

\*

•

( )

:

.

:

:

%

t

)

( / ± / )

(± )

:

.(P< / )

( / ± / )

(±

.(r= / P< / )

(r= / P< / )

.(P> / ) .

:

:

\_\_\_\_\_

.()

( )

.( )

.()

.()

.( )

.( )

( .

)

(

((

(

(

:

.( )

.()

---

Subjective bias

.( )

.( )

.( )

.( )

(Teaching portfolio)

%

( )

( )

( )

( )

.( )

( )

( )

)

---

(

( )

) ( )

(

( )

) ( )

(

SD= / )

( $\bar{x}$  = /

(  $\bar{x}$  = / SD= / )

(  $\bar{x}$  = / SD= / ) %

( $\bar{x}$  = / SD= / )

(P< / )

.( )

)

spss

.(P< / P</

t

( )

( )

\_\_\_\_\_

)

( r= /                      r= /  
.(P> /    )

:

.( )

( Fink)

.( )

p value	±    ) (	±    ) (	
p < /	/ ± /	/ ± /	
p < /	/ ± /	/ ± /	
p < /	/ ± /	/ ± /	
p < /	/ ± /	/ ± /	
p < /	/ ± /	/ ± /	

:

P Value		
/	/	
/	/	
/	/	
/	/	
/	/	

\_\_\_\_\_

. ( )

.

. ( )

( ).

( r = / p = / )

. ( ) .

. ( )

/

/

( )

.

/

/

/

.

. ( )

.

.

.

. ( )

.

- 
- 
3. Algozzine B, Beattie J, Bray M, Flowers C, Grete J, Howley L, Mohanty G, Spooner F. Student Evaluation of college teaching: A practice in search of principles. *College Teaching* 2004 ; 52 (4) :134.
  6. Fink L D. Evaluating your own teaching. *Improving college Teaching* 1999: 20.
  9. Glassick, et al. Standards for teaching in medical school; double or nothing. *Medical teacher* 1999; 21:543-545.
  10. Burke LM. Teacher self- evaluation: an assessment using Delmont's beyond Flanders field's technique, *Nurse Educ Today* 1994;14(3): 194-202.
  12. DEVELOPMENTS/portfolio.html <http://www.pitt.edu/~ciddeweb/FACULTY>

- 
15. Woolliscroft JO, TenHaken J, Smith J, Calhoun JG. Medical students' clinical self- assessments: comparison with external measures of performance and the students, self - assessments of overall performance and effort. *Acad Med* 1993 Apr; 68(4): 285-94.
  17. Eckel CC , Grossman P. Are women less selfish than men ? Evidence from dictator experiments. *The Economic Journal*,1998;108: 726 – 35.
  18. Skeff KM, Stratos GA, Bergen MR ,Regula DP Jr. A pilot study of faculty development for basic science teachers. *Acad Med* 1998 Jun; 73(6) : 701-4.
  19. Brightman H, Bhada Y, feldhaus W, Govinazzo V, Mansfield N, Rue L Schaffer M, Schreiber A. The Multiple-paths Faculty Evaluation System. *Journal on Excellence in College. Teaching*1990; 1: 98-108.

## **Comparison of student assessment of educational performance of the faculty with the teacher's self assessment in Kerman University of Medical Sciences**

**Ashraf Adhami, MA.\***

*Master of Educational Management, Lecturer in Kerman University of Medical Sciences*

**Hamed Reihani, MD.**

*Neurosurgeon, Assistant Professor of Medical School, Kerman University of Medical Sciences*

**Zahra Fattahi, MA.**

*Master of Educational Management, Evaluation Office of Medical Educational*

*Educational Development Center, Kerman University of Medical Sciences*

**Nouzar Nakhaie, MD. MPH.**

*Assistant Professor of Community Medicine Dept., Kerman University of Medical Sciences*

**Tayebeh Fasihi Harandi, MSc.**

*Master of Medical Education, Lecturer in Kerman University of Medical Sciences*

**Background:** Investigation of the opinions of individuals involved in education (faculty and student) makes the assessment of the faculty, educational performance more valid and helps improve quality as an objective of evaluation. A method to decrease subjectivity in evaluation of teachers by student is self – assessment, especially when evaluation aims to find shortages & help to improve education.

**Objective:** This survey is to compare the self – assessment of the faculty with student assessment about the faculty teaching method.

**Methods:** To do this descriptive-analytical study, two questionnaires with ten questions in four categories designed in EDC were randomly distributed among 600 students and 160 faculty members teaching theory lessons. 1530 questionnaires were returned by students and 137 questionnaires by the faculty members. Data were analyzed using t and, Man-Whitney U tests and Spearman's, correlation confident.

**Results:** The mean of self – assessment score of the faculty was more than mean of student evaluation score about their teachers ( $4.28 \pm 0.49$  vs  $3.39 \pm 0.51$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ). There was a significant although poor relationship between students and teachers assessment on evaluation by student ( $r = 0.25$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) and discipline ( $r = 0.25$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ). But there was no significant relationship between teaching method and scientific level of the faculty ( $P > 0.5$ ).

**Discussion:** In this survey, the scores the faculty members considered for themselves were higher than the scores the students assigned to them and the faculty's satisfaction on teaching methods and scientific performance is different from what the students considered. In this way presenting an appropriate evaluating system, using various methods of evaluation and giving proper feedback to the faculty is necessary.

**Keywords:** Educational performance, educational evaluation, self assessment, student, faculty member

\* **Correspondence:** Educational Development Center, Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Jomhoori Islami Blvd, Kerman, Iran

• Tel: 0341-2113024 • Fax: 0341-2113005 • Email: [adhami.2006@yahoo.com](mailto:adhami.2006@yahoo.com)