



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.  
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898475*

RFC: ATI120618V12

**Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.**

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseduccionpoliticayvalores.com/>

**Año: VII Número: 1 Artículo no.:58 Período: 1 de septiembre al 31 de diciembre, 2019.**

**TÍTULO:** Estudio de las actitudes de los estudiantes, miembros de la facultad y expertos en capacitación con respecto a los estándares de evaluación del desempeño educativo en los miembros de la Facultad de la Universidad Payam Noor de Teherán.

**AUTORES:**

1. Ph. D. stud. Robab Emami.
2. Ph. D. Nadergholi Ghoorchian.
3. Ph. D. Parivash Jafari.

**RESUMEN:** El propósito de este documento es examinar la actitud de los estudiantes, los docentes y los expertos en capacitación con respecto a los estándares de evaluación del desempeño educativo de los docentes universitarios. Para recopilar información, el cuestionario realizado por el investigador incluyó 20 preguntas en forma de un espectro de 5 Likert, de trivial a crítico. Los resultados mostraron los miembros de la facultad y los expertos en educación en tres áreas antes, durante y después de enseñar los estándares de evaluación del desempeño de los miembros de la facultad acreditados.

**PALABRAS CLAVES:** evaluación, desempeño educativo, miembro de la facultad, estudiantes, expertos en educación.

**TITLE:** Study of the attitudes of students, faculty members and training experts to the educational performance evaluation standards in faculty members of the Payam Noor University of Tehran.

**AUTHORS:**

1. Ph. D. stud. Robab Emami.
2. Ph. D. Nadergholi Ghoorchian.
3. Ph. D. Parivash Jafari.

**ABSTRACT:** The purpose of this paper is to examine the attitude of students, faculty members and training experts to the educational performance evaluation standards in university faculty members. To gather information, the researcher-made questionnaire included 20 questions, in the form of a 5 Likert spectrum, from trivial to critical, was used. The results showed that faculty members and experts in education in three areas before, during and after teaching accredited faculty members' performance evaluation standards.

**KEY WORDS:** assessment, educational performance, faculty member, students, education experts

**INTRODUCTION.**

Higher education has a pivotal role in the process of community development and co-ordination between the different dimensions of development in any society. For the same reason, universities have a heavy responsibility for creating new knowledge and training human resources (Ahmady et al, 2009).

Universities and centers of higher education, like any other social system, and based on the progress and needs of the community could have different functions (2). National – Cultural organization (UNESCO) considers three main functions of universities as to produce knowledge (research), and knowledge transfer (training) and applying knowledge (services) (Ejtehadi, 2014).

Improving the quality of education is in the hands of effective elements of the university meaning the faculty members and human resources development, without regard to increasing efficiency, retention and increasing motivation, vitality and creativity of faculty members, (as an essential component of education), will not be possible (Isfahan university of medical sciences, 2007). Therefore, considering the quality of education in universities and subsequently, considering the growth of faculty members, in order to improve the quality of education and training of human resources efficiently is of great importance (5). Identifying factors affecting on the innovation and creativity of faculty members at the University can provide the appropriate basis to foster and excellence of affiliated colleges to Medical Sciences (Storey, 2002).

Meanwhile, the structured evaluation process is for collecting and interpreting data (Saif al, 2004). In higher education, the evaluation should pay attention to the issue that what professional and academic qualifications and skills the faculty members have acquired, and was their results favorable or can they respond to the problems compared to their mission and the responsibilities that they have assumed, and finally, do they reach the desired objectives or not? In addition, the importance of educational evaluation in the higher education system resulted from the fact that, these evaluations provide information that will be used in educational decisions, determine future strategies and methods and the development of university education system (Bazargan, 2001).

This information is obtained from different sources that, without a doubt, it is one of the resources in obtaining the student information that all supporting and administrative educational efforts are employed for effective learning of them. In addition, other sources of information can be considered the faculty members, colleagues, university groups and education experts. Of course, judging a student, as a source of information has been widely used about the performance of the faculty members and other phenomena and educational elements, today, so that, even in areas of decision-

making, the promotion has been entered about the fate of the science board members' job (Sanjari, 1994).

