

The invisible accomplishments of faculty in Ugandan Universities: An 'Iceberg Tip Metaphor'

Maria Kaguhangire-Barifaijo* • James L. Nkata • Proscovia S. Namubiru

Uganda Management Institute, Kampala Uganda.

*Corresponding author. Email: mbkaguhangire@umi.ac.ug.

Accepted 1st September, 2021.

Abstract. The evaluation of faculty accomplishments has remained unresolved and contentious, threatening the quality of all university functions. Whereas performance evaluation of faculty is derived from their mandate of teaching, research, and community service, there has been no comprehensive tool that specifically measures aspects of quality, effectiveness or even commitment. As a result, without a comprehensive and reliable evaluation tool to evaluate faculty members' performance, institutional quality may suffer, as may faculty enthusiasm, emotional engagement, and commitment, all of which are vulnerable to institutional productivity and visibility. The paper concludes that the lack of a comprehensive tool to measure all faculty activities affected mechanisms to acquire evidence for certain accomplishments. Therefore, Universities must develop a comprehensive tool to capture multiple accomplishments as a basis for performance evaluations to inform personnel decisions that go beyond class time and paper publications in order to restore visibility of fundamental faculty accomplishments.

Keywords: Faculty accomplishments, assessment, evaluation, iceberg tip metaphor, psychological contract, university's mandate.

INTRODUCTION

The mandate of a university revolves around three functions: teaching, research, and community service, from which universities derive measures to evaluate, specifically, teaching staff. As a result, the functions of a university are to promote inquiry and advance the sum of human knowledge, to provide general education to students, and to develop experts for various sections of the community, but also to demand quality in all aspect of research, teaching, and community service (Huber and Kuncel, 2015). Farooq (2011) discovered no corresponding tool, specifically designed to capture measures of quality, effectiveness, and commitment, despite the fact that institutions demand quality and effectiveness in their roles of teaching, research, and service. However, faculties are expected to fulfill common responsibilities such as full commitment to teaching obligations, development and review of relevant academic programs, participation in scholarly activities, and appropriately supporting their universities in their

goal of providing the necessary services to society (Huevel, 2016; Arum and Roksa, 2011). Nonetheless, Bastedo *et al.* (2016) explain how the balance and evaluation of faculty activities can vary significantly according to institution type, terms of their employment relationships, and specializations (Barifaijo and Namubiru, 2017). Similarly, the axiom of their roles necessitates an increase in authority and discretion, which frequently results in consequence responsibilities - to their colleagues, students, the University, the community, and society (Durazzi and Sene, 2013). Faculty members must demonstrate evidence of teaching and research accomplishments through student graduation, publications, funding proposals, and dissemination of appropriate expertise to the community in order to account for their presence in universities (Dawson, 2016; Barifaijo and Namubiru, 2017). As a result, faculty members are expected to fully assume responsibility for carrying out the three-pronged mission

of teaching, scholarship, and service, and to develop each of these three areas in the regular course of their professional lives (Bowen and Tobin, 2015).

Faculty members are inextricably linked to the central university functions, requiring results from each of the functions performed, such as imparting knowledge to their students, generating and disseminating knowledge to peers as well as external audiences (Barifaijo, 2016; Gravely, 2014; Carey, 2015). Faculty are also expected to disseminate and impart basic or applied knowledge to students, which qualifies them as content experts due to the ongoing knowledge construction. As a result, in order for faculty expertise and knowledge base to remain current, they must stay up to date on the most recent developments in their fields. Surprisingly, while the focus of this article is on the missing measures in the evaluation tool, the evaluators may be unable to assess the visible accomplishments satisfactorily because these academics have varying specializations, even within same departments. As a result, effective performance evaluation of faculty is critical so that the results can be used for various personnel decisions such as staff development, pay increments, regular commendations, yearly awards and recognitions. In the course of carrying out their core functions of teaching, research, and community engagement, university faculty all over the world engage in a variety of activities that inform their performance evaluation (Kiran and Prakasha, 2017). However, while the functions may be universal, the activities of universities significantly differ depending on whether they are a 'research', 'teaching' or 'community' university (Dawson, 2016). Other distinctions could be the 'purpose of the evaluation' such as; overtime payment in teaching or contract renewal or promotion in research. Nonetheless, while all faculty accomplishments require both 'quality' and 'quantity,' the lack of evidence for 'quality' or 'effectiveness' in some activities has forced evaluators to focus on quantity, such as; the number of lessons taught, percentage of positive evaluations by students, number of students supervised, number of consultancies engaged in, amount of money generated by individual faculty, number of articles published, number of researches conducted etc. Surprisingly, there has been some reasonable adherence and quality constraints regarding the function of research. For example, while 'quantity' of publications may guide evaluators in the initial stages of evaluation 'quality' is a 'must' in determining an individual's suitability for promotion. Yet, while evaluating the teaching activity takes into account the hours taught by individual faculty and only informs the initial stages of evaluation, evaluating the research activity includes empirical research and graduate supervision, with only the aspect of a publication for promotion (UMI Promotional Guidelines, 2018). However, faculty accomplishments occur before, during, and after class but are never

