Myagdi Guru
[A Peer-Reviewed, Multidisciplinary and Multilingual Journal]
Volume 8, September 2025
p-ISSN 2645-8713; Indexed in NepJOL
http://myagdicampus.edu.np/myagdiguru/

MMC, Beni

Research Article/ Management

Exploring Students' Perspectives on Teaching Excellence of Community Campuses, Nepal

[1]Rajkumar Subedi, [2]Durga Nath Paudel
[1,2]Gupteshwor Mahadev Multiple Campus, Kaski, Nepal
ORCID: [1]*https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8261-4951*; [2]*https://orcid.org/0009-0002-3451-2437*

Article History: *Submitted 4 June 2025; Reviewed 13 July 2025; Revised 20 July 2025; Accepted 5 August 2025*

Corresponding Author: *Rajkumar Subedi,* **Email:** *subedirajkumar3@gmail.com*

Article DOI: *https://doi.org/10.3126/mg.v8i1.84189*

Abstract

With easy access to information through technology, students often explore syllabus content in advance and form opinions about their teachers before formal instruction begins. There is limited research on student evaluation of teaching in Nepali higher education. The objective of this study was to evaluate how students perceive various aspects of teaching effectiveness and to compare students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness between annual and semester-based academic systems at Gupteshwor Mahadev Multiple Campus, Pokhara, Nepal. The nature of the data was quantitative, and the source of data was primary, collected directly from students through a structured questionnaire. The study found that the students viewed their teachers effective, especially in subject knowledge, classroom management, and confidence. However, it also highlighted the need for improvement in the use of teaching materials and innovative instructional methods. Teachers of management showed the slightly better use of teaching materials, while those teaching in the semester-based system were rated significantly higher in time management. These findings suggest that academic structure may influence students' perceptions, highlighting the need to improve teaching aids and adopt more innovative methods to enhance overall teaching quality at the campus. The study has recommended for adopting student-centered teaching approaches, enhancing faculty development, and fostering an inclusive learning environment. Implementing these measures will not only improve teaching excellence but also promote greater student engagement and educational equity.

Keywords: Higher Education, SET, students' perception, teachers' evaluation, teaching methods

Introduction

In the present context, both teachers and educational institutions are making efforts to uplift the quality of teaching and learning process. Due to the fast advancement in information technology students now access the contents of their syllabus before the formal class so, students from their opinions on their teachers.

Teachers' evaluation has come to be known worldwide as a useful input to improve the quality of the teaching. While there are a large number of possible sources of feedback and evaluation data on teaching, the most common source of input for teaching evaluation is feedback from the students. In fact, student ratings is a necessary source of evidence of teaching effectiveness and obtaining student's feedback is a routine practice in most of the institutions (Husain & Khan, 2016). Student's evaluation of Gupteshwor Mahadev Multiple Campus (GMMC) serves as a pivotal instrument for assessing the pedagogical effectiveness and classroom engagement of faculty members. The systematic feedback collected from students facilitates the continuous professional development and instructional refinement of teachers.

Kulik (2001) states that the initial aim of student evaluations of teaching served two goals: mapping the quality of teaching in faculties/universities, and providing information and help to instructors in order to improve their teaching. It is certain that most researchers believe that the results of student ratings provide evaluators with valid, reliable and valuable data concerning the quality and effectiveness of teaching (Penny, 2003). Students are asked to spend a few minutes evaluating the instructor's teaching performance. Good teaching is then defined as' good scores on the student evaluation form (Voeks, 1962). However, it is important to note that such quantitative measures may not fully capture the multifaceted nature of instructional quality, as factor such as course difficulty, student's motivation, and individual expectations can influence evaluation outcomes. Consequently, scholars advocate for a complementary approach combining student's ratings with other qualitative and objective indicators to provide a more comprehensive assessment of teaching effectiveness.

Student ratings have been used for many years to evaluate the performance of teachers in their classes (Stronge and Ostrander, 1997). Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness are commonly used to provide: (1) formative feedback to faculty for improving teaching, course content and structure; (2) a summary measure of teaching effectiveness for promotion and tenure decisions; (3) information to students for the selection of courses and teachers (Marsh & Roche, 1993). From a student perspective, some researchers believe that students increasingly see themselves as customers' who are buying a service and, therefore, are becoming more vocal in communicating their desires and perceptions of 'good' teaching to universities and to individual teachers (Titus, 2008; Fairchild and Crage, 2014). This evolving dynamic underscore the importance of incorporating students voice in the ongoing dialogue on teaching quality and institutional accountability.

