

DOI: 10.5455/msm.2015.27.207-210

Received: 12 March 2015; Accepted: 05 May 2015

© 2015 Nassim Ghahrani, Azita Balaghafari, Kobra Aligolbandi, Mohammad Vahedi, Hasan Siamian

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

PROFESSIONAL PAPER

Mater Sociomed. 2015 Jun; 27(3): 207-210

The Viewpoints of Students and Evaluation Experts About Performance Processes of Faculty Member Evaluation at Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, 2014

Nassim Ghahrani¹, Azita Balaghafari², Kobra Aligolbandi², Mohammad Vahedi³, Hasan Siamian²¹ Educational Developmental Office, School of Allied Medical Sciences, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Mazandaran, Iran² Department of Health Information Technology, School of Allied Medical Sciences, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Mazandaran, Iran³ Department of Microbiology, School of Medicine, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Mazandaran, IranCorresponding author: Azita Balaghafari, Department of Health Information Technology, School of Allied Medical Sciences, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Mazandaran, Iran. E-mail: simian46@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background and purpose: One of the most common ways used in most of the countries and Iran to determine the status of teacher training is the evaluation by students. The most common method of evaluation is the survey questionnaire, the content of a number of questions about educational activities provided to the students. The researchers plan to evaluate the students' and experts' performances at Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences on the process of evaluating the performance of teachers, they examined in 2014. **Materials and methods:** This study surveys the students and experts in the evaluation of faculty members' performance process. The study subjects were 3904 students and 37 evaluation expert of Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences. Using Cochran sampling formula of 350 students through proportional stratified random sampling were selected. The experts' viewpoint, method was used. Data collection tools consisted of 14 questions with answers Yes, or, I don't know. Descriptive Statistical analysis of the data and chi-square test was performed. **Results:** From total of 350 students, 346 and the entire 37 evaluations expert participated in this study. Most of the students, 80 (23.12%) and the largest number of experts, 8 (21.62%) were from Sari Allied Medical Sciences Faculty. Most of the demographic information about gender were, 255 female students (74.56%) and 29 female experts (78.37%). In most age groups of students, 188 (55.62 percent) were in the category of 18 to 20 years, and the experts, 19 (51.35%) were in the category of 22 and 31 years. Most students, 232 of them (70.95%) were in semester 2 and 4. Most experts, 20 (54.05 percent) were under 10 years of work experience. The comparison between the views of students and experts in the evaluation process between the schools of Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari School of Nursing and Midwifery, there was difference between the opinions of experts and students (p -value=0.01. It showed 86.7% student and 33.3% of experts is satisfied with the evaluation process. **Conclusion:** on comparison of students and experts viewpoints on the implementation of the evaluation process, it is noteworthy that among students of different opinions on how the evaluation process. It worth to mention that there is insignificant difference between their viewpoints and majority of students and evaluation experts with the evaluation the process. In addition, the experts evaluated at different schools, most of them are satisfied the process.

Key words: Evaluation, Students, professional, viewpoints

1. INTRODUCTION

Man is purposive and idealist and from the beginning of life is prospective and willing to gain all the aims and ideals, and is happy with his successes and unhappy with the failures. And be unhappy with the failure to achieve their goals. He spent all his energy and resources to achieve pre-determined plans or goals. For this reason, he/she always strives to clarify their situation in relation to its objectives. He needs having feedback

and to gather information about the progress and how it measures the progress of its position (1). Certainty about reaching to the aims is called evaluation, which is a kind of reward for the responsibility of man. The correction of evaluation simply is determination of the evaluation for everything or judgment of evaluation. The more comprehensive definition of evaluation is referred to the regular systematic process for data collection, the interpretation and analysis of the pervious data. That is, it is

determined that whether, the expected aims are achieved, and/or achieving and how much are being achieved (2). The evaluation should be strong responsive about the way of selection, the program value, and support of educational activities. May be the most complex type of evaluation is that of the evaluating the teacher and universities faculty members, performance. The complexity of this method of evaluation is the low credit and lack of accuracy of the instruments and methods of measuring and the assessment being used in this type of evaluation (1). The faculty members are considered the main part of the education system, therefore must be evaluated. Different methods are applied in evaluation of the faculty members' performance. One of them is asking the view points and attitudes of the students towards the faculty members' teaching process (3). Evaluation the faculty members' teaching performance has been implemented for the first time after the 2nd world war in the Brooklyn College, the Pardo Washington, Michigan Universities, and the other higher education institutes.

