluator of instruction?* (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No.ED 222 506).

McGreal, T. L. (1983). *Successful teacher evaluation.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McGreal, T. L. (1988). Evaluation for enhancing instruction: Linking teacher evaluation and staff development. In S. J. Stanley & W. J. Popham (Eds.), *Teacher evaluation: Six prescriptions for success* (pp. 1-29). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McInnis, C. (1996). Change and diversity in the work patterns of Australian academics. *Higher Education Management, 8*(2), 105-117.

McInnis, C. (2000a). Changing academic work roles: The everyday realities challenging quality in teaching. *Journal of Quality in Higher Education, 6*(2), 143-152.

McInnis, C. (2000b). *The work roles of academics in Australian universities.* Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs Evaluations and Investigations Program. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Pfeifer, R. S. (1988). *Teacher evaluation: Improvement, accountability, and effective learning.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Mears, C. L. (2009). *Interviewing for education and social science research: The gateway method.* New York: Palgrace MacMillan.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam S. B, & Associates (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merton, R., & Kendall, P. (1946). The focused interview. *American Journal of Sociology, 51*(6), 541-57.

Milanowski, A. T. (2004). The relationship between teacher performance evaluation scores and student achievement: Evidence from Cincinnati. *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(4), 33-53.

Milanowski, A. T. (2005). Split roles in performance evaluation——a field studyinvolving new teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 18*, 153-169.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Miles, M, & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Millman, J. (1981). Student achievement as a measure of teacher competence. In J. Millman (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher evaluation*, (pp. 110- 145). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Mills, G. (2007). *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Ministry of Education and Training (1996). Draft of strategy of education and training by 2020. Retrieved from www.moet.gov.vn

Ministry of Education and Training (2000). *Decision No 27 on Regulation on recognition of a national standard secondary school.* Retrieved from www.moet.gov.vn

Ministry of Education and Training (2012). Improving the quality of teaching to meet social requirements. Ha Noi: *Seminar on Improving the quality of training.* Retrieved from www.moet.gov.vn

Mo, K. W., Comers, R., & McComick, J. (1998). Teacher appraisal in Hong Kong self- managing schools: Factors for effective practices. *Journal of Personnel Evaluations in Education, 12*, 19-42.

Mohrman, A. M., Jr., Resnick-West, S. M., & Lawler, III, E. E. (1990). *Designing performance appraisal systems: Aligning appraisals and organizational realities.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moomaw, W. E. (1977). Practices and problems in evaluating instruction. In J. A.

Centra (Ed.) *Renewing and evaluating teaching: New directions for higher education No. 1* (pp. 173-197). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morse, J. M. (2000). Determining sample size. *Qualitative Health Research, 10*(1), 3-5. doi: 10.1177/104973200129118183

Morse, J. M., & Field, P. A. (1995). *Qualitative research methods for health professionals* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Moyles, J. (2002). Observation as a research tool. In *Research methods in educational leadership and management* (pp. 172-191). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murphy, K., Balzer, W., Kellam, K., & Armstrong, J. (1984). Effects of the purpose of rating on accuracy in observing teacher behavior and evaluating teaching performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, 45-54.

Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1991). *Performance appraisal: An organizational perspective*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Nasser, F., & Fresko, B. (2002). Faculty views of student evaluation of college teaching. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 27*(2), 187-198.

Natriello, G., Deal, T., Dornbusch, S. M., &Hoag, M. (1977). *A summary of the recent literature on the evaluation of principals, teachers, and students* (Occasional Paper No. 18). Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

Neal, J. E. (1988). *Faculty evaluation: Its purposes and effectiveness.* Retrieved from http://ericae.net/db/edo/ED308800.htm

Nelson, B. (2000). Are performance appraisals obsolete? *Compensation and Benefits Review, 32*(3), 39-42.

Nemeroff, W. F., & Wexley, K. N. (1979). An exploration of the relationships between performance feedback interview characteristics and interview outcomes as perceived by managers and subordinates. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 52,* 25-34.

Nguyen, D. C., & Nguyen, P. N. (2000). *Criteria for quality management in tertiary education* (State level scientific research). Hanoi, Vietnam. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED477445.pdf

Nguyen, K. D. (2000). *The potential of appraisal policies to improve the quality of teaching in Ho Chi Minh City College of Education, Vietnam* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Melbourne, Australia.

Nguyen, K. D. (2003). *International practices in quality assurance for higher education teaching and learning: Prospects and possibilities for Vietnam* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Melbourne, Australia.

Nguyen, K. D. (August, 2008). *Recommendations for faculty evaluation in the new phase.* Paper presented at Quality Standards for Vietnam Pedagogical Schools Workshop, Institute of Educational Research, University of Pedagogy, Ho Chi Minh.