GMMC is a community educational institution committed to provide high-quality education and has received

accreditation from University Grants Commission (UGC)-Nepal as a mark of its excellence. It was established in 2008 through the collaborative efforts of intellectuals and socio-political leaders. The campus was named after Gupteshwor Mahadev Cave, Pokhara. GMMC operates as a not-for-profit and affiliated to Tribhuvan University, Nepal. The campus offers semester-based programs such as Master of Business Studies (MBS), Bachelor of Hotel Management (BHM), and Bachelor of Information Management (BIM), as well as annual-based programs like Bachelor of Business Studies (BBS) and Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.).

The campus aims to provide modern, scientifically grounded education that meets societal needs, national priorities, international standards, and current academic trends. This commitment is inclusive, regardless of religion, caste, creed, or nationality. GMMC remains dedicated to offering quality education to marginalized and economically disadvantaged students, helping them build a better future. In this context, the assessment of teachers by students has become an essential tool for evaluating teaching effectiveness, fostering professional growth, and enhancing the overall learning environment (Marsh, 2007). However, Spooren et al. (2013) stressed that while student evaluations of teaching (SET) are widely used, their implementation and interpretation often present challenges, including biases, varying student expectations, and the potential misuse of data.

Empirical research on student evaluations has demonstrated their significance in improving teaching practices and institutional policies. Studies have consistently shown that constructive feedback from students can lead to enhanced teaching strategies, increased student satisfaction, and better academic outcomes (Richardson, 2005). For instance, a study by Benton and Cashin (2014) highlighted that well-designed SET systems can provide valuable insights into teaching effectiveness, particularly when they focus on specific dimensions such as clarity of instruction, engagement, and feedback provision. Similarly, Alhija (2017) emphasized the importance of contextual factors, such as class size and subject discipline, in shaping students' perceptions of teaching quality. Despite these findings, there is a lack of empirical research on SET in the context of Nepalese higher education, particularly in institutions like GMMC, where cultural, institutional, and pedagogical dynamics may influence student evaluations. One of the critical gaps in the existing literature is the limited exploration of how the institutional contexts shape students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness. While studies in Western contexts have extensively examined SET, their findings may not be directly applicable to institutions in developing countries like Nepal, where educational systems, student expectations, and teaching practices differ significantly. Additionally, the faculty-wise comparison has not been explored till date.

The significance of this study lies in its potential to address these research gaps and provide actionable insights for GMMC and similar institutions. By examining students' assessments of teachers at GMMC, this study aims to shed light on the factors that students' value in their teachers, such as teaching

effectiveness, communication skills, subject expertise, and classroom engagement. Furthermore, the study seeks to identify patterns and trends in student feedback, explore challenges in the evaluation process, and provide recommendations for enhancing the quality of teaching. This work is particularly timely, as higher education institutions in Nepal are increasingly focusing on improving teaching standards and aligning with global educational practices.

This study aims to analyze student assessments of teachers at GMMC, focusing on key dimensions such as the importance of timing, teaching effectiveness (including subject command, proper use of teaching materials, and helping attitude), and effective class control. Additionally, the research will explore how student evaluation of teaching (SET) data is utilized for faculty development and institutional improvement. Ultimately, the findings will benefit GMMC and serve as a resource for other institutions striving to enhance teaching quality and student learning outcomes

GMMC, a community-based institution has been dedicated to providing quality education to underprivileged and rural communities since its establishment. Despite its achievements, including Quality Assurance and Accreditation (QAA) certification in 2021, ensuring teaching quality remains a challenge. Student evaluations of teaching (SET) are widely recognized as a tool for assessing teaching effectiveness, but their implementation often faces issues such as biases, varying student expectations, and underutilization of feedback (Spooren et al., 2013). Empirical research highlights the importance of SET in improving teaching practices and student outcomes (Benton & Cashin, 2014), but there is limited research on SET in Nepalese higher education, particularly in institutions like GMMC. Additionally, it remains unclear whether teaching effectiveness varies across faculties, such as management and education, and if there are perceptual differences between students in annual and semester-based systems towards teachers. The specific research questions include: What is the perception of students on different dimensions of teachers? Does effectiveness of teaching differ on the basis of the faculty they represent? And, is there a perceptual difference between annual and semester-based systems toward teachers teaching?

The main objective of this study is to analyze students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness at GMMC and explore factors influencing these perceptions to enhance teaching quality and institutional policies. The specific objectives are to assess students' perceptions of different dimensions of teaching effectiveness; determine whether teaching effectiveness differs based on the faculty, the teachers represent and identify perceptual differences in teaching effectiveness between students enrolled in annual and semester-based academic systems.