Creating required opportunities for students to comment on the methods, programs and teachers' performance will strengthen human relations between students, faculty members, and effectiveness of the program. In addition, reviewing past activities and investigating the causes of successes and failures give the opportunity to the faculty member and students to try in order to eliminate possible deficits and increase their performance (Basow, 2000).

Assessment of students from faculty members' educational performance is widely used in the world. Despite the criticism to this method, many people consider it a valid and reliable way to measure some aspects of training. At the same time, it is stressed that the use of a tool (students' evaluation) provides an incomplete and inaccurate picture of the effectiveness of the faculty member's teaching. The student is considered one of the gathering resources and should not be forgotten from other methods (Centra & Gaubatz, 2000).

While acknowledging the usefulness and appropriateness of using combined methods (using the opinions of students with the faculty members and experts' opinion), many researchers consider the unique and special place for the evaluation of students compared to other methods and have insisted on the use of this method in any combination of methods (Seldin, 1993). In addition, it should also be noted that the effectiveness and accuracy of the evaluation are related to many issues that should be considered. Among those cases, the proper tool of the information gathering process, scoring, analysis and interpretation and judgment based on the data (Rueda, 1989). Although the use of evaluation of students in universities in the country has been upward, filling out evaluation forms will take a lot of time of students, and enormous human and material resources will be spent to collect them, however, it seems that the results are not using optimal.

Given the importance of this study, it is searching to examine the attitude of students, faculty members and educational experts to the faculty members' performance evaluation standards.

## **DEVELOPMENT.**

### **The empirical record of the research.**

Dadman et al (2014) has done a research entitled "Performance scholarship of faculty members at Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, between the years of 2012-2009". The results of this study only showed significant differences in the activities of the Ministry among different academic rank and different faculty members ( $\chi^2 = 12.46$  and  $p = 0.002$ ) and ( $\chi^2 = 17.64$  and  $p = 0.000$ ).

In academic activities, course plan with 77% had the highest rate of credentials. No significant relationship was observed between age and the scores of regulations. In addition, the use of the examples of regulations did not show significant differences in different age groups. The results show that teachers have used more the examples that have the simpler structure and require less time.

Mahdavi and colleagues (2014) have done a research entitled "Comparative Evaluation of faculty members' educational performance by students with their self-assessment". The results showed that the mean score of self-evaluation of teachers was higher than their total average their evaluation score by students, but the results of the analysis of the total score mean based on the students and self-evaluation of professors had no significant differences according to independent t test ( $p = 0.38$ ).

Abdosamadi et al (1391) have done a research entitled "Comparison of teachers' self-assessment and evaluation of students from the faculty members' educational performance of the Dentistry Faculty in Hamedan University of Medical Sciences".

The results showed that the mean scores of professors' self-evaluation was  $76.02 \pm 10.5$  and the mean scores of professors' evaluation by students was  $71.12 \pm 9.03$ , which there was a significant difference between these two statistically ( $P = 0.041$ ). Self-evaluation scores were negatively correlated with the students' evaluation scores ( $r = -0.299$ ).

In this study, self-evaluation scores of professors were at a higher level than the poll scores of students from faculty members. Teachers should use students' poll of faculty members, in order to improve their education and try to reduce the results difference between these two:

- Griffin (2002), in a research, has studied "the link between the reputation of the faculty member (as it was perceived by students) and students' evaluation of teachers and lessons". 754 students from 39 classes participated in this study. It was because students have heard about their former professor and they have enrolled in this course, they were classified in three groups: positive reputation, without awareness and information, negative reputation. The results showed the mean differences in the groups of positive reputation and negative reputation of faculty members in grading students. Students, who had heard about the good reputation of the previous professor, had evaluated the professor higher than the students, who had heard about the bad reputation of the previous professor.
- Host (2000) in his study entitled, what is the sign of a good teacher? have considered the following features for a good teacher: has a goal, expects the success for all students, bears the contradictions and discrepancies in the class (such as walking of a student in the classroom, etc.), shows the desire for change and adaptation in dealing with the needs of students, be intellectual, accepts that he does not know something, learns various models of teaching and enjoys from his work and being with his students.
- Robinson Wolf (2004) in a research has examined the patterns of strengths and weaknesses of faculty members' teaching performance through the reports of nursing students in faculty members' evaluation forms. After checking the content, the strengths of the faculty members' performance include the following according to students; knowledge and technical strategies, create an active learning environment, professionalism, researcher features, being supportive, and scientists. Their weakness points include the following; providing poor content of teaching, unorganized activities,