No doubt, the evaluation of the performance due to its nature and specificity in every educational system is one of the most extensive and controversial issues process, so that the improvement of the educational system at the universities and programming of the educational activities based on the researches, are strictly depended to the matter to be evaluated (4-7). One of the most common methods used in evaluating the faculty members' educational performance in Iran and many other countries is the evaluation done by the students (8, 9). The most common method of evaluation is using questionnaire consisting many questions on the faculty members about the quality of educational performance.

This method of evaluation has supporters saying that students have the efficiency to evaluate properly the faculty members, and the non-supporters saying that, the students' judgment is subjective, and non-reliable (10, 11). Despite at most of the worlds' universities knowing the students' view point considered as the main source of evaluation of the faculty members' teaching quality. This method of simple and reliable evaluation generally is used for giving promotion and reward to the faculty members (12-15).

In the Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, evaluation of the faculty members' teaching quality has been started from 1994, and was not computerized till 2009. From 2009 onwards, under the Kerman Web and from 2012 onwards under the system of SAMA of the Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences.

Considering the significance of evaluation in increasing the quality of teaching, and that the last available paper was the study on the attitude of the students and faculty members on the manual system of evaluation in 2005.

We tried to study the view point of the faculty members, students and evaluation experts towards the evaluation at the Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences about the evaluation done on basis sciences faculty members' teaching quality at the Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences.

It is hoped that the results of the present study have role, though little, in enrichment of the educational system, particularly at the Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

In this descriptive study, aimed at knowing the view points of the students and evaluation experts particularly on the execution of the evaluation process on the faculty members' performance in 2014 has been done. The societies under study were 3904 students and 37 evaluation experts at the Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences. Sampling in the students was done by stratified random method. The sample size estimation was done using the Chocran formula consisted 350 students (the MSc students, the junior medical students, students of pharmacy and dentistry). The entry students of the 2014 academic year were excluded from the study.

The survey method used to study the view points of the evaluation experts at the Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences.

Two check lists used for evaluating the viewpoint of the evaluation of experts and the students about the execution process of evaluation, which comprised 14 questions with the answers of "yes", "I don't know" and "No". The data analyses were done in descriptive and inferential methods using the X² test and SPSS-15 software.

3. RESULTS

This research was done at the Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences faculties in 2014. Of 350 students, 346 of them and also all of the 37 evaluation experts participated in this study.

Of the participants, 80 (23.12%) students and 8 (21.62%) evaluation experts were from the Sari health allied faculty (Table 1).

Faculties	Student F (%)	Evaluation expert F (%)
Sari Medical Faculty	38 (10.98)	3(8.11)
Ramsar Pardis Faculty	41 (11.85)	2(5.41)
Sari Faculty of Pharmacy	43 (12.43)	5(13.51)
Faculty of Dentistry	16 (4.62)	2(5.41)
Allied Medical Sciences Faculty	80 (23.12)	8(21.62)
Nasibe Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery	45 (13.01)	6(16.20)
Sari Health Faculty	40 (11.56)	2(5.41)
Amol Allied Medical Sciences Faculty	19 (5.49)	2(5.41)
Amol Nursing Faculty	31 (6.07)	4(10.81)
Behshahr Nursing Faculty	3 (0.87)	2(5.41)
University head quarter	0 (0)	1(2.70)
Total	346 (100)	37(100)

Table 1. Frequency of the students and evaluation experts differentiating the colleges of the Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences in 2014

Highest frequency of gender related demographic information was observed in 255 (74.56%) female and 29 (78.37%) male. Also 188 (55.62%) students under study were in age range of 18-20 years and the evaluation experts 19 (51.35%) in the age range of 29 to 31 years. We found 232 (70.95%) of the students in their 2 to 4 academic term of study and 20 (54.05%) of the evaluation experts with work experience of 10 years (Table 2).

