

Comparison of Self-Assessment with Peer and Student Assessment in Evaluating the Overall Performance of the Faculty

Imran Amjad, Syed Shakil-ur-Rehman, Asghar Khan, Khalid Farooq Danish, Ilyas Babar Awan, Sikandar Ghayas Khan

ABSTRACT

Objective: To evaluate the overall faculty performance by comparison of Self-assessment with peer and student assessment.

Study Design: A comparative cross sectional survey.

Place and Duration of Study: Study was conducted from January to June 2012 in Riphah College of Rehabilitation Sciences, Riphah International University Islamabad.

Materials and Methods: This research study was conducted among students of Doctor of physical therapy (DPT), post-professional Doctor of physical Therapy (PPDPT), and Master of Science in speech language pathology (MS-SLP), and faculty members at Riphah College of Rehabilitation Science (RCRS), Riphah International University Islamabad. The total sample size was 730, including 700 students and 30 faculty members.

A questionnaire was developed according to likert scale, and after a pilot study on 20 student and 10 faculty member to determine the reliability. The questionnaire was circulated among all the 30 faculty members and 700 students, including 500 undergraduate and 200 post graduate students of all the 3 programs.

The data was analyzed and Wilcoxon (Kruskal-Wallis) was applied at 95% level of significance for all the 3 groups. The group "A" included assessment of the performance of the faculty members done by the students, group "B" done by other faculty members, and group "C" included self assessment done by faculty members. The averages were calculated to determine the overall performance of the faculty members as assessed by themselves, other faculty members, and the by students as well, afterwards the averages of 3 groups were compared.

Results: the overall performance of the faculty members was graded as 71% ($P=0.015$) as evaluated by the students, 77% ($P=0.009$) as evaluated by other faculty members, and 73% ($P=0.011$) as evaluated by the faculty members through self assessment.

Conclusion: It is concluded that there was no significant difference in the performance of the faculty members, as assessed themselves, by the students and the other faculty members.

Key words: Faculty performance, self assessment, students' feedback.

Introduction

Faculty evaluation is always vital for the Faculty development in academic institutions for further improvement and enhancement. This evaluation process helps the organization to arrange the faculty development programs for further improvement in the performance of the faculty members.¹

Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) develops variety of assessment "tools" for performance of

faculty members outcomes. Though it is not very much popular in the literature concern with medical and rehabilitation fields, but it is the most useful practice in business sector. The performance evaluation technique focuses on multiple perspectives and levels performance leading to results that are considered to be highly convincing and a powerful phenomenon to bring change in behavior. This feedback also known as multisource feedback, multi rater assessment, peer evaluation and full-circle appraisal. Peer evaluation provides developmental feedback which is always used to assess competency and behavior rather than personality and professionalism.²

Correspondence:

Dr. Syed Shakil-ur-Rehman
Principal/Assistant Professor
Riphah College of Rehabilitation Sciences
Riphah International University Islamabad

One frequently used method for identifying educational needs is the mailed questionnaire. Generally, educational program planners gather initial information about a particular audience and design an appropriate questionnaire to elicit information from that audience regarding its perceived importance of identified topics.³

Although the literature related to conducting educational needs, assessment is quite plentiful, specific literature related to the tools and methods which are useful in the process is somewhat less abundant. Randol G. Waters, used the modified Borich Model to describe the educational needs of extension in field, faculty and indentifying the faculty development needs. Researchers would recommend the use of this need assessment model in determining educational needs of similar groups of clients.⁴

This study analyzes the outcomes of peer reviews of faculty members and the outcomes of students' feedback. Before this the general practice was getting feedback from the students or by the faculty member's separately. This particular research includes self assessment by the faculty members themselves, compared with the students' feedback.⁵

Materials and Methods

This comparative cross sectional research survey was conducted among students of Doctor of physical Therapy (DPT), Post-Professional Doctor of physical Therapy (PPDPT), and Master of Science in speech language pathology (MS-SLP), and faculty members at Riphah College of Rehabilitation Science (RCRS), Riphah International University Islamabad. The faculty performance was evaluated for semester Spring 2012 and for the period of 6 months, from January-June 2012. The total sample size was 730, including 700 students and 30 faculty members.

A questionnaire was developed according to likert scale, and after a pilot study on 20 student and 10 faculty member to determine the reliability. The questionnaire was circulated among all the 30 faculty members and 700 students, including 500 undergraduate and 200 post graduate students of all the 3 programs. The details about the study sample are summarized in Table I.

The questionnaire has 10 questions, which covered all of the following 10 important domains for performance of the faculty members:

1. Knowledge of the subject
2. Up-to-date knowledge
3. Communication Skills
4. Students' participation in class
5. Distribution of material among students
6. Punctuality
7. Regularity
8. The use of virtual learning system VLS
9. The use of campus management system CMS
10. Following Islamic Ethical values

The data was analyzed and Wilcoxon (Kruskal-Wallis) was applied at 95% level of significance for all the 3 groups. The group "A" included assessment of the performance of the faculty members done by the students, group "B" done by other faculty members, and group "C" included self assessment done by faculty members. The averages were calculated to determine the overall performance of the faculty members as assessed by themselves, other faculty members, and the by students as well, afterwards the averages of 3 groups were compared.