documented and thus remain unnoticed (Barifaijo and Namubiru, 2017; Basheka *et al.*, 2013). Faculty members, in particular, devote a significant amount of time and energy to preparing for teaching, researching current content, differentiating learning for different learners, preparing case studies, assessing learning, and providing feedback. Similarly, faculty are expected to demonstrate deep knowledge, involve learners, and effectively communicate knowledge to students – all while actively and meaningfully engaging them (Clarke, 2012). Indeed, faculty are expected to engage students by modeling the values and practices associated with professionalism and scholarly inquiry; and to successfully mentor and advise students (De Houwer, 2019). Faculty prepares assessment tools at the end of teaching, administer the preferred type of assessment, carry out the assessment, and finally provide feedback to students.

The problem

Faculty perform numerous niceties as part of their research activity, such as reviewing students' proposals and moderating dissertations, as well as advising and counseling graduate students. On the other hand, the adage "publish or perish" may dampen faculty enthusiasm, harming teaching quality, research output, student enrollment, and university visibility as faculty remain in the same positions (Matovu and Ainol, 2014). As a result of 'quality' being a prerequisite for a university and a precursor for university profiling, faculty accomplishments necessitate a significant amount of time and energy, which should be evaluated and recompensed. However, critical measures that improve performance, quality, productivity and emotional engagement have consistently been omitted from performance evaluation tools (Anderson and Braud, 2011; Jeyarajasekar and Sivakumar, 2019). Community engagement, on the other hand, only informs the initial stages of evaluation and includes things like leadership positions, representation on internal and external organs, external examination, etc. This activity, too, is always evaluated by the local evaluators. However, evaluation of teaching and research accomplishments remains controversial, and evaluation of service activities remains utterly perplexing (Barifaijo, 2016). If such critical faculty accomplishments go uncaptured and unrecognized, it may have a negative impact not only on the quality of teaching, research output, and graduate dissertations, but also on universities' competitive advantage. As a result, the melting iceberg metaphor is often effective in depicting rather complex concepts that are frequently pondered as simple above the water's surface. However, omitting critical faculty accomplishments that yield numerous benefits, similar to the dangers of the iceberg that are invisible to the naked eye, may be detrimental to

these institutions while significantly contributing to their overall performance, quality, and productivity. To address such issues, the following questions were answered: (1) what are the established efforts made by these institutions to extract various aspects of faculty accomplishments? and (2) What are the implications of uncaptured faculty accomplishments?

LITERATURE REVIEW, THEORETICAL EXPLORATION AND CONCEPTUAL ORIENTATION

Academics around the world are expected to complete a variety of activities divided into five categories: education, research, community engagement, students' affairs and administration (Barifaijo, 2016). However, Bowen and Tobin (2015) classify these functions as teaching, research, and service, with the assumption that administration falls under 'community engagement' and students' advising falls under education. In fact, the vast majority of literature, like the authors, has embraced the latter. While the primary role is commonly referred to as 'teaching,' literature provides other options such as 'training,' 'education,' or 'instruction.' Graduate supervision, advising, and publication, on the other hand, have been grouped under 'research', while all other functions, including institutional committees, representation, professional engagements, external examination, consultancy, partnerships, and collaborations, appear to have been grouped under 'community engagement'. What is unclear is whether 'supervision of students' internships' and 'field attachments' fall under the teaching or research function because they culminate in a 'project.' Notwithstanding, the object of this article is to highlight the evaluators' inability to measure them so that they can be rated during performance evaluation.

Gouldner's (1960) Social Exchange Theory (SET) was used to guide the discussion. The theory espouses that individuals often make decisions based on certain outcomes, such as; rewards, positive outcomes and long-term benefits, and will prefer the exchange that results in the most professional growth and independence (Rousseau, 2016a, b). As a result, academics, like other employees, will most likely choose alternatives with the fewest costs, consequences, and least social disapproval. Every social exchange involves a complex decision because the individual must weigh various costs and benefits. Hence, the theory is a direct theoretical explanation of the psychological contract (Gouldner, 1960; Blau, 1964), with three aspects of social exchange that are particularly relevant to conceptualizing psychological contracts: (i) 'social exchange vs. economic exchange', (ii) 'reciprocity,' and (iii) 'inequalities' (Robinson, 2016). Whereas the invisible accomplishments may be the acuity of psychological contracts that are largely reliant on promises made by both parties, a breach of such contract may occur when

the employer fails to recognize what was expected, and vice versa. However, according to the social exchange theory, faculty members are more likely to perceive a breach of contract, which results in negative reactions, as a sign of mistrust (van den Huevel, 2016). Academics' responses may take the form of reduced loyalty, commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors (Curcio and Lynch, 2017), which feelings frequently increase negative tension, such as deliberate refusal of faculty to incorporate critical accomplishments that are never recognized.