Nguyen, K. D., & McInnis, C. (2002). The possibility of using student evaluations in Vietnamese higher education. *Quality in Higher Education, 8*(2), 151-158.

Nguyen, K. D., & Pham, X. T. (2003). Necessary definitions to ensure quality in education. *Journal of Educational Research, Ministry of Education and Training, 66*(9), 9-11.

Nguyen, K. T., Griffin, P., & Nguyen, C. (2006). *Generating criteria for assessing lecturers in Vietnam's universities: A conceptual paper.* Retrieved from www.aare.edu.au/06pap/ngu06311.pdf

Nguyen, P. N. (2005). Teacher evaluation and its development. In P. N. Nguyen *Higher education: Quality and evaluation* (pp.17- 47). Ha Noi, Vietnam: Vietnam National University Publisher.

Nguyen, P. (2004). Resolute reform in higher education is a must. In the article series *Educational reform—The call from life.* Retrieved from http://www.tuoitre.com.vn

Nguyen, T. T. (2008). Criteria for faculty evaluation. *Journal of Science—Ho Chi Minh City University of Social Sciences and Humanities, 24,* 131-135.

Nguyen, V. D. (2004). Some thoughts on Vietnam Higher Education. In the article

series *Educational reform—The call from life*. Retrieved from

http://www.tuoitre.com.vn

OECD (2005). *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing and retaining effective*

teachers. Retrieved from

http://www.oecd.org/document/52/0,2340,en 2649 34859095 34991988 1

11 1,00.html

Odden, A., Borman, G., & Fermanich, M. (2004). Assessing teacher, classroom

and school effects, including fiscal effects. *Peabody Journal of Education,*

79(4), 4-32.

Oliver, D. E. (2002). *The U.S. Community College system as a potential model*

for developing countries: The case of Vietnam (Unpublished doctoral

dissertation). Walden University.

Ovando, M. N. (2005). Building instructional leaders' capacity to deliver

constructive feedback to teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in*

Education, 18, 171-183.

Park, C., & Lee, H. (2010). What makes a case study really qualitative? Show me

your evidence please. *English Teaching, 65*(4), 79-101. Retrieved from

http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.apollolibrary.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfvi

ewer?sid=4f8d6e88-2c2f-4c80-88e3-

8c06f8af5e56%40sessionmgr110&vid=6&hid=110

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Peterson, K., & Kauchak, D. (1982). *Teacher evaluation: Perspectives, practices and promises*. Salt Lake City: Center for Educational Practice, University of Utah.

Peterson, K. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and new practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Peterson, K., Kelly, P., & Caskey, M. (2002). Ethical considerations for teachers in the evaluation of other teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 16*(4) 317-324.

Pham, T. N. (2000). *Quality management in tertiary education*. Hanoi: National University Publisher.

Pham, X. H. (2012). Improving the quality of education and training in compliance with Resolution of The Eleventh National Congress. *Scientific Yearbook 2012*. Ho Chi Minh City: Institute for Educational Research, University of Pedagogy.

Pham, X. T. (2005). Quality accreditation in higher education. *Journal of Education, 11*.

Redfern, G. B. (1963). *How to appraise teaching performance*. Columbus, OH: School Management Institute.

Rector, J. (2009). *Faculty perceptions of faculty evaluation programs at selected private college/universities in the Southeast United States* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Tennessee, Chattanooga.

Rice, J. K. (2003). *Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes.* Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute.

Richards, L., & Morse, J. (2007). *A user's guide to qualitative methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rifkin, T. (1995). The status and scope of faculty evaluation. *ERIC Digest.*

Rindler, B. (1994). The attributes of teacher evaluation systems that promote teacher growth as perceived by teachers of intensive English programs (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Boston University, Boston, MA.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sachs, J. (2003). Teacher professional standards: Controlling or developing teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory into Practice, 9*(2), 175-186.

Schacter, J., & Thum, Y. M. (2204). Paying for high- and low-quality teaching. *Economics of Education Review, 23*(4), 411-430.

Schuler, R. S. (1984). *Personnel and human resource management* (2nd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.

Schuler, R. S., Fulkerson, J. R., & Dowling, P. J (1991). Strategic performance measurement in multinational corporations. *Human Resource Management, 30*(3), 365-392.

Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry.* Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

Scriven, M. (1987). Validity in personnel evaluation. *Journal of Personnel*

Evaluation in Education, 8(1), 9-23.

Scriven, M. (1991). *Evaluation thesaurus* (4th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Publications.

Seldin, P. (1984). *Changing practices in faculty evaluation: A critical assessment*

and recommendations for improvement. San Francisco: Joey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1979). *Supervision human perspectives.*

New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition* (7th ed.).

Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

Shinkfield, A. J., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (1995). *Teacher evaluation: Guide to*

effective practice. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Smith, M. L., & Kleine, P. L. (1986). Qualitative research and evaluation:

Triangulation and multi -methods reconsidered. In D. D. Williams (Ed.),

Naturalistic evaluation (New Directions for Program Evaluation, No. 30).

(pp. 249-263). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview.* New York: Holt, Rinehart &

Winston.

Stake, R. (1998). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). (pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stiggins, R. J., & Duke, D. (1988). *The case for commitment to teacher growth: Research on teacher evaluation.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Stronge, J. H. (1997). Improving schools through teacher evaluation. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice* (pp. 1- 23). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Stronge, J. H. (2006). *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Stronge, J. H., & Tucker, P. D. (2003). *Handbook on educational specialist evaluation.* Philadelphia, PA: Routledge/Falmer.

Sykes, G., & Winchell, S. (2010). Assessing for teacher tenure. In M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teacher assessment and the quest for teacher quality* (pp. 201- 224). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tang, T. L., & Sarsfield-Baldwin, L. J. (1996). Distributive and procedural justice as related to satisfaction and commitment. *SAM Advanced Management Journal, 61,* 25-31.

Tellis, W. (1997). Introduction to case study. *The Qualitative Report, 3*(2). Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-2/tellis.1html

Texas Education Agency Appraisal Model (1984). Retrieved from

http://www.tea.state.tx.us/dpchse/docs.html

Thomas, M. D. (1979). *Evaluation of educational personnel.* Bloomington, IN: Phi

Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Toch, T. (2008). Fixing teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 66*(2), 32-37.

Toch, T., & Rothman, R. (2008). *Rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public*

education. Washington D.C.: Education Sector. Retrieved from

http://www.educationsector.org/usr_doc/RushToJudgment_ES_Jan08.pdf

Tran, B. G. (2005). Renovating the work of educational inspection. *Educational*

Review, 116(6), 5-8.

Tran, T. T. A. (2008). *Evaluate the quality of training at the Academy of*

Journalism and Communication (Unpublished master's thesis). Academy

of Journalism and Communication, Ha Noi.

Tran, T. T. M. (2005). Enhancing the efficiency of the examination of teachers.

Educational Review, 113(5), 13-14.

Tran, V. T. (2004). Improving educational quality: Not so costly. In the article

series *Educational reform—The call from life.* Retrieved from

http://www.tuoitre.com.vn

Tucker, P. D., & Stronge, J. H. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student*

learning. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum.

Vietnam's Educational Law. (2005). Retrieved from

http://www.edu.net.vn/VanBan_Luat/LuatGD_2005/

Warwick, D. P., & Osherson, S. (1973). Comparative analysis in the social

sciences. In D. P. Warwick and S. Osherson (Eds.) *Comparative research

methods: An overview* (pp. 204-226). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Whitaker, P. (1998). *Managing schools.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Whyte, W. F., & Braun, R. R. (1968). On language and culture. In H. S.

Becker, B. Geer, D. Riesman, & R. Weiss, (Eds.) *Institutions and the

Person.* (pp. 16-27). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Wilkinson, T. M. (2001). The core ideas of ethics research. In M. Tolich (Ed.),

Research ethics in Aoteoraoa, New Zealand: Concepts, practice, critique

(pp. 13-34). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education.

Wilson, F. (2002). Dilemmas of appraisal. *European Management Journal, 20*, 1-

17. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com.

Wilson, J. P., & Western, S. (2001). Performance appraisal: An obstacle to

training and development? *Career Development International, 6,* 1-9.

Retrieved from http://dandini.emeraldinsight.com.

Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M.W., & Bernstein, H.T. (1984).

Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. Paper prepared for the

National Institute of Education, Santa Monica, CA.

Wolcott, H. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Descriptions, analysis and

interpretation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yao, Y., & Grady, M. L. (2005). How do faculty make formative use of student

evaluation feedback? A multiple case study. *Journal of Personnel

Evaluation in Education, 13,* 321-341.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand

Oaks, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF INVITATION AND INFORMED CONSENT

Hello, my name is Nam Phan. I am a doctoral student at California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) under the direction of Dr. Vita Jones. I am also a faculty member at Hoa Sen University, Ho Chi Minh City.

This is an invitation for you to participate in a research study exploring the perceptions of faculty in a Vietnamese university about their current faculty performance appraisal process. The results of this study may lead to improvement of faculty evaluation practices and policies.

Your involvement will consist of one audio-recorded interview (approximately one hour in length). Your participation is completely voluntary and you may withdraw from this investigation at any time. You may also choose not to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable.

Ensuring your confidentiality is a critical element of this study. To the degree allowable by law, all data resulting from your interview will be kept confidential. No identifying information will be associated with information or viewpoints that you share. The interview recordings will be transcribed by an independent, professional transcription service. The transcription service is bound by contract to confidentiality and will not maintain copies of any records. All study materials will be maintained in my password-protected computer and in locked files in my home.

