



# Designing an Evaluation Form for Professors in Iranian Universities of Medical Sciences in 2022

Mansour Rezaei <sup>1</sup>, Farhad Salari <sup>2</sup>, Aliakbar Parvizifard <sup>3</sup>, Ramin Abiri <sup>4</sup>, Khansa Rezaei <sup>5</sup>,  
Forough Zanganeh <sup>5</sup> and Vida Sepahi <sup>5,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Social Development and Health Promotion Research Center, Health Institute, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Department of Immunology, School of Medicine, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran

<sup>3</sup>Department of Clinical Psychology, School of Medicine, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran

<sup>4</sup>Department of Microbiology, School of Medicine, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran

<sup>5</sup>Education Development Center, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran

\*Corresponding author: Education Development Center, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran. Email: vidasep2002@yahoo.com

**Received** 2023 December 04; **Accepted** 2023 December 13.

**Keywords:** Evaluation, Medical Sciences, Professors

## Dear Editor,

Professor evaluation by university students is one of the most common evaluation methods (1, 2). The correct evaluation process enables a university system to prepare valuable programs for the personal growth and empowerment of its faculty members by strengthening the strengths and correcting the weaknesses (3). Professors should also be informed about students' attitudes toward themselves and career decisions. Therefore, it is necessary to have a valid and comprehensive evaluation system to provide an actual evaluation of professors' educational performance, which is valid and reliable and less influenced by students' personal opinions (4, 5). This study aimed to design a standard tool for evaluating the University of Medical Sciences professors in the country so that all universities use a uniform form.

Group discussion and Delphi techniques were used in this tool-making study. First, all the forms available in the country's medical sciences universities were collected through correspondence with the study and development centers of medical sciences. Then, relevant experts determined their strengths, weaknesses, similarities, and differences through the focused group discussion (FGD) method. Then, the necessary classification was performed on all the items obtained from the existing forms. Then, their opinions about the proposed form were considered using the Delphi method and through correspondence with experienced professors. In the next step, the final form was prepared using the FGD method, and a panel of

experts determined the face and content validity of the form.

A general form with a 4-mode Likert scale and 29 questions was developed for all students, including the title, introduction, guide, and specifics of the relevant course regarding the teaching of theoretical courses by professors compiled for all students in all courses. In addition, four other forms were included in this questionnaire, depending on the case, one may be completed in addition to the general form. The four forms included a form asking students for their opinions about teaching theoretical courses virtually (14 questions), practical and laboratory courses (16 questions), internships (26 questions), and Islamic education courses (9 questions). All five forms (main form and four appendices) had 94 questions.

Since a student evaluation form is a practical, valid, and reliable tool for evaluating professors, this uniform form should be combined with other evaluation methods (such as professor self-evaluation and manager evaluation) throughout the country to improve the educational performance of professors. A standardized questionnaire should also be developed for professor self-evaluation and manager evaluation of professors so that the results can be used to improve medical science education and address professor performance shortcomings.

## Footnotes

**Authors' Contribution:** Study concept and design: M.R. and V.S.; analysis and interpretation of data: M.R.; drafting of the manuscript: F.S., Data collection: F.Z.; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: AA. P., R.A., and Kh.R.; statistical analysis: M.R.

**Conflict of Interests:** First author is the Editor in chief and corresponding author is a member of the journal..

**Funding/Support:** The project was funded by the National Agency for Strategic Research in Medical Education in Tehran, Iran (grant no. 993647) including personnel and executive costs.

## References

1. Gharatapeh A, Rezaei M, Pasdar Y, Asadi F, Safari Y, Nazari M. [Comparison of the Teaching Quality Aspects by Student Evaluation of Education Quality (SEEQ) and Students Survey Questionnaires; Health School, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences]. *Education Strategies in Medical Sciences*. 2015;**8**(4):247-54. Persian.
2. Arabi Mianroodi AA, Asgari Baravati Z, Khanjani N. [Explaining the pros and cons of different sources of faculty evaluation from the viewpoints of medical university academics]. *Strid Dev Med Educ*. 2012;**9**(1):65-76. Persian.
3. Sepahi V, Karami Matin B, Memar Eftekhari L, Hatam G, Khoshay A, Rezaei M. [Viewpoint of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences student's about Professor evaluation and related factors]. *15th National Conference of Medical Science Education*. 29 April-1 May 2013; Yazd, Iran. 2013. Persian.
4. Rahimi M, Zarooj Hosseini R, Darabian M, Taherian AA, Khosravi A. [Teacher Evaluation by Students: A Comprehensive Approach]. *Strid Dev Med Educ*. 2012;**9**(1):34-45. Persian.
5. Mahdavi S, Zare S, Naeimi N. [Comparison between Student Evaluation and Faculty Self-Evaluation of Instructional Performance]. *Res Med Educ*. 2014;**6**(2):51-8. Persian. <https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.rme.6.2.51>.