Universities, in particular, have long taken pride in the high caliber of teaching provided by their faculties, with classroom teaching consistently cited as the most important factor in evaluating overall faculty performance (Hart Research Associates, 2015). Recently, the research function has gained prominence due to its potential to increase visibility and university rankings, as well as academic career advancement, which is viewed as long-term recompenses (Goe *et al.*, 2008). Surprisingly, despite the fact that faculty evaluation has existed since the Bologna process to strengthen quality and guide management decisions, it only gained popularity in the last two decades with the pressing need value for money, career opportunities, and merit increase, which caused evaluation to change academics' work-related behavior and overall expectations (Shahid and Wahab, 2015; O'Connor and Carvalho, 2014). While changed work behavior was not the authors' primary concern for this article, it does explain faculty reactions when evaluations fail to capture their numerous accomplishments, which have a significant impact not only on the quality of every endeavor and productivity, but also on faculty enthusiasm, just as the larger part of the iceberg has the potential to harm the ship.

The idiom "*tip of the iceberg*" literally means "there is more to it than meets the eye," because a massive chunk of ice frequently detaches from a glacier and floats around the ocean (Jeyarajasekar and Sivakumar, 2019). As a result, the term "iceberg" refers to the fact that there is a very large problem, and the tip is a smaller part of that larger problem, just as uncaptured critical faculty accomplishments may reduce their engagement and enthusiasm. Fundamentally, icebergs are notorious for being much larger beneath the water's surface than what is visible on its surface, making the situation dangerous for ships as they attempt to navigate their way around icebergs. Because there are always uncertainties about the magnitude of the iceberg, there is a perceived risk of the iceberg damaging the ship and causing it to sink – similar to the 'Titanic story' (Chapman, 2016). In contrast to losing the niceties in university activities, the 'icebergs' and the '*tip of the iceberg*' have much depth beyond the depth - as the 'Knowledge Iceberg' portrays, because the icebergs eventually melt and return to where they originally came from, regaining their status quo and becoming part of the water cycle again (Benton and Ryalls, 2016). There is a

growing argument that faculty activities are so intertwined in their nature and intent that institutional accounting mechanisms have forced artificial separations between teaching and research (Clarke, 2012), encouraging plagiarism among staff. Indeed, the links between teaching and research are numerous, diverse, dynamic, and discipline-specific (Dawson, 2016), necessitating special consideration. Similarly, De Houwer (2019) discovered that supervising research and projects is the most complex and finest form of education because supervisors are familiar with methods to make research effective and help students not only conduct genuine research, but also assemble credible research reports. In the same vein, dissertation or thesis writing required superior skills such as supervision, skill promotion, scientific climate, evaluation process, clarity of goals and standards, structure, and students' satisfaction in the thesis writing process (Heaney, 2015).

Faculty responsibilities primarily include effective classroom teaching, academic advising and counseling of students, participation in departmental committee work, continuous curriculum development through assessment, applied research or scholarly activity, and service (Wagenaar, 2014). Faculty members are also expected to improve the learning environment through instruction, applied research, scholarly activity, and service that supports the institutional mission (IUCEA, 2010). Individual faculty members, regardless of rank, must always be held accountable for competent and effective performance of their roles and must foster collegial relationships with supervisors, peers, students, and, of course, the University community. Teaching activity can be defined as a collection of procedures carried out both inside and outside the classroom with the goal of promoting student learning in relation to the objectives and guidelines defined in the curriculum and a predetermined institutional context (Kangas *et al.*, 2017). As a result, teaching activity entails planning and managing teaching, deploying teaching methods, learning and evaluation activities, and finally revising and improving the procedures used (Heaney, 2015; Huber and Kuncel, 2015). In order to carry out the teaching activity effectively, faculty implement procedures in response to the training objectives and competencies that students are expected to develop.

Notably, an evaluation of teaching activity must take into account all procedures carried out and assess the magnitude of their work and quality (Basheka *et al.*, 2013). Every faculty is expected to deliver high-quality content and instruction, as well as to engage in scholarship and research in order to apply new and improved devices, techniques, online technologies, procedures, and methods to improve the teaching and learning process. Similarly, faculty are expected to provide challenging learning opportunities for all learners, to provide academic and career guidance and encouragement, to develop efficient and equitable procedures for evaluating student

academic performance, and to provide students with timely and appropriate feedback (Dawson, 2016). While these academics are expected to carry out all of the aforementioned activities, they are also expected to stay active in their fields of study through research, innovation, creative output, and other professional activities as defined by their institution (De Houwer, 2019). Similarly, almost all university faculty (whether teaching or research university) engage in research to contribute to the discipline's or academic field's knowledge base, and it is commonly associated with conducting empirical studies (Kasozi, 2006). Considering all the highlighted accomplishments, universities need to devise strategies to academics in each of the peculiar accomplishment of value.