the lack of professor, lack of teaching skills, non-professionalism, incompetence, showing negative features.

- Rector (2009), in a study that was done in the number of universities and colleges in South America, 290 full-time professors was evaluated. Data were studied with different strategies. Faculty members, in their perception to the evaluation of the program have considered facing with the accreditation guidelines as the most important factor and even have considered it higher than the designated areas to improve the performance of faculty. Furthermore, the results showed the components that are important in terms of faculty members in evaluating, are respectively, teaching in a class, personal qualities and working on college committees.

Knoll et al. (2010), in some universities, student evaluation of teachers' performance was done online and not in the classroom. However, the difference between the two types of evaluation has been of interest to researchers, but, in certain cases, no significant differences were observed between the two methods of evaluation. Moreover, technically, increasing the variance between respondents to the assessment forms and reducing the size of the sample is of great importance in the evaluation of the performance of faculty members from the students.

Teaching quality assessment forms, used in this study, have five areas, including organization, tend to respond to students' questions, availability, respect for students, and help the teacher to the students.

### **Research questions.**

The first question: What are educational performance evaluation criteria before the faculty members' teaching?

The second question: What are educational performance evaluation criteria during the faculty members' teaching?

The third question: What are educational performance evaluation criteria after the faculty members' teaching?

### Research methodology.

The aim of the present study is practical, in terms of nature is descriptive and in terms of methodology is a survey. The statistical population in this study was all students in different grades of Payam Noor University of Tehran, faculty members and education experts of Payam Noor University of Tehran. 100 students, 50 faculty members and 30 educational experts were randomly selected.

In order to collect information, the research made questionnaire included 20 questions in 5 Likert range from trivial to critical was used. Face and content validity of the questionnaire was confirmed by using experts in education and research opinion. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 86% for students, 75% for faculty members and 78% for experts, which showed a high validity of questionnaire and internal consistency of the items. To analyze the data, one sample t test with SPSS software were used.

### Research findings. The first question: What are educational performance evaluation criteria before the faculty members' teaching?

The items	Number	Average	Standard deviation	Test value: 3		
				t	Degrees of freedom	Significance level
Determine the course objectives	100	5.48	0.69	4.72	99	0.000
Determine the timing of courses for semester	100	5.20	0.74	5.6	99	0.000
Diagnostic evaluation process with input	100	4.73	0.8	3.7	99	0.000
Determine learning activities	100	4.57	0.7	7.6	99	0.000
Select educational Tools	100	4.21	0.74	4.8	99	0.000

Table 1 one-sample t-test results about the items related to the educational performance evaluation criteria before the faculty members' teaching according to students.



As shown in Table 1, the one-sample t-test P level, to examine the first question is smaller than the 0.05 that has evaluated the statistical significant difference between two actual and assumption averages of educational performance evaluation criteria before the faculty members' teaching according to the students. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the average value of criteria is equal to 3, will not be approved. On the other hand, the average of respondents' views about these criteria is greater than the number 3 and in total, average data analysis results show that, the t statistic for all criteria is greater than the critical value 1.96 and it is in the critical region. In other words, a mean difference of all the criteria is significant in the number 3, therefore, mean of all the criteria is above average (3). Therefore, we can say that the educational performance assessment criteria are confirmed before faculty members' teaching and according to the students in the study community.