I have no conflict of interest in the results of this study, financial or otherwise. If you have additional questions please contact me at phanthivietnam@csu.fullerton.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Vita Jones, at vjones@fullerton.edu. For any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, contact the CSUF Institutional Review Board (IRB) at 657-278-7640.

Thank you.

I have carefully read and had the terms used in this consent form and their significance explained to me. By signing below, I confirm that I am at least 18 years of age and I agree to participate in this project.

Participant's Name (Print):_____Signature:_____Date:_____

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Aims:

1. Establish rapport with interviewee

2. Keep interviews between 45 and 60 minutes

3. Ask probing questions when warranted, use "Could you explain what you meant by that?"; "Could you tell me more about that?"; etc. when necessary.

Introduction:

1. Introduction to the researcher

2. Purpose of the study

3. Review of confidentiality agreement and signature of Consent form

Date: Time: Location: Interviewee #:

1. How long have you been working at the University?

   Anh/Chị đã công tác ở Trường Hoa Sen được bao lâu?

2. How often is the performance review at the University?

   Bao lâu thì Anh/Chị lại được đánh giá một lần?

3. How do you describe your experience with the evaluation process implemented on campus?

   Anh/Chị có cảm nghĩ gì về chính sách đánh giá giảng viên đang được áp dụng tại Trường?

4. What factors contribute to the perceptions you have regarding the current evaluation process?

Những yếu tố nào góp phần khiến cho Anh/Chị có suy nghĩ như vậy?

5. Do you think the process meets your expectations? In what way does the process satisfy you?

Việc đánh giá có đáp ứng được nguyện vọng của Anh/Chị không? Xin Anh/Chị giải thích rõ.

6. Do you know the evaluation criteria? Are they informed to you? What are they?

Anh/Chị có nắm được các tiêu chuẩn đánh giá giảng viên của Trường không? Các tiêu chuẩn đó có được công bố đến tất cả giảng viên hay không?

7. What do you think is the key purpose of the University faculty evaluation process?

Anh/ Chị nghĩ mục đích chính của việc đánh giá giảng viên là gi?

8. What do you think about the implementation of evaluation in the University?

Suy nghĩ của Anh/ Chị về việc thực thi chính sách đánh giá giảng viên tại Trường?

9. Who is the evaluator? What do you think about the evaluator? For example, does the evaluator consider multiple sources of evidence when evaluating you? Does the evaluator master the evaluation standards?

Ai là người đánh giá các Anh/Chị? Các Anh/Chị có suy nghĩ gì về người đánh giá? Ví dụ như người đánh giá có dành đủ thời gian cho việc đánh giá các Anh/Chị hay không? Họ có sử dụng nhiều nguồn dữ liệu khác nhau khi đánh giá không? Họ có nắm vững các tiêu chuẩn đánh giá giảng viên của Trường không?

10. How important is the evaluation process to you?

Việc được đánh giá quan trọng như thế nào đối với Anh/Chị với vai trò là một giảng viên?

11. How has the evaluation process affected you?

Chính sách đánh giá ảnh hưởng như thế nào đến Anh/ Chị?

12. Do you agree/ disagree with the ratings you have gotten so far?

Anh/ Chị đồng ý hay không đồng ý với các kết quả đánh giá Anh/ Chị đã nhận được trong thời gian công tác tại Trường vừa qua?

13. Do the ratings motivate your professional development? In what way do the ratings affect your instructional performance?

Kết quả đánh giá có là động cơ thúc đẩy Anh/Chị nâng cao chuyên môn và cải thiện việc giảng dạy không? Xin Anh/ Chị giải thích rõ.

14. What part of the evaluation process do you think has the most effect in strengthening your teaching practice?

Yếu tố nào trong chính sách đánh giá giảng viên Anh/Chị cho rằng hiệu quả nhất trong việc giúp Anh/ Chị cải thiện việc giảng dạy?

15. What part of the evaluation process do you think has the least effect in strengthening your teaching practice?

Yếu tố nào trong chính sách đánh giá giảng viên Anh/Chị cho rằng ít hiệu quả nhất trong việc giúp Anh/ Chị cải thiện việc giảng dạy?

16. Do you have any recommendation to improve the current appraisal policies so that they would be more effective in improving your instructional performance? What are your explanations for these recommendations?

Anh/ Chị có ý kiến gì để cải thiện chính sách đánh giá giảng viên hiện tại với mục

đích làm cho chính sách đó hiệu quả hơn trong việc thúc đẩy công tác giảng dạy

của Anh/Chị? Xin Anh/Chị giải thích rõ.

Thank you for your time.