METHODOLOGY

In order to address the two objectives, an integrative synthesis and review summaries were adopted because of their ability to summarize existing research literature and observe situations. These approaches are recommended by Kothari and Garg (2014) not only for resolving reliability disputes, but also for investigating patterns across primary and secondary research studies and practice, which often compensates for single-study weaknesses. Furthermore, Creswell (2014) considers review summaries to be superior in terms of ensuring the internal and external validity of various research findings in order to enable critical judgements. Data were collected from selected schools of 'management', 'social sciences' and 'humanities' from three institutions: Uganda Management Institute, Makerere, and Kyambogo Universities. Because the three institutions are public, they are governed by public service guidelines that emphasize 'performance management.' Documentary reviews, yearly performance appraisal tools, statutory instruments, institutional policies, promotional guidelines, evaluation reports, committee reports, students' evaluation form, and performance targets against which personnel decisions are made were among the methods used for this qualitative research according to Bryman (2016) and Şahan and Tarhan (2015). Furthermore, published scientific articles on the subject were used as a basis for comparison. However, given the subjective nature of qualitative research, precautions were taken to avoid ethical slanders, such as adhering to the set out objectives, protecting participants' identities, as well as acknowledging scholars who contributed to this paper.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Teaching and research have frequently been viewed as distinct activities with distinct outcomes (Linse, 2017), and this distinction has resulted in distinct evaluation and

recognition systems for each constituent. Although community engagement is critical for university visibility and profiling, the evaluation of its activities in terms of individual benefits is ambiguous. However, while the consulting function has always existed, it has become more prominent due to its role in generating income not only for these universities, but also for individuals through commissions. However, the most important nuances of significance have gone unrecognized. Aside from the financial contribution, the niceties of this function are also uncaptured, with the exception of the quality assurance directorates, which have institutionalized various strategies to promote quality in the three universities, but not as a mandatory framework (NCHE, 2014; Bowen and Tobin, 2015). Interestingly, whereas performance appraisals for all staff are required in all public service institutions, both Makerere and Kyambogo Universities were lax. Furthermore, because the two Universities used the 'permanent and pensionable' type of employment relationship, performance evaluations were limited to specific purposes such as leadership positions and promotions (KyU, 2016). Unlike the other two institutions (Makerere and Kyambogo), employment relationships of Uganda Management Institute were contractual and run on modular systems, which made their performance evaluations functional, significant, and vigorous (Barifaijo and Namubiru, 2017).

The first and perhaps most important question, explored efforts made by universities in incorporating various aspects of faculty accomplishments for continued staff engagement and competitive advantage. All the three institutions had instituted numerous quality assurance strategies, including assessment strategies that capture faculty accomplishments, numerous staff development initiatives, specifically to reinforce staff competencies, not only to drive students' skill acquisition, but also to ensure students' relevance and employability. Each of the three institutions had a Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Department; a Directorate of Research/Graduate Schools in Makerere and Kyambogo; and an Institute Research Center and Innovations, at UMI. Further, UMI recently established an Incubation and Innovation Centre. Through their strategic objectives, the comprehensive and periodic reviews of their Strategic Plans were discovered to be an area that emphasized faculty performance. On the other hand, whereas the function of the Audit in Makerere and Kyambogo were limited for financial auditing, at UMI, this department *went beyond financial-related matters, to matters of quality in the teaching, learning and assessment* (UMI Strategic Plan, 2018). By implication, all these efforts are intended to increase quality. However, even with all these efforts, there was no measurement tool in all the institutions that had been developed to capture those indicators.

Specifically, unlike the other two universities, UMI was consistent in conducting 'student evaluations' at the end

of each module, with the goal of capturing faculty teaching competencies, conducting tracer studies, 360 degrees 'self-assessment'. Still, unlike other two institutions, UMI instituted a 'Leadership Development Program' for the Governing Council on a regularly basis. This practice was actually applied in the Nigerian Universities, and was found to yield high benefits according to Archibong *et al.* (2017). Nevertheless, students' ratings were found to be a source of information in assessing the teaching function, because students' matter a great deal in evaluating teaching, since everything done must be done to satisfy them (Matovu and Ainol, 2014). In fact, whereas Clarke (2012) hyped students rating to be the most accurate in judging teaching effectiveness, Revell and Wainwright (2009) disputed this claim, for its numerous flaws, such as high ratings associated with individual faculty awarding high grades; humor, less content, easy tasks, a soft personality, but also with instructors who seek popularity by going against institutional regulations such as submission timelines.