The study is confined to a single institution, limiting the generalizability of findings to other higher education institutions. A purposive sampling method was used, potentially introducing selection bias, and the sample size of 274 students, while statistically valid, may not fully represent the diversity of student experiences. Certain groups, such as MBS (second and fourth-

semester students), BBS, and B.Ed. (second year students), were excluded due to exam preparation, omitting valuable insights. It focuses on a limited set of variables (teaching effectiveness, classroom management) and overlooks other important factors, such as teacher-student rapport and assessment methods. Faculty-wise comparisons are restricted by small sample sizes in certain programs like BIM and B.Ed. As a cross-sectional study, it captures perceptions at a single point in time, which limits its ability to assess changes over time or determine cause-and-effect relationships. The absence of a comparative analysis with other institutions limits broader insights into teaching effectiveness within Nepalese higher education. Despite these limitations, the study offers valuable insights. Future research should address these gaps for a more comprehensive understanding of teaching effectiveness in similar contexts.

Research Methods

The study employed a descriptive research design to collect and analyze students' assessments of their teachers at GMMC. The primary objective was to explore students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness across various dimensions. The nature of the data was quantitative, and the source of data was primary, collected directly from students through a structured questionnaire. The population of the study comprised 869 students enrolled in different programs BBS, BHM, BIM, and B.Ed. during the academic year 2081 B.S. To ensure a representative sample, purposive sampling was used, as the study aimed to capture the opinions of students from diverse faculties, levels, programs, and academic systems (annual and semester-based). The sample size was determined using Slovin's formula, resulting in 274 students being selected. This sample size was chosen to ensure a 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error. The formula used was:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2} = \frac{869}{1 + 869x0.05^2} = 273.91 \approx 274$$

A structured questionnaire developed by Himachal Pradesh University, India, was administered to collect the data. The items were originally in English and were also translated into Nepali to ensure better understanding and ease of response for the students. (https://www.hpuniv.ac.in/upload/uploadfiles/files/Teachers_Feed_Form_E13.pdf). The final sample represents 287 students studying in different programs on campus. The primary data were collected using a standard questionnaire, which included two sections: the profile of the students and their perceptions of teaching effectiveness using a 5-point Likert scale. The scale ranged from 1 (Below Average) to 5 (Excellent), allowing students to rate their teachers on various dimensions such as subject command, use of teaching materials, classroom management, and helping attitude. To ensure clarity and accessibility, the questionnaire was translated into Nepali. The questionnaire was administered after obtaining informed consent from participating students. To ensure anonymity, no identifying markers or personal symbols were included in the survey instrument. The collected data were coded and entered into SPSS software for analysis. Descriptive statistical tools such as mean, standard deviation, frequency, and percentage were used to assess students' perceptions of their teachers. Additionally, an

independent sample t-test was employed to identify any significant differences in students' perceptions based on the faculty they belonged to (e.g., management vs. education) and the academic system they were enrolled in (annual vs. semester-based).

Results and Discussion

Results

This section exhibits the evaluation of teachers by students. It comprises the profile of respondents and an analysis of teachers' effectiveness as perceived by students.

Profile of Respondents

The profile of the respondents (students) is presented in Table 1. It highlights their representation based on faculty, semester or annual system, the program they are enrolled in, and the year they are currently studying.

Table 1

Profile of the Respondents

Year	Frequency	%	Programs	Frequency	%
First Year	167	58.2	BBS	157	54.7
Second Year	14	4.9	B.Ed.	44	15.3
Third Year	46	16	BIM	50	17.4
Fourth Year	60	20.9	BHM	36	12.5
Faculty	**Frequency**	**%**	**Academic System**	**Frequency**	**%**
Management	243	84.7	Annual System	201	70
Education	44	15.3	Semester System	86	30

The table presents the profile of respondents based on their year of study, programs, faculty, and academic system. In terms of year of study, the majority of respondents were first-year students 58.2%, followed by fourth-year students 20.9%, third-year students 16%, and second-year students 4.9%. Regarding programs, the Bachelor of Business Studies (BBS) program had the highest representation 54.7%, followed by Bachelor of Information Management (BIM) 17.4%, Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) 15.3%, and Bachelor of Hotel Management (BHM) 12.5%. In terms of faculty, the majority of respondents were from the Management faculty 84.7%, while the remaining 15.3% were from the Education faculty. Regarding the academic system, most respondents were enrolled in the annual system 70%, while 30% were part of the semester system.

Assessment of Faculties: Students Perspectives

The assessment of faculties by students has been presented on the basis of different factors. Time management skills, command of subject matters, proper use of teaching materials, helping attitude, and ability to control the class are considered. The students were asked to rate their respective teachers on the given dimensions.