Notes:

Describe setting	Note body language
Note non-verbal communication	Other
Other	Other

APPENDIX C

STUDENT FEEDBACK FORM

ĐẠI HỌC HOA SEN	PHIẾU SINH VIÊN ĐÁNH GIÁ HIỆU QUẢ MÔN HỌC *(Dùng để khảo sát ý kiến của sinh viên khi kết thúc môn học)*	Mã số tài liệu: BM/1TYK/ĐBCL/01 Phiên bản . 02 - 2008

Tên giảng viên: .... **Môn học/Mã môn học** ....

Bạn hãy dùng bút tô đen các số mà bạn đánh giá, theo thang điểm từ 1 đến 5 :

Ghi chú: - ① *là mức đánh giá thấp nhất,* ⑤ *là mức đánh giá cao nhất*

  - *Không dùng bút màu đỏ, bút highlighter để tô.*

  - *Ví dụ: Bạn chọn ③ thì thể hiện là* ●

①=Hoàn toàn không đồng ý, ②=Không đồng ý, ③=Phân vân, ④= Đồng ý, ⑤=Hoàn toàn đồng ý

A. Chương trình môn học		Tô đen vào điểm phù hợp nhất				
1	Trước khi bắt đầu môn học, bạn được thông báo đầy đủ về mục tiêu của môn học	①	②	③	④	⑤
2	Bạn được thông báo chi tiết về phương pháp kiểm tra, đánh giá ngay khi bắt đầu môn học.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3	Nội dung của môn học liên quan trực tiếp tới mục tiêu của môn học	①	②	③	④	⑤
4	Trình tự sắp xếp nội dung các bài giảng của môn học phù hợp và logic	①	②	③	④	⑤
5	Các tài liệu phục vụ môn học đã cập nhật các kiến thức và kỹ năng mới nhất	①	②	③	④	⑤
6	Thời lượng dành cho môn học đã đáp ứng được mục tiêu môn học	①	②	③	④	⑤
7	Môn học mang tính thực tiễn cao	①	②	③	④	⑤
8	Môn học này đã góp phần trang bị kiến thức/kỹ năng nghề nghiệp cho bạn	①	②	③	④	⑤

B. Phương pháp và kỹ thuật giảng dạy của giảng viên		Tô đen vào điểm phù hợp nhất				
9	Khi bắt đầu môn học, giảng viên thông báo cho bạn biết cần chuẩn bị như thế nào cho môn học này.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10	Giảng viên chuyển tải nội dung rõ ràng dễ hiểu	①	②	③	④	⑤
11	Giảng viên kết hợp nhiều phương pháp giảng dạy và các hoạt động khác nhau để giúp bạn học có hiệu quả.	①	②	③	④	⑤
12	Phương pháp giảng dạy của giảng viên giúp bạn có tư duy phản biện hoặc sáng tạo hơn trong suy nghĩ	①	②	③	④	⑤
13	Giảng viên tạo cho bạn các cơ hội để chủ động tham gia vào quá trình học trong và ngoài lớp học.	①	②	③	④	⑤
14	Giảng viên động viên khích lệ bạn đặt câu hỏi và thảo luận các quan điểm, các phương pháp tiếp cận để hiểu sâu nội dung bài học.	①	②	③	④	⑤
15	Kỹ thuật giảng dạy của giảng viên rèn luyện cho bạn phương pháp suy nghĩ liên hệ giữa các vấn đề trong môn học với thực tiễn	①	②	③	④	⑤
16	Giảng viên sử dụng các giáo trình và giới thiệu tài liệu tham khảo giúp bạn hiểu rõ hơn hoặc mở rộng hiểu biết về nội dung môn học.	①	②	③	④	⑤
17	Giảng viên đưa ra các hoạt động và các yêu cầu về bài tập/nghiên cứu để giúp bạn đạt được mục tiêu của môn học	①	②	③	④	⑤
18	Giảng viên nhiệt tình giảng dạy.	①	②	③	④	⑤

C. Việc bảo đảm giờ dạy và quan hệ với sinh viên		Tô đen vào điểm phù hợp nhất				
19	Giảng viên giao tiếp với thái độ lịch sự	①	②	③	④	⑤
20	Giảng viên là nguồn tư vấn cho sinh viên trong lĩnh vực học thuật và hướng nghiệp.	①	②	③	④	⑤
21	Giảng viên tận dụng hết thời lượng quy định cho môn học	①	②	③	④	⑤
22	Bạn rất muốn được tham gia vào các môn học khác do giảng viên này giảng dạy	①	②	③	④	⑤

D. Kiểm tra đánh giá kết quả học tập		Tô đen vào điểm phù hợp nhất				
23	Phương pháp kiểm tra và thi kết thúc môn học phù hợp với tính chất và đặc điểm của môn học	①	②	③	④	⑤
24	Các bài viết/kiểm tra được giảng viên nhận xét rõ ràng nên rất có ích cho bạn	①	②	③	④	⑤