The data on the table-3 shows the frequency of performance and significant level of the students' and evaluation experts' viewpoints differentiating the item of the check list of evaluation process. Regarding the suitability of giving brief name and password, significant difference was observed between the students' and evaluation experts' viewpoints by considering the

Demographic information	F (%)
Gender	Female 255 (74.56)
	Male 87 (25.44)
Age	18-20 188 (55.62)
	21-23 127 (37.57)
	24-26 13 (3.85)
	27 and more 10 (2.96)
	2-4 232 (70.95)
The academic semester	5-7 77 (23.55)
	8-10 18 (5.5)
Gender	Female 29 (78.38)
	Male 8 (21.62)
Age	22-31 yrs.
	32-41 yrs.
	42-51 yrs.
History of the profession	10 <
	10-20 yrs.
	20 >

Table 2. Frequency of demographic information in the students and evaluation experts under study at Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences in 2014

Items	Student (%)	The evaluation experts (%)	Total (%)	α level
Giving information being suitable particularly on the necessity of evaluation performance	59.7	70.3	60.7	0.27
The data of evaluation being suitable	58.4	67.6	59.3	0.242
Informing on the performance date be suitable	74.6	56.8	72.8	0.351
Given password and user name be suitable	74.6	56.8	72.8	0.022
The route of accessing to the evaluation report be clear	76.6	59.5	74.9	0.016
The recording process and evaluation preservation be suitable	77.6	63.9	76.3	0.023
The recording process and preservation of the evaluation being suitable	65.8	43.2	63.6	0.043
The possibility of editing the performed evaluation	45.8	25	43.8	0.000
Being certain about the secrecy of the performed evaluation	27.3	59.5	30.4	0.000
Satisfaction with the questions asked	54.5	43.2	53.4	0.444
Satisfaction with the supporting and answering towards the evaluation process	39.4	45.9	37.4	0.018
The end time of evaluation being suitable (few days before examination)	53.8	51.4	53.5	0.261
Need of opening evaluation system after term examination	61.3	45.9	59.8	0.0001
Delay in evaluation is suitable in the improvement of faculty members performance	42.2	35.1	41.5	0.158

Table 3. Frequency distribution and significance level of students and evaluation experts differentiating the check list of items

significance level of 0.022. In this study, 74.6% and 56.8% of students and evaluation experts agreed with the way of giving password and user name, but only 56.8% of the experts accepted it suitable. By knowing the way of accessing to the evaluation with the significance level of 0.016, significant difference is present between the view points of the students and evaluation experts, so that, 76.6% and 59.5% of the students and evaluation

experts respectively known it clear.

Regarding covering of the syllabus, by 77.6% of the faculty members, and 63.9% of evaluation experts stated that it was covered it was stated that there is significant difference between, all of the presented lessons, with the significance level of 0.023%.

In this study 8.65% of the students and 43.2% of the evaluation experts expressed that the recording and preservation of the evaluation is suitable, and with the significance level of 0.043%, significant difference was observed between their view points and attitude.

Regarding editing of the evaluation performed 45.8% of the students and 25% of the evaluation experts stated it possible, and with the significance level of 0.000, significant difference was observed between their view points.

In this study, 27.3% of students and 59.5% of the evaluation experts were aware of the security of the performed evaluation and with significance level of 0.000, a significant difference was observed between the view points of the participants.