Whereas some universities such as; UMI conducted 'self-evaluation' to provide insights into the values and beliefs that help shape course and instructional objectives, at the same time, the activity was found to contribute to classroom competency. The finding on self-assessment was supported by scholars such as; De Houwer, 2019; Linse, 2017 and Kiran and Prakasha, 2017; who actually affirmed that self-evaluation was the cornerstone of an evaluation system with its academic teaching portfolios, insights not found elsewhere, and its invaluable values and attitudes that determine why academics teach the way they do. In fact, Hakel *et al.* (2008) also found how universities created reliable, valid, and fair evaluation systems by developing multiple methods of evaluation, tailored to specific purposes. As a result, institutions could create comprehensive scores that include multiple measures that are required to capture important information that is not included in most classroom observation protocols or value-added scores (Goe *et al.*, 2008). Similarly, duty officers deployed to determine attendance, facility adequacy, hygiene, and general discipline of learners and staff at UMI was one of the attempts to assure compliance. However, just like the iceberg, effective teaching, preparedness, or completeness are never ensured through evidence of attendance or availability. In 2019, UMI further obtained an International Standardization for Organization (ISO) Certificate – not only for its current quality-related endeavors, but also as a sustainability strategy for quality. While ISO requires documentation of university activities such as meetings, curriculum development, policy formulation, and so on, no provision requires documentation of the quality of faculty accomplishments in the three strands of 'teaching, research & community engagement'. Remarkably, the custodians of quality who

evaluate faculty activities frequently demand effective teaching, differentiated instruction, case study development and utilization, and the use of relevant examples in class, have not provided assessment measures to inform objective evaluation.

Notwithstanding, some faculty members have done some credible job in performing all of these niceties without being recognized, yet, others have continued to deliver shallow instruction but with no corresponding sanctions. While great and successful teaching requires time, passion, high-quality materials, and tailored feedback designed to help students build competence and self-efficacy, it is never assessed (Kiran and Prakasha, 2017). Yet, teaching necessitates critical thinking, relevant examples, and the ability to assess the learners' abilities. As a result of the immediate rewards for the teaching function, as well as the lack of effective evaluation tool, instructors no longer teach for deeper understanding; instead, they teach for students to pass, without leaving 'hallmarks' for them to reminisce (Mamdani, 2007). In fact, some faculty members lacked the honesty to decline participation in areas they are not so familiar with (Barifaijo and Namubiru, 2017), where the majority lacked adequate preparation, affecting students' learning and the methods used. The teaching activity that is the subject of evaluation, in theory, plays an important role in the teaching-learning process because it occurs both inside and outside the classroom with the goal of assisting students' learning (Arum and Roksa, 2011; Clarke, 2012).

On the second question that sought for the 'implications of uncaptured faculty accomplishments', it took many by surprise, because, while the vast majority of invisible faculty accomplishments fell under teaching activities, which most evaluators could not identify, only publication under scholarship and research was identified. In fact, although majority engaged in various activities, they never thought those activities had any quality-related implication. Similarly, although the evaluators frequently demand for high-quality research, critical reading, and writing, as well as quality supervision, some may not even be in position to identify them, and perhaps, the reason these accomplishments have remained invisible. Faculty advice and counsel to students on a variety of topics such as academic performance, relationships, integrity issues, sickness, financial burdens, family challenges, etc. remained uncaptured. Yet, they were found by Barifaijo and Namubiru (2017) to accelerate students' stability, development, academic achievement as well as completion rates. While faculty participation in institutional committee work was considered part of their roles, these meetings consumed a significant amount of time, affecting their productivity levels in terms of research and publication.

Another underutilized but necessary activity for skill development is 'student internships,' but (i) it is unclear

whether this activity falls under research, teaching, or community engagement functions, and (ii) its relevance has not received adequate attention (Barifaijo, 2016). This may be due to a lack of measures for effective internship supervision or the quality of students' engagement during internship. According to O'Meara *et al.* (2018), universities should pay special attention to internships, lest they end up in limbo. On the other hand, while 'curriculum development' is a requirement in the employment contract, not all members have the capability of developing academic programs, and those who have developed them are never recognized, thus discouraging potential curriculum developers (Barifaijo and Namubiru, 2017).