Time Management Dimension: This factor evaluates the teachers from the student's side on how effectively the

teachers manage their time. It comprises three items. The comprehensive analysis of this factor has been presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Assessment of Faculties on Time Management Skills

Items of Time Management	M	SD	Percentage				
			BA	A	G	VG	E
Punctuality in the class	4.10	0.83	0.30	3.10	18.10	42.50	35.90
Regularity in taking classes	4.21	0.91	1.70	2.40	15.00	34.50	46.30
Complete the syllabus of the course in time	3.93	0.92	1.40	3.80	25.80	38.30	30.70
Makes alternate arrangements for class in his/her absence	2.70	1.16	16.70	29.60	27.20	19.50	7.00
Class time management	3.66	0.98	3.50	6.30	30.70	40.10	19.50
Allocation of time for learning activities	3.54	1.05	4.20	10.80	31.70	33.80	19.50

Note: M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, BA=Below Average, A=Average, G=Good, VG=Very Good, E=Excellent

The evaluation of teachers' time management, as assessed by students, reveals strengths in punctuality and regularity but highlights areas for improvement in alternate class arrangements and time allocation. The findings indicate that teachers are generally perceived as punctual in the classroom (M = 4.10, SD = 0.83), with the majority of students rating this aspect as very good (42.5%) or Excellent (35.9%), and only a negligible percentage (0.3%) considering it below average. Similarly, regularity in taking classes received the highest mean score (M = 4.21, SD = 0.91), with 46.3% of students rating it as excellent and a minimal 1.7% rating it as below average, suggesting that students highly appreciate teachers' consistency in attending classes.

In terms of syllabus completion, teachers received a moderate rating (M = 3.93, SD = 0.92). While 30.7% of students rated it as excellent and 38.3% as very good, a notable proportion (25.8%) rated it as good, and 3.8% found it Average, indicating some variability in perceptions. However, making alternate arrangements in case of absence received the lowest rating (M = 2.70, SD = 1.16), with only 7% of students considering it excellent, whereas 16.7% rated it below average and 29.6% rated it as average. The high standard deviation suggests significant variation in students' opinions on this aspect, implying that some teachers manage absences better than others. Class time management also showed moderate effectiveness (M = 3.66, SD = 0.98), with 40.1% of students rating it as very good, 30.7% as good, and 19.5% as excellent, though 6.3% still found it average. Similarly, the allocation of time for learning activities was rated

slightly lower (M = 3.54, SD = 1.05), with 19.5% rating it as excellent, 33.8% as very good, and 10.8% as average, indicating a need for improvement in structuring learning activities effectively.

Command on Class and Subject Matters

This factor evaluates teachers based on subject matters and the command they demonstrate in the class. Table 3 demonstrates the on the given factor. The factor comprises eight items. The assessment of teachers' command of class and subject matters revealed varying levels of proficiency across different dimensions. Teachers demonstrated strong self-confidence (M = 4.24, SD = 0.81), with 45.30% rated as excellent and 36.20% as very good. Similarly, their ability to teach subject matters effectively was highly rated (M = 4.03, SD = 0.89), with 34.50% rated as excellent and 41.50% as very good. Focus on the syllabus also received high ratings (M = 4.03, SD = 0.91), with 35.20% rated as excellent and 39.70% as very good. However, communication skills were rated slightly lower (M = 3.74, SD = 1.05), with 28.90% rated as excellent and 31.40% as very good. Classroom discussions were conducted effectively (M = 3.84, SD = 0.98), with 29.30% rated as excellent and 38.00% as very good. Structured lecture delivery received moderate ratings (M = 3.60, SD = 0.88), with 15.30% rated as excellent and 41.10% as very good. Linking subject matters to real-life situations (M = 3.55, SD = 1.05) and referring to the latest developments in the field (M = 3.36, SD = 0.93) were rated comparatively lower, with 20.20% and 11.10% rated as excellent, respectively. Overall, teachers excelled in self-confidence and subject matter expertise but showed room for improvement in integrating real-life applications and staying updated with recent developments.

Table 3

Assessment of Teachers on Command on Class and Subject Matters

Items of Command on Class and Subject Matters	M	SD	Percentage				
			BA	A	G	VG	E
Focus on syllabus	4.03	0.91	1.40	3.80	19.90	39.70	35.20
Self-confidence	4.24	0.81	0.30	1.70	16.40	36.20	45.30
Communication skills	3.74	1.05	3.10	8.00	28.60	31.40	28.90
Conducts classroom discussion	3.84	0.98	1.00	9.80	22.0	38.00	29.30
Teaches the subject matters	4.03	0.89	0.70	5.60	17.80	41.50	34.50
Delivers structured lecture	3.60	0.88	1.40	8.00	34.10	41.10	15.30
Links subject matters to real-life situations	3.55	1.05	4.50	9.10	33.10	33.10	20.20
Refers to the latest development in the field	3.36	0.93	2.10	14.60	38.70	33.40	11.10

Note: M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, BA=Below Average, A=Average, G=Good, VG=Very Good, E=Excellent

Assessment on the Proper Use of Teaching Materials: The evaluation of teachers by students on the proper use of teaching materials has been presented in this section. Table 4 exhibits six items related to the proper use of teaching materials.

