

Brief Communication

Comparing Student's Assessment of the Faculty Member's Training Performance and Faculty Member's Self-Assessment at Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences

Bijan Sabour M.Sc.^{1*}, Mansour Rezaei Ph.D²

1. Dept. of Emergency Medicine, School of Paramedics, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran

2. Dept. of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran

* Email. sabour_b@kums.ac.ir

(Received: 22 Aug 2012 Accepted: 6 Mar 2013)

Abstract

As an important strategy to promote the quality of teaching, the faculty member's assessment has been seriously taken into consideration by universities. The purpose of the present study was to compare the student's assessment of the faculty members and self-evaluation. In this cross-sectional descriptive analytic study, 885 students and 49 faculty members participated in this study in the second semester in 2009-2010. The maximum of 20 students were considered for the evaluation of each teacher. The instrument of data collection comprised of two corresponding questionnaires that were prepared based on Likert scale and included demographic information and teaching methodology. Data were analyzed by SPSS 16 software using descriptive statistics (independent T-test and ANOVA). The mean of scores for the faculty member's self-assessment was 88.12 ± 6.21 out of 100 and the mean of scores for the student's assessment was 79.33 ± 8.25 out of 100 that was statistically significantly differently from each other ($p=0.021$). There was a significant difference between the two groups in most cases regarding the 20 questions of the questionnaire.

Keywords: Assessment, Self-assessment, Students, Faculty members

Citation: Sabour B, Rezaei M. Comparing student's assessment of the faculty member's training performance and faculty member's self-assessment at Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences. *Edu R Med S*. 2013; 2(1): 32-35.

Introduction

The evaluation of the competence, performance, knowledge and capability of the faculty members is a major concern for educational institutions and is considered an important strategy for the promotion of educational quality (1). The faculty member's assessment includes determining their success in achieving educational objectives. To this end, it requires the collection of data about the faculty member's educational activities and selection of the criteria to compare the obtained data with those criteria and then making judgment on this to achieve given objectives (1, 2). The student's assessment of the faculty members can be regarded as a precious resource

to provide feedback to them. However, some people disagree with the student's assessment of the faculty members and believe that personality traits and general environmental characteristics affect student's understanding and judgment (3).

Faculty member's assessment is one of the most complicated types of evaluation owing to its low credibility and inaccuracies of measurement instruments and methods. Although student's assessment is an inevitable part of education, there is no comprehensive mechanism for the evaluation of the faculty member's performance. Thus, it is suggested that a combination of evaluation data such as evaluation by authorities,

colleagues, students, and self-assessment be carried out in order to make the final judgment (1, 3).

With regard to the frequent challenges about the student's assessment in recent years, combined evaluation seems necessary. Therefore, the present study was conducted to compare the student's assessment of the faculty members and faculty member's self-assessment.

Methods

In this descriptive analytic cross-sectional study, the statistical population comprised of the students and faculty members of Kermanshah University Medical Sciences. Teachers were selected by census method. Sampling was carried out in the final third part of the semester, and the courses were evaluated that included one credit points or more.

We selected students that were studying for associate and bachelor degree in various majors. The maximum of 20 students from different educational levels and years, who were passing a theoretical course with the given faculty members, were chosen for the evaluation of each faculty member. Those who were excluded from the study included: non-faculty members and guest students.

The instruments for collecting the data were two corresponding questionnaires. This questionnaire comprised of 20 five-choice questions rated by Likert scale from very good to very bad (from 1 to 5). The questionnaire contained questions on demographic and educational information, and the faculty member's teaching method. The validity and reliability of the questionnaire were approved by valid methods. Data were analyzed by SPSS 16 software. Descriptive statistics (independent T-test, ANOVA and Spearman correlation coefficient) were used to compare the student's assessment of the faculty members and faculty member's self-assessment. P value <0.05 considered as significant results.

Results

The population of the study comprised of 885 students (57.4% female) and 49 faculty members (73.5% male) with the mean age of 46.14 ± 5.53 and average teaching experience of 12.82 ± 6.19 years. The total mean of the faculty member's self-assessment and student's assessment of the faculty members were 88.12 ± 6.21 and 79.33 ± 8.25 , respectively indicating a significant difference between them ($p=0.021$).

The highest mean of score in the student's evaluation of the faculty members belonged to the age range of 45-

49; this, however, belonged to the age range of 50 and over in the faculty member's self-evaluation. The highest mean score for the student's assessment were for teachers belonged to faculty of paramedics, but in the case of the faculty member's self-assessment, this belonged to the faculty of nursing and midwifery. The highest mean of score for the student's evaluation belonged to the faculty members with less than 10 years experience as faculty members, and in the case of the faculty member's self-assessment, the highest mean belonged to those with over 18 years experience as faculty members (Table 1). From the 20 questions in the questionnaire, there was a significant difference between the scores of the faculty member's self-assessment and those of student's assessment of the faculty members, except in three cases ($p<0.05$).