The most popular activity for assessing students' learning is either formative or summative. Whereas this role is the most difficult of all university activities in terms of maintaining a central position in students' learning, it also has a strong influence on students' learning behavior (Jadama, 2014). In fact, like Clarke (2012), we discovered that more than 60% of the warning letters in faculty's files were due to either lack of timely or failure to execute students' assessments. Surprisingly, assessment is perhaps the most overlooked role in academic evaluation; however, the ultimate goal of teaching is to assess how well they are accomplishing this goal, and considering possible answers to several questions useful in their teaching (Chapman, 2016; Gautier, 2015). Indeed, assessment was discovered to be a critical role of teaching because it is frequently informed by the type of examination that has an impact on the quality of graduates. In fact, Arum and Roksa (2011) discovered that because regular assessment provides feedback, it has the potential to assist students in reflecting on their potentials; and, of course, the lack of it has the potential to impede students' learning. While teaching preparation can be handled with reasonable challenges, Barifaijo and Namubiru (2017) discovered assessment to be more complex, particularly in the social sciences and humanities where answers vary significantly, but also more difficult with deceptive examiners. Similarly, assessment of the niceties that necessitate different strategies due to their unique circumstances for various types of learning processes that aim to cater for differences in students' learning preferences and styles, as well as improve learners' psychological approaches to learning (Kangas, *et al.*, 2017). More recently, universities have diversified study arrangements, causing more faculty burnout, such as day, evening, weekend, distance learning, and so on, which makes it even more complicated given the different challenges of each group as well as assessment of multiple groups. While some universities had multiple intakes per year, making time tabling, teaching, and assessment extremely exhausting, others had study centers spread across the country.

Whereas students are thought to provide the most reliable information because they had direct contact with their teachers and used teachers' services, the approach has been found to have serious flaws. In fact, O'Connor and Carvalho, 2014; Robert, 2008, found students' ratings to be invalid because students frequently lack knowledge about the full context of teaching, making their ratings susceptible to bias. Whereas Wagenaar (2014) attributes students' subjective evaluations to situational factors, Clarke (2012) asserts that long-standing disagreements with their teachers inform their evaluation decisions. Whereas information gleaned from student evaluations should be used with caution, assessors rarely pay close attention to inconsistencies, such as situations in which the same facilitator is rated differently in different courses or modules, but the results are still used in personnel decisions. Similarly, final evaluators may not know what to look for because most evaluations are based on institutional desire to create a culture that is primarily based on dedication and the accomplishments of its members, rather than the effectiveness of teaching (O'Connor and Carvalho, 2014). Consequently, students' evaluation tools should clearly identify critical areas of quality for assurance and improvement in the quality of teaching, taking into consideration the planning, development, and results of teaching that encompass all teaching accomplishments, with an obligatory character and annual periodicity (De Houwer, 2019).

Surprisingly, the content of psychological contracts in universities can vary depending on the leadership style, discipline, type of activity, career stage, rank, position held, and, most importantly, perceived equity (Ryan, 2016). Similarly, the risk of breach of contract can be detrimental to institutional performance, particularly if the assessment of faculty accomplishments is perceived to be unjust or prejudicial, such as unfairness in performance appraisals, inequities in compensation, training opportunities, and delayed promotions. Nonetheless, George (2016) explains how evaluating academics who are technocrats in their fields can be enigmatic, and argues that only their contemporaries can do so. Therefore, the two parties (faculty members and the evaluators) should rely on psychological contracts to fulfill their obligations. Indeed, Coyle-Shapiro *et al.* (2008) explain how psychological contracts strengthen trust and innovation, implying that breaching psychological contracts may be detrimental to university quality. Conversely, Turnley and Feldman (2016) discovered fairness to be a significant part of the psychological contract because employees need to perceive that they are being treated fairly to sustain a healthy psychological contract (Gautier, 2015). He cautions employers to stop breaching the psychological contracts of their relationship, because it negatively affects employee productivity and retention. Surprisingly, whereas it is natural for employers to expect more from employees, they often give less in terms of career opportunities, lifetime employment, job security,

life insurance cover, and even a healthy and enjoyable work environment. This misfit in the two parties' expectations which is actually a violation of psychological contract led to serious burnout, frustration, anguish and emotional disorientation, (van den Huevel, 2016). Researchers (e.g. Robinson, 2016; Rousseau, 2016) discovered that such mismatch could actually erode the notion of reciprocity - which is crucial in maintaining the well-being of a relationship.

CONCLUSION

Universities lack tangible indicators and documented evidence to guide evaluators in capturing faculty accomplishments, which has caused serious contradictions and disgruntlement among faculty members. In fact, the relegated invisible but critical faculty accomplishments have a significant impact on students' learning experiences, success, and overall institutional quality. However, evaluators only deal with a small portion of the total, while the larger portion, like the "tip of the iceberg," remains submerged. As a result, the partial evaluation of faculty accomplishments has reduced execution of those niceties, affecting institutional quality and productivity and possibly tarnishing institutional images.