Between the view points of the students and evaluation experts about the satisfaction from the supports and answering about the evaluation process, with the significance level of 0.018 a significant difference was observed, so that 39.4% of the students and 45.9% of the evaluation experts were satisfied with the supporting.

Regarding the after term examination evaluation, a significant difference was observed between viewpoints of the students and evaluation experts with the significance level of 0.001, here, 61.3% of the students and 45.9% of the evaluation experts needed to the post examination evaluation (table-3).

As the table-4 shows only in the participants of the present study from Nasibeh College of Nursing and Midwifery there was significant difference between the view points of the students and evaluation experts towards the evaluation process, with the significance level of 0.01.

So that, 86.7% of the students and 33.3% of the experts evaluation were satisfied with the evaluation process (table-4).

The faculties	Students (%)	Evaluation experts (%)	Total	
Medical faculty of sari	68.4	100	70.7	0.343
Ramsar Pardis faculty	80.5	100	81.4	0.695
Sari Pharmacy	69.8	100	72.9	0.190
Dentistry faculty	62.5	50	61.1	0.641
Sari health allied faculty	72.2	50	74.7	0.165
Nasibeh college of nursing and midwifery	86.7	33.3	80.4	0.01
Environment health	82.5	100	83.3	0.691
Amol medical allied faculty	73.7	100	76.2	0.571
Amol nursing	71.4	100	76	0.306
Behshahr nursing	66.7	100	80	0.6

Table 4. The distribution percentage and significance level of the students and evaluation experts view points towards the satisfaction from the evaluation process at the faculties of Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences

4. DISCUSSION

The present study was performed to determine the students' and evaluation experts' view points towards the evaluation process on the faculty members' performance. The obtained data indicate insignificant difference between the view points of the faculty members and students towards the evaluation

process in the Mazandaran University Medical Sciences, with the significance level of 0.343. So that, 68.4% of the students and 100% of the evaluation experts and overall, 70.7% of them were satisfied from the evaluation process.

At Ramsar Pardis faculty significant difference was observed between the view points of the students and evaluation experts, with the significance level of 0.695. Also, 80.5% of the students and 100% of evaluation were satisfied with experts and in all, 81.4% of them were satisfied with the process of evaluation.

At the Pharmacy Faculty, with the significance level of 0.190, a significant difference was not observed between the view points of the students and evaluation experts.

So that, 69.8% of the students and 100% of the evaluation experts and in all, 72.9% of them satisfied with the evaluation process. In the Dentistry Faculty insignificant difference was observed between students and evaluation experts with the significance level of 0.641.

We found that, 62.5% of the students, 50% of the evaluation experts and in all, 61.1% of them were satisfied with the evaluation process. In the Sari Health Allied Faculty, with the significance level of 0.165, insignificant difference was observed between the students and evaluation experts.

Also, 77.2% of the students, 50% of the evaluation experts and in all, 74.7% of them were satisfied with the evaluation process. In the Sari College of Nursing and Midwifery, with the significance level of 0.01 significant difference was observed between the students' and evaluation experts' viewpoints. In a way that, 86.7% of the students were satisfied, but only 33.3% of the evaluation experts were satisfied, but in all, 80.4% of them were satisfied with the evaluation process. At the environment health Faculty, with the significance level of 0.691, insignificant difference was observed between the view points of the students and evaluation experts, so that, 82.5% of the students, 100% of evaluation experts and in all, 83.3% of them were satisfied with the evaluation process.

At Amol Health Allied Faculty, with the significance level of 0.571, insignificant difference was observed between the view points of the students and the evaluation experts, that is, 73.7% of the students, 100% of the evaluation experts and in all, 76.2% of them were satisfied with the evaluation process. At the Amol Nursing College, with the significance level of 0.306 an insignificant difference was observed between the view points of the students and evaluation experts, and 71.4% of the students, 100% of the evaluation experts and in all, 76% of them were satisfied with the evaluation process. At the Behshahr Nursing College with the significance level of 0.6, insignificant difference was observed between the view points of the students and the evaluation experts in a way that, 66.7% of the students and 100% of the evaluation experts, and in all, 80% of them were satisfied with the evaluation process.