Results

A total of 730 students and faculty members participated in this research study; majority (77%) was female. Mean age of the undergraduate students was 23, postgraduates 27 and faculty members 30 years. The majority of participants were

from under grade (68%), followed by post grade (27%), and faculty members (4%). The background of the students and faculty members were from physical therapy and speech therapy. The overall performance of the faculty

the performance of the students and faculty members.⁶ Keith Topping carries out a comparative cross-sectional survey on “Assessment between Students Colleges and Universities” and published in research

Table I: Summary of Study Sample (n=730)

Level	No. of participants	mean age	Gender Distribution	
			Male	Female
Under-graduates	500	23 years	90	410
Post-graduates	200	27years	60	140
Faculty Members	30	30 years	17	13

Table II: Comparison of Overall Faculty Performance (n=730)

Groups	Q-1	Q-2	Q-3	Q-4	Q-5	Q-6	Q-7	Q-8	Q-9	Q-10	Over all Faculty Performance	P-Value
Group-A (Assessment by Students)	75%	70%	72%	66%	76%	70%	68%	69%	72%	70%	71%	0.015
Group-B (peer-Assessment)	70%	80%	80%	75%	77%	85%	75%	76%	79%	77%	77%	0.009
Group-C (Self-Assessment)	80%	71%	65%	85%	72%	71%	70%	67%	80%	65%	73%	0.011

members was graded as 71% (P=0.015) as evaluated by the students, 77% (P=0.009) as evaluated by other faculty members, and 73% (P=0.011) as evaluated by the faculty members through self assessment. Table-II

Discussion

Nigel K. Ll. Pope conducted a research study on “The impact of stress in self and peer assessment” and published in a research journal the assessment and evaluation in higher education in 2005. They concluded that the peer assessment and evaluation method is very effective for the evaluation

journal the Review of Educational Research in 1998. This study strongly supports the peer evaluation method for finding students and faculty outcomes at the colleges and universities level.⁷

Davis and John conducted a comparative cross-sectional research survey on “Comparison of faculty, peer, self, and Nurses Assessment in Obstetrics and Gynecology Residents” and published in a research journal the Obstetrics and Gynecology in 2002. They had evaluated the performance of residents placed in

Obstetrics and Gynecology wards, through self assessment, peer assessment and by the nurses. They concluded that there was no significant difference among the all 3 groups.⁸

F. Dochy and colleagues carries out a review research study on “the use of self, peer, and co-assessment in higher education” and published in an international research journal named the Studies in Higher Education in 1999. They considered the peer review method effective and develop recommendations for educational institutions. They also stated in the conclusion after the completion the research review that peer review method made the students more responsible while responding the evaluation and assessment at the higher education level.⁹

Matthew Ohland and colleagues conducted a review research study on “A Comprehensive Assessment of Team Members Effectiveness: Development of Behaviorally Anchored Scale for Self and Peer Evaluation”, and published in a research journal the Academy of Management, Learning, and Education in 2012. They find three studies which supports the effectiveness of peer review method for the evaluation and assessment of the effectiveness team members.¹⁰

Conclusion

It is concluded that there was no significant difference in the performance of the faculty members, as assessed by the students, themselves, and the other faculty members.

References

1. Darling-Hammond L, Amrein-Beardsley A. Haertel E & Rothstein J. Evaluating teacher evaluation. Phi Delta Kappan 2012; 93:8-15.
2. Schmoker M. The madness of teacher evaluation frameworks. Phi Delta Kappan 2012; 93:70-1.
3. Hill H C, Kapitula L & Umland K. A validity argument approach to evaluating teacher value-added scores. American Educational Research Journal 2012; 48:794-831.
4. Madden T J, Dillon W R & Leak R L. Students' evaluation of teaching: concerns of item diagnosticity. Journal of Marketing Education 2010; 32:264-74.
5. Johnson D W, Johnson R T & Smith K A. Cooperative learning returns to college what evidence is there that it works? Change: the magazine of higher learning 1998; 30: 26- 35.
6. Davis J D. Comparison of faculty, peer, self, and nurse assessment of obstetrics and gynecology residents. Obstetrics & Gynecology 2012; 99: 647-51.
7. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. Review of Educational Research 1998; 68: 249-76.
8. Pope N K L. The impact of stress in self-and peer assessment. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 2005; 30: 51-63.
9. Dochy F J R C, Segers M & Sluijsmans D. The use of self-, peer and co-assessment in higher education: A review. Studies in Higher education 1999; 24: 331-50.
10. Ohland M W, Loughry M L, Woehr D J, Bullard L G, Felder R M, Finelli C J. The Comprehensive Assessment of Team Member Effectiveness: Development of a Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale for Self-and Peer Evaluation. Academy of Management Learning & Education 2012; 11: 609-30.