To avoid moral drift, institutions should rely more on staff ethical consciousness to make decisions in the form of a psychological contract while making such judgments. Since the psychological contract develops and evolves constantly based on communication, or lack thereof, the lack of transparency or reciprocation between parties in faculty performance evaluations, merit promotions, salary increases, and other forms of recognition may jeopardize the status quo of HEIs. However, managing expectations is a complex function that frequently gives employees the wrong perception of action that does not always materialize, resulting in both parties managing incorrect expectations that can harm institutional productivity while also fueling workplace defiance. Therefore, universities should devise comprehensive and complex systems that validate deep teaching rather than generic and simplistic sets of parameters of 'lecture room teaching' used in measuring faculty performance. Such tools should target critical activities in the three areas of teaching, research, and community engagement, as well as meet academics' expectations of being rewarded for their efforts in order to keep them emotionally engaged. Therefore, creating a comprehensive score that includes multiple measures is unquestionably necessary in order to capture the invisible faculty accomplishments that are never included in teaching observation protocols or value-added scores.

REFERENCES

- Anderson R, Braud W (2011). Transforming self and others through research: Transpersonal research methods and skills for the human

- sciences and humanities. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. BF76.5. A68.
- Archibong IA, Effiom DO, Omoike D, Edet AO (2017).** Academic Staff Disposition to Promotion Criteria in Nigerian Universities. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298796807>. Accessed Oct. 18, 2019.
- Arum R, Roksa J (2011).** Academically adrift: Limited learning on college campuses.
- Barifaijo KM, Namubiru SP (2017).** Intellectual Curiosity or deception: An Investigation into the Practice of teaching outside Area of Expertise in Uganda. *Makerere University J. Higher Educ. (MAJOHE)*, ISSN: 1816-6822. 9(1):3-20.
- Barifaijo KM (2016).** Higher Education-Community Partnerships: Extricating Value Addition: A Critical- Analytical Paper. *Int. J. Soc. Sci. Educ. (IJSSE)*, 2(2):267-282. ISSN 2105 6008. September, 2016.
- Basheka CB, Nkata JL, Barifaijo KM (2013).** Teaching-Learning quality assurance benchmarks and characteristics that promote learner outcomes among Public Administration students at Uganda Management Institute: An exploratory study. *Acad. J.* ISSN 1996-0816. 5(1):8-14.
- Benton SL, Ryalls KR (2016).** Challenging misconceptions about student ratings of instruction. IDEA Paper No. 58. Manhattan, KS: The Idea Center.
- Blau PM (1964).** Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.
- Bowen WG, Tobin EM (2015).** Locus of authority: The evolution of faculty roles in the governance of higher education. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Brennan, J.
- Bryman A (2016).** *Social Research Methods* (5th ed.). London: Oxford University Press.
- Carey K (2015).** The end of college: Creating the future of learning and the university everywhere. New York, NY: Riverhead Books.
- Chapman A (2016).** The Psychological Contract. Theory, Diagrams, Definitions, Examples of in Work, Businesses, Organiz. *Manag. Buss. balls Corp.*, n.d. Web. 20 Oct. 2016.
- Creswell JW (2014).** *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curcio AA, Lynch MA (2017).** Addressing social loafing on faculty committees. *J. Legal Educ.* 6(1):242-262.
- Dawson, Catherine (2016).** 100 Activities for Teaching Research Methods, ISBN: 9781473946293, SAGE Publications.
- De Houwer J (2019).** Moving beyond the distinction between System 1 and System 2: Conditioning, implicit evaluation, and habitual responding might also be mediated by relational knowledge. *Exper. Psychol.* 66:257-265.
- Durazzi N, Sene T (2013).** Things we know and don't know about the Wider Benefits of Higher Education: A review of the recent literature. London, UK: London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Farooq MS (2011).** Factors affecting student's quality of academic performance: A case of secondary school level *J. Qual. Technol. Manag.* 7(2). December, 2011.
- Gautier C (2015).** *The Psychology of Work*. Kogan Page. via ProQuest Ebook Central.
- George C (2016).** *Psychological Contract: Managing and Developing Professional Groups*. Maidenhead, GB: Open University Press, 2010. Chapter 1: Introducing the psychological contract. ProQuestebruary. Web. 14 October 2016.
- Goe L, Bell C, Little O (2008).** Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Gouldner A (1960).** The norm of reciprocity. A preliminary statement. *American Sociol. Rev.* 25:161-178. doi:10.2307/2092623.