In all, comparing the view points of the students and evaluation experts regarding the process of evaluation, with the significance level of 0.204, it was clear that there is insignificant difference between the view points of the students and the evaluation experts from different colleges under study, and majority of them were satisfied with the evaluation process. Since, similar studies have been performed and most of the similar studies are on the effect of evaluation on the improvement of the faculty members' performance. Therefore it is not possible to compare the findings of the present study with the other obtained data.

Because study on the evaluation process stand on a particular position, it is proposed that further relevant studies be conducted, to benefit the obtained data in order to improve this process and encourage the students in active participation of the evaluation process.

5. CONCLUSION

On comparison of students and experts viewpoints on the implementation of the evaluation process, it is noteworthy that among students of different opinions on how the evaluation process. It worth to mention that there is insignificant difference between their viewpoints and majority of students and evaluation experts with the evaluation the process. In addition, the experts evaluated at different schools, most of them are satisfied the process.

Acknowledgement

Thanks to Vice chancellor for the Research and Technology at Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, for providing the finance and the other facilities. This study was approved by the code number of D.T.4.3077 at the Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: NONE DECLARED.

REFERENCES

1. Dargahi H, Movahedkor E, Shaham G. View of the faculty of Tehran University of Medical Sciences about of faculty evaluation in Para medicine of Tehran University of Medical Sciences [Persian]. Tehran: Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Paramedical Sciences; 2008-2009.
2. Stufflebeam DL, McCormick CH, Brinkerhoff RO, Nelson CO. Conducting educational needs assessments: Kluwer-Nijhoff, Boston, 1985.
3. Alkin M. Three Decades of Curriculum Evaluation: An Introduction, in lewy A (Ed). The international Encyclopedia of Curriculum. London: Pergmon, 1991.
4. Amid H. Amid dictionary. Tehran: Amir Kabir iInstitute, 1999.
5. Bazargan A. Internal evaluation of universities and its usage in continuous improvement of the quality of high education, periodical of research and planning in high education. Tehran, 1995.
6. Mohammad Zadeh N. Review of attitude of scientific board's members of medical documents groups of medical sciences universities throughout the country towards the effectiveness of information technology in health system [Thesis in Persian]. Tehran: Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, 2005.
7. Nelson M. Peer evaluation of teaching: an approach whose time has come. Academic Medicine. 1998; 73(1): 4-5.
8. Bowles LT. The evaluation of teaching. Medical Teacher. 2000; 22(3): 221-224.
9. University of North Carolina. Report of the task force on student evaluation of teaching 2012. Available from: <http://www.unc.edu/faculty/reports/R99tfset.htm>.
10. Amini M, Honardar M. The view of faculties and medical students about evaluation of faculty teaching experiences. Koomesh. 2008; 9(3): 171-178.
11. Shakournia A, Motlagh M, Malayeri A, Jahan mard A, Kamili Sani H. The view of Jondishapour Medical university students about faculty evaluation. Iranian J Edu Res. 2005; 5: 109-117 [Persian].
12. Dilts DA. A statistical interpretation of student evaluation feedback. The Journal of Economic Education. 1980; 11(2): 10-15.
13. Vakili A, Hajaghajani S, Rashidy-Pour A, Ghorbani R. An investigation of factors influencing student evaluation of teacher performance: a comprehensive study in Semnan University of Medical Sciences. Koomesh. 2010; 12(2): Pe93-Pe103.
14. Costin F, Greenough WT, Menges RJ. Student ratings of college teaching: Reliability, validity, and usefulness. Review of Educational Research. 1971: 511-55.
15. White LJ. Efforts by departments of economics to assess teaching effectiveness: Results of an informal survey. The Journal of Economic Education. 1995; 26(1): 81-85.