Table 4

Assessment of Teachers on the Proper Use of Teaching Materials

Items of Proper Use of Teaching Materials	M	SD	Percentage				
			BA	A	G	VG	E
Properly use teaching aids	3.58	1.15	5.60	12.90	24.4	32.10	25.10
Proper use of whiteboards and ensuring clear writing and visibility	3.70	0.96	1.70	9.10	28.6	38.7	22.0
Uses innovative teaching methods	3.43	0.90	0.70	16.70	33.10	39.70	10.50
Distribute answer sheets after the completion of exams/tests	3.47	1.11	4.50	19.20	30.30	29.60	20.90
Links subject matters to real-life situations	3.55	1.05	4.50	9.10	33.10	33.10	20.20
Refers to the latest development in the field	3.36	0.93	2.10	14.60	38.70	33.40	11.10

Note: M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, BA=Below Average, A=Average, G=Good, VG=Very Good, E=Excellent

The assessment of teachers' proper use of teaching materials indicated varying levels of effectiveness across different dimensions. Teachers demonstrated moderate proficiency in properly using teaching aids (M = 3.58, SD = 1.15), with 25.10% rated as excellent and 32.10% as very good. The use of whiteboards, including clear writing and visibility, was rated slightly higher (M = 3.70, SD = 0.96), with 22.0% rated as excellent and 38.7% as very good. However, the use of innovative teaching methods received lower ratings (M = 3.43, SD = 0.90), with only 10.50% rated as excellent and 39.70% as very good. Distributing answer sheets after exams or tests was also rated moderately (M = 3.47, SD = 1.11), with 20.90% rated as excellent and 29.60% as very good. Linking subject matters to real-life situations (M = 3.55, SD = 1.05) and referring to the latest developments in the field (M = 3.36, SD = 0.93) were rated similarly, with 20.20% and 11.10% rated as excellent, respectively. While teachers showed competence in using traditional teaching tools like whiteboards, there is a need for greater emphasis on adopting innovative methods and staying updated with recent developments in their fields.

Assessment of Helping Attitude of Teachers:This section exhibits the student's perception towards teachers on the helping attitude factor. Table 5 exhibits the evaluation of teachers helping attitude as perceived by students.

Table 5

Assessment of Helping Attitude of Teachers

Items of Helping Attitude of Teachers	M	SD	Percentage				
			BA	A	G	VG	E
Helpful approach toward the varied academic interests of students	3.51	0.99	2.40	12.90	31.70	36.60	16.40
Helps students in providing study materials that are not readily available in textbook	3.42	1.12	5.90	14.30	30.70	30.00	19.20
Helps students irrespective of ethnicity and cultural background	4.06	0.95	1.40	5.20	18.80	34.80	39.70
Helps students irrespective of gender	4.20	0.88	0.30	3.10	19.20	30.70	46.70
Approaches students in developing professional skills	3.38	0.93	1.70	14.60	39.00	32.80	11.80
Helps students realize their strengths and development needs	3.55	1.03	4.20	8.40	35.50	31.70	20.20

Note: M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, BA=Below Average, A=Average, G=Good, VG=Very Good, E=Excellent

The assessment of teachers' helping attitudes revealed strong performance in several areas, particularly in fostering inclusivity and support for students. Teachers were highly rated for helping students irrespective of gender (M = 4.20, SD = 0.88), with 46.70% rated as excellent and 30.70% as very good. Similarly, their support for students regardless of ethnicity and cultural background was also highly rated (M = 4.06, SD = 0.95), with 39.70% rated as excellent and 34.80% as very good. Teachers demonstrated a helpful approach toward students' varied academic interests (M = 3.51, SD = 0.99), with 16.40% rated as excellent and 36.60% as very good. However, their assistance in providing study materials not readily available in textbooks received slightly lower ratings (M = 3.42, SD = 1.12), with 19.20% rated as excellent and 30.00% as very good. Approaches to developing students' professional skills were rated moderately (M = 3.38, SD = 0.93), with 11.80% rated as excellent and 32.80% as very good. Additionally, helping students realize their strengths and development needs was rated moderately (M = 3.55, SD = 1.03), with 20.20% rated as excellent and 31.70% as very good. Teachers excelled in promoting inclusivity and gender equality but showed room for improvement in providing supplementary study materials and fostering professional skill development.