- Gravely (2014).** Teacher Quality-and Student-Achievement Center for Public Education. Updated on Aug 27, 2014.
- Hart Research Associates (2015).** Falling short? College learning and career success. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).
- Heaney C (2015).** What is the university today? *J. Crit. Educ. Pol. Stud.* 13(2):278-314.
- Hakel MD, Koenig JA, Elliott SW (2008).** Assessing accomplished teaching: Advanced-level certification programs. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Huber CR, Kuncel NR (2015).** Does college teach critical thinking? A meta-analysis. *Rev. Educ. Res.* 20(10):1-38.
- Inter-University Council for East Africa (IUCEA) (2010).** A road map to quality. Hand book for quality assurance in higher education. Volume 2: Guidelines for external assessment at programme level.
- Jadama LM (2014).** Impact of Subject Matter Knowledge of a teacher in teaching and Learning Process. *Middle East and Afr. J. Educ. Res.* 7:20-29.
- Jeyarajasekar T, Sivakumar M (2019).** ICEBERG Metaphor – A Tool for Healthcare Quality Management Systemic Structure. *Int. J. Manag. Stud.* ISSN 2249-0302 ISSN (Online). pp. 2231-2528.
- Kangas M, Siklander P, Randolph J, Ruokamo H (2017).** Teachers' Engagement and Students' Satisfaction with the Playful Learning Environment. *Teach. Educ.* 63:274-284.
- Kasozi ABK (2006).** A proposed quality assurance framework for institutions of higher learning in Uganda. Paper presented at the seminar on Quality Assurance in Tertiary Education.
- Kiley M (2011).** Developments in research supervisor training: causes and responses. *Studies in Higher Education* 36(5):585-599.
- Kiran S, Prakasha GS (2017).** Research competence of University Faculty members in relation to Organizational Ethos. *IOSR J. Human. Soc. Sci. (IOSR-JHSS)*. 22(12):78-81.
- Kothari CR, Garg G (2014).** *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
- Kyambogo University Council Charter Rules of Procedure for Kyambogo University Council July, 2016, Kampala.**
- Linse AR (2017).** Interpreting and using student ratings data: Guidance for faculty serving as administrators and on evaluation committees. *Stud. Educ. Eval.* 54:94-106.
- Mamdani M (2007).** *Scholars in the Marketplace: The Dilemmas of Neo-Liberal. Reform at Makerere University, 1989-2005*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- Matovu M, Ainol MZ (2014).** Factors influencing assessment practices among university academic staff: a multiple regression analysis. *Mevlana Int. J. Educ.* 4(1):176-188. Retrieved on 22nd November, 2019.
- O'Connor P, Carvalho T (2014).** Excellence in university academic staff evaluation: a problematic reality? *Journal of Higher Educ. Pol. Manag.* Published online 04 June 2014. <http://www.tandfonline.com/author/O%27Connor%2C+Pat>.
- O'Meara K, Jaeger A, Misra J, Lennartz C, Kuvaeva A (2018).** Undoing disparities in faculty workloads: A randomized trial experiment. *PLoS ONE* 13(12):e0207316.
- Revell A, Wainwright E (2009).** What makes lectures "unmissable"? Insights into teaching excellence and active learning. *J. Geograph. Higher Educ.* 33(2):209-223. Accessed November, 2019.
- Robert MK (2008).** *Student Evaluations of Faculty: Concerns and Possible Solutions* University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, USA.
- Robinson SL (2016).** Trust and Breach of the Psychological Contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly* (Dec., 1996), 4:574-599. Accessed October 2019.
- Rousseau DM (2016b).** The 'Problem' of the Psychological Contract Considered. *J. Organiz. Behav.* 19(1998):665-71. JStor. Web. 14 October 2016.
- Rousseau DM (2016a).** Schema, promise and mutuality: The building blocks of the psychological contract. *J. Occup. Organiz. Psychol.* 74(4):511-541. Web. 26 October 2016.
- Ryan CJ (2016).** Old knowledge for new impacts: Equity theory and workforce nationalization. *J. Bus. Res.* 69(5):1587-15932. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.10.022.
- Sahan HH, Tarhan R (2015).** Scientific Research Competencies of Prospective Teachers and their Attitudes toward Scientific Research.
- Shahid H, Wahab Z (2015).** Quality assurance mechanism in higher education institutions – a thematic analysis of experts' perspective. [Online] <http://mrjpk.com/wp-content/uploads/Issue%2010>. Retrieved 4 November, 2019.
- The National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) (2014).** *Quality Framework for Universities and the Licensing Process for Higher Education Institutions*. pp. 1-40. ISBN 978-9970-111-01-077.

van den Huevel S, Schalk R, Freese C, Timmerman V (2016). What's in it for me? A Managerial Perspective on the Influence of the Psychological Contract on Attitude towards Change. *J. Organ. Chang. Manag.* 29(2):263-292. doi:10.1108/JOCM-06-2015-0100.

Wagenaar R (2014). Competences and learning outcomes: A panacea for understanding the (new) role of higher education? *Tuning J. Higher Educ.* 1(2):279-302.

<http://sciencewebpublishing.net/jerr>