APPENDIX D

FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

Evaluation of Faculty member
Faculty of Languages & Culture Studies

Evaluator: Department Chair
Faculty member name: Ngô thị Thanh Thanh
Department: The Anglo-Saxon Language & Culture studies   Date: 14/09/2012
Department chairperson: Dr. Nguyen Thu Huong
Department Chairperson signature:

Faculty member designated weights	Teaching & Supervision	Professional Development	Research Activities	University/Faculty Involvement	Community Service	Final score
100%	60%	5%	5%	20%	10%	
Component score	4.38	3.00	3.35	4.35	3.50	4.16694

COMPONENT	CRITERIA	SCORE	4. Exceptional Performance	3. Professional Level Performance	2. Improvement Needed	1. Unprofessional Performance
I. TEACHING AND SUPERVISION		4.3824				
1. Instructional Delivery (25%)	1. Instructional Delivery (25%)					
1.1 Using class time effectively	1 Student feedback (60%)	4.62	All classes with ratings A & B	80% of all classes with ratings A & B and no rating D or E	50% of all classes with ratings A & B and no rating D or E	More than 50% of all classes with ratings C, D, or E
1.2 Using effective instructional techniques and tools (including lecture, discussion, audio/visuals, group activities, or technology)				550-560	4.62 feedback của 7 lớp	

COMPONENT	CRITERIA	SCORE	4. Exceptional Performance	3. Professional Level Performance	2. Improvement Needed	1. Unprofessional Performance
1.3. Stimulating student interest and achievement	2. Dept. chair rating from observation (40%)	4.5	All classes with ratings A & B	80% of all classes with ratings A & B and no rating D or E	50% of all classes with ratings A & B and no rating D or E	More than 50% of all classes with ratings C, D, or E
2. Instructional Design (25%)	2. Instructional Design (25%)	4.5	Faculty member meets three criteria (1, 5, 6) and two or more of the remaining criteria	Faculty member meets three criteria (1, 5, 6) and one of the remaining criteria	Faculty member meets one of criteria (1, 5, 6)	Faculty member meets none of criteria 1, 5, 6
2.1 Developing new course materials 2.2 Developing new courses 2.3. Designing effective instructional tools 2.4. Evaluating student learning 2.5 Selecting textbooks 2.6 Creating class website 2.7 Bring speakers to campus	1 Course syllabi are submitted in the approved university format 2 Develop new course 3 Developing new course materials (study guides, tests, etc.) 4 Design case studies 5 Textbook is appropriate and no more than 5 years old 6 Evidence of use of multiple assessment strategies (written exams, quizzes, projects, oral presentation) 7 Incorporating Service Learning into coursework 8 Creating a class website and website forum in the course syllabus 9 Invite speakers to some sessions 10 ... (to be approved by Dean/Dept. Chair)		Develop the course outline of Critical Reading Skills Revise course outlines: Phonetics-Phono; Morpho-Syntax; Semantics; Project 2; Crit VOA from youtube, to improve pronunciation Balanced method of assessment: 40% objective, 60% subjective			

COMPONENT	CRITERIA	SCORE	4. Exceptional Performance	3. Professional Level Performance	2. Improvement Needed	1. Unprofessional Performance
3. Course Management (15%)	3. Course Management (15%)	5	Faculty member meets three criteria (2, 3, 4) and two of the remaining criteria	Faculty member meets three criteria (2, 3, 4) and one of the remaining criteria	Faculty member meets three criteria (2, 3, 4) and none of the remaining criteria	Faculty member meets one or two criteria of (2, 3, 4)
3.1 Course coordination	1 Coordinating lecturers teaching the same course, coordinate project-based courses		Coordinating Linguistics course strand, Project 2			
3.2 Designing examination questions	2 Designing examination questions in a correct and timely manner (with detailed		Prepare 4 summative tests			
3.3 Grading and returning papers	3 Grading and returning papers in a correct and timely manner		Mark on average 250 writing papers			
3.4 Respecting class regulations	4 Respecting class starting time and finishing time					
3.5 Discover and fix problems in the course syllabus	5 Discover problems or inconsistencies in the course syllabus, inform Dept. chair in a					
3.6 Use of class website	6 Frequent use of class website and online forum to interact with students; 7 ....(to be approved by Dean/Dept. Chair)					
4. Supervising student research and internship (15%)	4. Supervising student research and internship (15%)	4	Faculty member meets three criteria (1, 5, 8) and one or more of the remaining criteria	Faculty member meets three criteria (1, 5, 8)	Faculty member meets only one criterion	Faculty member meets no single criterion
4.1 Supervising internship experiences	1 Supervising internship experiences					
4.2 Supervise service learning projects	2 Supervise service learning projects		Supervise 5 project groups			
4.3 Supervising social entrepreneurship projects	3 Supervising social entrepreneurship projects		Jury members: 2 committees			
4.4 Guiding student research	4 Guiding and assisting student research thesis		Marking 6 intern papers			
4.5 Directing field trips	5 Serving on internship report thesis evaluation committees					
4.6 Directing/coaching competitive teams	6 Directing field trips					
4.7 Supervising project-based courses	7 Directing/coaching competitive teams					