Assessment on Class Control: Class control is regarded as an important aspect of evaluating teacher performance. Students were asked to evaluate their teachers on the effectiveness of handling the class. Details on the seven items of class control has been presented in Table 6

Table 6

Assessment of Class Control

Items of Teachers' Class Control Behaviour	M	SD	Percentage				
			BA	A	G	VG	E
Ensure effective control mechanisms in conducting the class	3.55	0.94	2.10	9.40	35.20	36.60	16.70
Ensures student's involvement by assigning them relevant questions to answer	3.88	0.88	1.00	5.60	23.00	44.90	25.40
Skills in addressing inappropriate behavior of students	3.68	0.91	1.70	5.60	34.80	37.60	20.20
Maintaining discipline in the class	3.92	0.93	1.70	4.90	19.20	41.80	32.40
Improves learning through reinforcement	3.50	0.93	2.40	9.40	37.60	36.20	14.30
Inspires students for ethical conduct	3.73	0.96	1.40	9.10	27.50	38.30	23.70
Acts as a role model	3.83	1.11	5.20	5.90	22.30	33.10	33.40

Note: M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, BA=Below Average, A=Average, G=Good, VG=Very Good, E=Excellent

The assessment of teachers' class control behavior indicated strong performance across multiple dimensions. Teachers were highly effective in maintaining discipline in the class (M = 3.92, SD = 0.93), with 32.40% rated as excellent and 41.80% as very good. They also demonstrated strong skills in ensuring student involvement by assigning relevant questions (M = 3.88, SD = 0.88), with 25.40% rated as excellent and 44.90% as very good. Additionally, teachers acted as role models (M = 3.83, SD = 1.11), with 33.40% rated as excellent and 33.10% as very good. Their ability to address inappropriate student behavior was also well-rated (M = 3.68, SD = 0.91), with 20.20% rated as excellent and 37.60% as very good. Teachers inspired students for ethical conduct (M = 3.73, SD = 0.96), with 23.70% rated as excellent and 38.30% as very good. However, their use of reinforcement to improve learning received slightly lower ratings (M = 3.50, SD = 0.93), with 14.30% rated as excellent and 36.20% as very good. Similarly, ensuring effective control mechanisms in conducting the class was rated moderately (M = 3.55, SD = 0.94), with 16.70% rated as excellent and 36.60% as very good. Teachers were successful in maintaining discipline, engaging students, and serving as role models, but there is room for improvement in leveraging reinforcement strategies and control mechanisms.

Assessment of Different Factors: This section presents the composite value of all the factors that were assessed during the evaluation. Table 7 demonstrates the perception of students towards their teachers on all five factors.

Table 7

Assessment of Teachers on Different Factors

Different Factors of Teachers' Evaluation	N	Min	Max	M	SD
Time management	287	1.2	5	3.69	0.64
Command on class and subject matters	287	1.6	5	3.81	0.60
Proper use of teaching materials	287	1.3	5	3.52	0.67
Helping attitude of teachers	287	1.5	5	3.69	0.66
Class control	287	1.9	5	3.74	0.63

Note: N=Number of Respondents, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation

The assessment of teachers across different factors revealed consistent performance, with varying degrees of effectiveness. Teachers demonstrated strong command over class and subject matters (M = 3.81, SD = 0.60), followed closely by their class control behavior (M = 3.74, SD = 0.63). Time management (M = 3.69, SD = 0.64) and helping attitude (M = 3.69, SD = 0.66) were rated similarly, indicating moderate to high effectiveness in these areas. However, the proper use of teaching materials received slightly lower ratings (M = 3.52, SD = 0.67), suggesting room for improvement in this domain.

Teachers' Effectiveness on Various Factors across the Faculty They Represent

The teachers were evaluated by the students on the five factors. However, it is worthwhile to assess whether the effectiveness of teachers varies across the faculty they represent. To determine it, the perception of students has been presented in Table 8

Table 8

Teachers' Effectiveness across the Faculty They Represent

Factors of Teachers' Effectiveness	Faculty	N	M	SD	t
Time Management	Management	243	3.71	0.63	0.933
	Education	44	3.60	0.72	
Command on Class and Subject Matters	Management	243	3.79	0.61	-0.936
	Education	44	3.88	0.53	
Proper Use of Teaching Materials	Management	243	3.55	0.66	1.405
	Education	44	3.39	0.69	
Helping Attitude of Teachers	Management	243	3.66	0.67	-1.971*
	Education	44	3.88	0.58	
Class Control	Management	243	3.74	0.62	-0.346
	Education	44	3.77	0.64	

*Note: N=Number of Respondents, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, *p<0.05*

The assessment of teachers' effectiveness across different factors revealed variations between management and education faculties. In terms of time

management, management faculty scored slightly higher (M = 3.71, SD = 0.63) compared to education faculty (M = 3.60, SD = 0.72), with no significant difference (t = 0.933, p>0.05). For command on class and subject matters, education faculty outperformed (M = 3.88, SD = 0.53) management faculty (M = 3.79, SD = 0.61), though the difference was not significant (t = -0.936, p>0.05). The proper use of teaching materials was rated higher for management faculty (M = 3.55, SD = 0.66) than for education faculty (M = 3.39, SD = 0.69), but the difference was not significant (t = 1.405, p>0.05). Education faculty demonstrated a stronger helping attitude (M = 3.88, SD = 0.58) compared to management faculty (M = 3.66, SD = 0.67), with a significant difference (t = -1.971, p<0.05). Finally, class control was rated similarly for both faculties, with management faculty scoring M = 3.74 (SD = 0.62) and education faculty scoring M = 3.77 (SD = 0.64), showing no significant difference (t = -0.346). Education faculty showed slightly better performance in command on subject matters and helping attitude, and management faculty performed better in the proper use of teaching materials, though most differences were not statistically significant.