Discussion

In the present study, the faculty members and students were investigated as the major influential elements in the evaluation process. The findings revealed that the mean of the total score for student's assessment of the faculty members was statistically significantly lower than that of the faculty member's self-assessment. Aghamolaei et al. (2007) reported a significant difference between the student's assessment of the faculty members and faculty member's self-assessment with the score of self- assessment being higher than that of student's assessment (4). Also in Goharian's study, the score of the resident's assessment of the surgeon faculty members was lower than that of surgeon's self- assessment indicating a significant difference between them (5), which is in line with the results of this study. But in the study conducted by Lane et al. (2004) in Pennsylvania, the score of student's assessment was higher than that of the faculty members and head of the department evaluation (6), which is not compatible with the findings in this study. This can suggest that the faculty members not only are unable in terms of individual monitoring but also not striving to eliminate their deficiencies.

Based on the findings of this study, there was no significant difference between the scores of faculty member's self-assessment and student's assessment of the faculty members in terms of age, sex, academic rank, experience, and student's academic level. There was only a difference in faculty member's self-assessment by different faculties. The faculty members at nursing and midwifery faculty obtained the highest score and visiting faculty members from medical and pharmaceutical faculties obtained the lowest score, which is compatible with the results of Aghamolaei (4),

Table 1. Comparison of the means of the results for student's assessment and faculty member's self-assessment

		Number	Student's assessment Mean \pm SD	P value	Self- assessment Mean \pm SD	P value
Sex	Male	36	78.53 \pm 8.66	0.208	87.19 \pm 6.40	0.082
	Female	13	81.92 \pm 6.67		90.69 \pm 5.01	
Age	younger than 45	22	79.24 \pm 8.99	0.328	87.91 \pm 7.21	0.951
	45-49	13	82.06 \pm 7.00		88.88 \pm 5.31	
	50 and over	14	77.30 \pm 7.99		88.57 \pm 5.68	
Academic rank	Lecturer	32	80.69 \pm 8.76	0.340	88.34 \pm 6.54	0.849
	Assistant professor	12	76.73 \pm 7.98		88.17 \pm 6.58	
	Associate professor	5	77.90 \pm 3.27		86.60 \pm 3.05	
Faculty	paramedics	12	82.38 \pm 6.55	0.193	88.83 \pm 6.18	0.036
	Nursing & midwifery	16	80.56 \pm 7.90		90.43 \pm 5.55	
	Health	12	78.38 \pm 8.62		88.08 \pm 7.13	
	Others	9	74.91 \pm 9.50		83.11 \pm 3.44	
Grade	Associate degree of science	15	81.35 \pm 8.18	0.246	81.35 \pm 8.18	0.557
	Continuous B.Sc.	24	79.97 \pm 7.20		79.97 \pm 7.20	
	Non-continuous B.Sc.	10	75.27 \pm 10.03		75.27 \pm 10.03	
Academic experience	Less than 10 years	14	80.36 \pm 9.21	0.837	87.79 \pm 7.45	0.927
	10-17 years	22	78.86 \pm 8.66		88.00 \pm 6.12	
	Over 18 years	13	79.41 \pm 6.90		88.69 \pm 5.31	

but in contrast with the findings of Shakournia (7) and Fleischman & Williams (8). One of the reasons for this may be the low sample of the faculty members in the present study.

Conclusion

With regard to the significant difference between students and faculty member's opinions on the influential and essential factors in education, their evaluation of the teaching quality is probably different. This may, however, be due to the exaggeration of some attributes in the faculty member's self-assessment.

Acknowledgments

This study was taken from a research proposal, No: 88014, at Kermanshah University of medical sciences. There is no conflict of interest.

References

1. Saif AA. Educational measurements, assessment and evaluation. 3th ed. Tehran: Doran Publication; 2010. [Persian]

2. Khtebi R, Saedpana M, Vahabi A, Mehrabi S, Yazd- anpana K, Rostaei H. Comparison of self and student's evaluation of faculty members in Kordestan University of Medical Sciences. Strides in Development of Medical Education. 8th congress of medical education; Kerman: 2007. [Persian]

3. Aultman LP. An unexpected benefit of formative student Evaluation. College Teaching. 2006; 54(3): 251-285.

4. Aghamolaei T, Abedini S. Comparison of self and student's evaluation of faculty members in school of health of Hormozgan University of Medical Sciences. IJME. 2008; 7(2): 191-199. [Persian]

5. Goharian V, Kafami Z, Yamani N, Omidifar N, Sa- fai M. Comparing resident evaluation of attendings surgeons to attendings self-evaluation. IJME. 2005; 5 (1):62-69. [Persian]

6. Lane JL, Gottlieb RP. Improving the interviewing and self-assessment skills of medical students: is it time to readopt videotaping as an educational tool? Ambul Pediatr. 2004; 4(3): 244-248.

7. Shakournia A, Elhampour H, Mozafari A, Dasht evaluation results in Jondi Shapour University of Medical Sciences. IJME. 2008; 7(2):309-316. [Persian]

Bozorgi B. Ten years trends in faculty member's
8. Fleischman H. L, Williams L. An introduction to program evaluation for classroom teachers. 2004. Available from:
<http://teacherpathfinder.org/School/Assess/assess.html>