COMPONENT	CRITERIA	SCORE	4. Exceptional Performance	3. Professional Level Performance	2. Improvement Needed	1. Unprofessional Performance
	8 Supervising project-based courses 9 .... (to be approved by Dean/Dept. Chair)					
5. Enrollment Management & student career enhancement (20%)	5. Enrollment Management & student career enhancement (20%)	3	Faculty member meets two criteria (1-3) and 1 or more of the remaining criteria	Faculty member meets two criteria (1-3) or 1 of criteria 1-3 and another criterion	Faculty member meets one of two criteria (1-3)	Faculty member meets none of criteria (1-3)
5.1 Recruiting students 5.2. Advising senior students on their career orientation 5.3. Contributing to student retention 5.4. Assist students in finding internships 5.5. Assisting students in finding jobs or places at graduate schools	1 Provide evidence of personal contact with potential students 2 Participating in mock interview/exit surveys 3 Following up students' dropout rate and proposing solutions 4. Provide evidence of assisting students in finding internships 5 Provide evidence of assisting students in finding jobs or places at graduate schools overseas/undergrad schools 6 Contribute to organization of job fairs 7 .... (to be approved by Dean/Dept. Chair)		Personal consultancy related to learning improvement			
II. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		3.7				
1. Professional Organizations (45%)	1. Professional Organizations (45%)	4	Faculty member meets criteria 1 & 2	Faculty member meets criterion 1	Faculty member meets criterion 2	Faculty member meets none of criteria 1 & 2
1.1 Maintaining membership in professional organizations	1. Membership in 1 or more professional organizations plus holding office/position or attending at least one professional meeting					1

COMPONENT	CRITERIA	SCORE	4. Exceptional Performance	3. Professional Level Performance	2. Improvement Needed	1. Unprofessional Performance
1.2 Attending professional meetings	2 Attending at least 1 professional meeting 3 .... (to be approved by Dean,Dept. Chair)		Attending 2 conferences held by HSU Attending 5 departmental colloquiums			
2. Continuing Education (56%)	2. Continuing Education (56%)	3.5	Faculty member meets three of 4 criteria	Faculty member meets two of 4 criteria	Faculty member meets one of 4 criteria	Faculty member meets none of 4 criteria
2.1 Progressing toward advanced degree	1. Provide evidence of course work toward advanced degree completed or dissertation research and/or 2 or more regional or national seminar or workshop attended		Institutional TOEFL 630 July 2012			
2.2 Attending seminars,conferences workshops 2.3 Participate in lecturer exchange	2 Attending seminars,conferences workshops 3 Teach as a visiting or exchange lecturer in a foreign partner university					
	4 Provide evidence of professional certificates (CFA, ACCA, CPA, PHR...)					
III. RESEARCH ACTIVITY		3.35				
1. Publications/presentations (30%)	1. Publications/presentations (30%)	3.5	Faculty member meets criterion 2 or criteria 1 & 3	Faculty member meets criterion 1 or criteria 3, 4	Faculty member meets criterion 3 or 4	Faculty member meets none of criterion 1, 2, 3 & 4
1.1 Publishing articles, books, and reviews	1 publish books in his or her discipline		1 presentation at Dpt colloq	Sep-13		1
1.2 Making presentations at local, and national conferences 1.3 Developing websites for research purposes	2 publish article in refereed publication 3 present at national conference					
	4. give a public presentation in his/her discipline beyond those required by job (public lecture, etc.) 5 publish in local journal (recognized by State Board of Professors of VN)					