Teachers' Effectiveness on Various Factors across the Academic System They Represent

The students evaluated the teachers on the five factors of teaching effectiveness. The factors were assessed based on the academic system the teachers were involved. To determine it, the students' perception has been presented in Table 9

Table 9

Teachers' Effectiveness across the Academic System They Represent

Factors of Teachers' Effectiveness	Faculty	N	M	SD	T
Time Management	Annual system	201	3.64	0.65	-2.025*
	Semester system	86	3.80	0.61	
Command on Class and Subject Matters	Annual system	201	3.82	0.56	0.884
	Semester system	86	3.75	0.67	
Proper Use of Teaching Materials	Annual system	201	3.53	0.64	0.620
	Semester system	86	3.48	0.71	
Helping Attitude of Teachers	Annual system	201	3.69	0.62	-1.47
	Semester system	86	3.70	0.75	
Class Control	Annual system	201	3.74	0.63	0.90
	Semester system	86	3.73	0.60	

*Note: N=Number of Respondents, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, *p<0.05*

A comparison of teachers' effectiveness across the annual and semester systems was conducted based on student assessments. The results revealed significant differences in one of the five factors assessed. Specifically, teachers in the semester system (M = 3.80, SD = 0.61) were rated significantly higher in time management compared to teachers in the annual system [(M = 3.64, SD = 0.65), t(285) = -2.025, p < 0.05].

For the remaining factors, no significant differences were found. In command on class and subject matters, teachers in the annual system (M = 3.82, SD = 0.56) were rated slightly higher than those in the semester system [(M = 3.75, SD = 0.67), t(285) = 0.884, p > 0.05]. Similarly, for proper use of teaching materials, annual system teachers (M = 3.53, SD = 0.64) scored marginally higher than semester system teachers [(M = 3.48, SD = 0.71), t(285) = 0.620, p > 0.05]. In terms of the helping attitude of teachers, both systems received nearly identical ratings, annual system (M = 3.69, SD = 0.62); semester system, [(M = 3.70, SD = 0.75), t(285) = -1.47, p > 0.05]. Finally, for class control, annual system teachers (M = 3.74, SD = 0.63) and semester system teachers (M = 3.73, SD = 0.60) were rated similarly, [t(285) = 0.90, p > 0.05].

Discussion

The primary objective of this study was to examine students' perceptions of their teachers' instructional methods. While students may not possess the expertise to critically evaluate formal curriculum design, their perspectives offer valuable insights into various aspects of teaching, including pedagogy, communication, and classroom engagement. Teacher evaluation is a critical process enhancing teaching and learning outcomes. It serves to identify strengths and areas for improvement, thereby contributing to the refinement of instructional methods. This study provides substantial evidence that the teachers at GMMC demonstrate strong professional competence.

The education faculties are traditionally expected to excel in pedagogical approaches; this study reveals that management faculties are equally capable of delivering effective and efficient instruction through the appropriate use of teaching materials. Furthermore, the findings indicate that teaching effectiveness more pronounced in the semester system, as evidenced by statistically significant differences. This disparity may be attributed to the greater regularity and engagement of students in semester-based programs.

One notable area requiring improvement ins the arrangement of alternate classes in the event of teacher's absence, which appears to be inadequately managed. This shortcoming may stem from the lack of an establishment substitute class culture in higher education institutions. Regarding supportive behaviour, education faculty members were perceived to be slightly more helpful than their counterparts in other disciplines, possibly due to smaller class sizes fostering closer faculty-student interactions. Additionally, semester faculty members were rated significantly higher in time management compared to annual system faculty, suggesting better adherence to structured lesson plans.

The findings of the study, based on the analysis of students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness at GMMC, are as follows:

Students rated teachers highly in terms of command over class and subject matters (M = 3.81, SD = 0.60) and class control (M = 3.74, SD = 0.63). Time management (M = 3.69, SD = 0.64) and helping attitude (M= 3.69, SD = 0.66) were also rated positively, though slightly lower. The proper use of teaching materials received the lowest ratings (M = 3.52, SD = 0.67), indicating room for improvement in this area.