COMPONENT	CRITERIA	SCORE	4. Exceptional Performance	3. Professional Level Performance	2. Improvement Needed	1. Unprofessional Performance
2. Ongoing research (40%)	2. Ongoing research (40%)	4	Faculty member meets criterion 1	Faculty member completes research project but hasn't yet published	Faculty member hasn't finished research project	Faculty member has no research project
2.1 Conducting research projects	1. complete formal research project resulting in publication		A study in the area of educational psychology			1
3. Professional recognition (30%)	3. Professional recognition (30%)	2	Faculty member meets criteria 1, 2, 3	Faculty member meets criteria 1, 2	Faculty member meets criteria 1 or 2	Faculty member meets none of criteria 1, 2, 3
3.1 Receiving awards and honors 3.2 Completing an advanced degree	1 create and maintain a discipline specific scholarly website 2 receive national award 3 complete terminal degree in discipline					1
IV. UNIVERSITY/ FACULTY INVOLVEMENT		**4.36**				
1. Evaluation of student learning outcomes (30%)	1. Evaluation of student learning outcomes (30%)	4	Faculty member meets criteria 1, 2, 3	Faculty member meets two of criteria 1, 2, 3	Faculty member meets one of criteria 1, 2, 3	Faculty member meets none of criteria 1, 2, 3
1.1 Participating in evaluation of program learning outcomes	1 Participating in evaluation of a program's learning outcomes			Member of the project task force to evaluate the project syllabus		
1.2 Participating in course learning outcomes 1.3 Participating in program review	2. Participating in evaluation of 1 or several courses' learning outcomes 3. Participating in review of 1 program 4 .... (to be approved by Dean/Dept Chair)			Survey of students' perceptions of the effectiveness of project 2		
2. Student event/project/ activity support (30%)	2. Student event/project/ activity support (30%)	4 5	Faculty member meets three of criteria 1, 2, 3, 4	Faculty member meets two of criteria 1, 2, 3, 4	Faculty member meets one of criteria 1, 2, 3, 4	Faculty member meets none of criteria 1, 2, 3, 4

166

COMPONENT	CRITERIA	SCORE	4. Exceptional Performance	3. Professional Level Performance	2. Improvement Needed	1. Unprofessional Performance
2.1 advise student program/project events	1 serving as an adviser to a student organization, student events		Organize 6 events, 1 public speaking contest, 5 tutoring sessions			1
2.2 find funds for student activities	2 assist students in raising funds for student activities					
2.3 participate in student events in various roles	3 attend/support Tutoring program or English Speaking club, Writing contest					
2.4 advise students to go on exchange programs	4 Convince students to go on exchange programs 5 ... (to be approved by Dean/Dept. Chair)					
3. Contributing to University/Faculty activity (40%)	3. Contributing to University/Faculty activity (40%)	4.5	Faculty member meets three of criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	Faculty member meets two of criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	Faculty member meets one of criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	Faculty member meets none of criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
3.1 contribute to institutional studies and reports	1 gathering information for university/faculty report writing		Enrollment consultancy at Cao Thang	2 sessions		
3.2 serving on University/Faculty committees/projects 3.3 organize team-building activities	2 analyzing information for university/faculty report writing 3 writing University/Faculty reports 4 chair University/Faculty committees 5 participate in 1 or more projects 6 attend most of faculty meetings 7 organize team-building activities 8 participate in team-building activities 9 organize faculty workshops 10 ... (to be approved by Dean/Dept. Chair)		Vision/Mission statement writing group member Participating in the matriculation exam ETPs coordinator Member of the matriculation exam committee (of the integration exam)			
V. COMMUNITY SERVICE		3.5				
work with teachers in schools	1 provide documentation of collaboration with teachers in public high schools		Faculty member meets three of criteria 1, 2, 3, 4	Faculty member meets two of criteria 1, 2, 3, 4	Faculty member meets one of criteria 1, 2, 3, 4	Faculty member meets none of criteria 1, 2, 3, 4

COMPONENT	CRITERIA	SCORE	4. Exceptional Performance	3. Professional Level Performance	2. Improvement Needed	1. Unprofessional Performance
serve as consultant to not-for-profit organizations	2 provide documentation of consultation with not-for-profit and non-governmental organizations		Join Terry Fox in 2012			
judge contest in area of expertise serve as a volunteer for community programs	3 provide documentation of judging contest in area of expertise 4 provide documentation of service as volunteer for community program, social entrepreneurship projects					

Recommendations:
1. To be eligible for 2 notches of pay rise
2. To be eligible for annual awards

APPENDIX E

LETTER OF AUTHORIZATION

California State University Fullerton Institutional Review Board
c/o Regulatory Compliance
800 N. State College Blvd.
Fullerton, CA 92831

Please note that Ms. Phan Thi Viet Nam, CSUF Graduate Student, has

the permission of Hoa Sen University to conduct research at our facility for her

study, "Faculty Perceptions of Performance Appraisal Policies".

Ms. Phan will email faculty to recruit them and conduct an interview with

each of them regarding their perceptions of the university performance appraisal

policies. Her plan is to have all interviews done by the end of October. Our

human resources office will provide any help Ms. Phan may need for her

research. Ms. Phan's on-site research activities will be finished by October 31,

2013.

Ms. Phan has agreed to provide my office a copy of the California State

University Fullerton IRB-approved, stamped consent document before she

recruits participants on campus.

If there are any questions, please contact my office.

Signed,

Mr. Do Sy Cuong, Vice President