There were some variations in teaching effectiveness between the Management

and Education faculties. Education faculty teachers were perceived to have a stronger helping attitude (M = 3.88, SD = 0.58) compared to Management faculty teachers (M = 3.66, SD = 0.67), with this difference being statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). In terms of command over class and subject matters, Education faculty teachers scored slightly higher (M = 3.88, SD = 0.53) than Management faculty teachers (M = 3.79, SD = 0.61), though the difference was not significant. Management faculty teachers were rated higher in the proper use of teaching materials (M = 3.55, SD = 0.66) compared to Education faculty teachers (M = 3.39, SD = 0.69), but this difference was also not significant.

Teachers in the semester-based system were rated significantly higher in time management (M = 3.80, SD = 0.61) compared to those in the annual system (M = 3.64, SD = 0.65), with this difference being statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). However, teachers in the annual system were slightly higher rated in command over class and subject matters (M= 3.82, SD = 0.56) compared to semester system teachers (M = 3.75, SD = 0.67), though the difference was not significant.

Conclusion and Implications

This part depicts the conclusion of the study as per the research questions and objectives. The conclusions are derived from the objectives and findings of the study. Additionally, the implications to different stakeholders have been presented as per the study findings.

The study aims to evaluate the teachers on different dimensions of academic effectiveness by the students. The study concludes that students at GMMC generally perceive their teachers as effective in key areas such as command over subject matter, class control, and time management. Teachers demonstrated strong self-confidence, subject expertise, and the ability to maintain discipline and engage students effectively. However, there is room for improvement in the proper use of teaching materials and the adoption of innovative teaching methods, as these areas received comparatively lower ratings. Faculty-wise comparisons revealed that while Education faculty teachers were perceived to have a stronger helping attitude, Management faculty teachers were slightly better in utilizing teaching materials, though most differences were not statistically significant. Additionally, teachers in the semester-based system were rated significantly higher in time management compared to those in the annual system, suggesting that the academic system may influence students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness. Overall, the findings underscore the importance of addressing specific areas of improvement, such as enhancing the use of teaching aids and fostering innovative pedagogical practices, to further elevate teaching quality at GMMC. These insights provide valuable guidance for institutional policies aimed at faculty development and improving student learning outcomes, while also highlighting the need for further research to explore broader contextual factors influencing teaching effectiveness in Nepalese higher education.

The study provides several key implications for various stakeholders, including students, teachers, the campus, top management, UGC-Nepal, and future research studies.The study reveals that while students perceive teachers as effective in core areas like subject

expertise and classroom management, there is a need for greater innovation in teaching methods and materials. It underscores the value of student feedback and continuous professional development to enhance teaching quality, suggesting institutional policies and resource allocation to support these improvements. Additionally, the findings advocate for broader research and national guidelines to elevate teaching standards across higher education institutions in Nepal.

References

Alhija, F. N. A. (2017). Good teaching through students' lens. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 54*, 4–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.10.006

Benton, S. L., &Cashin, W. E. (2014). Student ratings of teaching: *A summary of research and literature* (IDEA Paper No. 50). IDEA Center.

Fairchild, E., &Crage, S. (2014). *Beyond the debates: Measuring and specifying student consumerism. Sociological Spectrum, 34*(5), 403–420.

GuptehworMahadev Multiple Campus. (2024). *Gupteshwordarpan: Annual report 2080/81*. GuptehworMahadev Multiple Campus.

Himachal Pradesh University, IQAC. (n.d.). *Teachers' feedback form*. https://www.hpuniv.ac.in/upload/uploadfiles/files/Teachers_Feed_Form_E13.pdf

Husain, M., & Khan, S. (2016). Students' feedback: An effective tool in teachers' evaluation system. *International Journal of Applied and Basic Medical Research, 6*(3), 178–181. https://doi.org/10.4103/2229-516X.186969

Marsh, H. W. (2007). Students' evaluations of university teaching: A multidimensional perspective. In R. P. Perry & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An evidence-based perspective* (pp. 319–384). Springer.

Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. (1993). The use of students' evaluations and an individually structured intervention to enhance university teaching effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal, 30*(1), 217–251.

Penny, A. R. (2003). Changing the agenda for research into students' views about university teaching: Four shortcomings of SRT research. *Teaching in Higher Education, 8*(3), 399–411. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510309396

Richardson, J. T. E. (2005). Instruments for obtaining student feedback: A review of the literature. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 30*(4), 387–415. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500099193

Spooren, P., Brockx, B., &Mortelmans, D. (2013). On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research, 83*(4), 598–642. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313496870

Stronge, J. H., & Ostrander, L. P. (1997). Client surveys in teacher evaluation. In J. H. Stronge (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice* (pp. 129–161). Corwin Press.

Voeks, V. W. (1962). Publications and teaching effectiveness: A search for some relationship. *The Journal of Higher Education, 33*(4), 212–218. https://doi.org/10.2307/1978904