The items	Number	Average	Standard deviation	Test value: 3		
				t	Degrees of freedom	Significance level
Determine the course objectives	50	8.68	0.36	3.7	49	0.000
Determine the timing of courses for semester	50	5.03	0.63	6.8	49	0.000
Diagnostic evaluation process with input	50	3.9	0.67	5.12	49	0.000
Determine learning activities	50	5.14	0.57	7.8	49	0.000
Select educational Tools	50	4.85	0.52	5.3	49	0.000

Table 2 one-sample t-test results about the items related to the educational performance evaluation criteria before the faculty members' teaching according to faculty members.

As shown in Table 2, the one-sample t-test P level, to examine the first question is smaller than the 0.05 that has evaluated the statistical significant difference between two actual and assumption averages of educational performance evaluation criteria before the faculty members' teaching according to the faculty members. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the average value of criteria is equal to 3, will not be approved. On the other hand, the average of respondents' views about these criteria is greater than the number 3 and in total, average data analysis results show that, the t statistic

for all criteria is greater than the critical value 1.96 and it is in the critical region of the test. In other words, mean difference of all the criteria is significant in the number 3, therefore, mean of all the criteria is above average (3). Therefore, we can say that the educational performance assessment criteria are confirmed before faculty members' teaching and according to the faculty members.

The items	Number	Average	Standard deviation	Test value: 3		
				t	Degrees of freedom	Significance level
Determine the course objectives	30	6.18	0.69	3.12	29	0.000
Determine the timing of courses for semester	30	6.30	0.74	4.62	29	0.000
Diagnostic evaluation process with input	30	5.83	0.8	4.5	29	0.000
Determine learning activities	30	5.64	0.7	8.9	29	0.000
Select educational Tools	30	5.33	0.74	5.6	29	0.000

Table 3 one-sample t-test results about the items related to the educational performance evaluation criteria before the faculty members' teaching according to experts.

As shown in Table 3, the one-sample t-test P level, to examine the first question is smaller than the 0.05 that has evaluated the statistical significant difference between two actual and assumption averages of educational performance evaluation criteria before the faculty members' teaching according to the experts. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the average value of criteria is equal to 3, will not be approved. On the other hand, the average of respondents' views about these criteria is greater than the number 3 and in total, average data analysis results show that, the t statistic for all criteria is greater than the critical value 1.96 and it is in the critical region of the test. In other words, mean difference of all the criteria is significant in the number 3, therefore, mean of all the criteria is above average (3). Therefore, we can say that the educational performance assessment criteria are confirmed before faculty members' teaching and according to the experts of the population.

**The second question: What are educational performance evaluation criteria during the faculty members' teaching?**

The items	Number	Average	Standard deviation	Test value: 3		
				T	Degrees of freedom	Significance level
Skill in selecting and arranging content	100	5.14	0.924	8.1	99	0.000
View photos, posters and...	100	4.14	0.55	7.6	99	0.000
Establish a significant relationship between previous and new learning	100	4.61	0.437	6.5	99	0.000
Proper communication between teacher and student	100	5.64	0.645	3.7	99	0.000
Voice and Speech role in understanding and conveying material	100	4.71	0.532	6.8	99	0.000
Motivation and creativity in students	100	4.6	0.823	5.12	99	0.000
Discipline and training regulations	100	3.61	0.59	7.8	99	0.000
Promoting the active participation of students in discussions and...	100	4.04	0.824	5.3	99	0.000
Interest, patience of professor to answer the questions	100	4.76	0.55	9.6	99	0.000
Select appropriate teaching methods to provide lessons	100	4.71	0.534	5.7	99	0.000
Summary and conclusions of the lesson;	100	4.71	0.417	7.4	99	0.000
Evaluation (mid-term exams)	100	4.5	0.667	8.5	99	0.000

Table 4 one-sample t-test results about the items related to the educational performance evaluation criteria during the faculty members' teaching according to students.

As shown in Table 4, the one-sample t-test P level, to examine the second question is smaller than the 0.05 that has evaluated the statistical significant difference between two actual and assumption averages of educational performance evaluation criteria during the faculty members' teaching according to the students. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the average value of criteria is equal to 3, will not be approved. On the other hand, the average of respondents' views about these criteria is greater than the number 3 and in total, average data analysis results show that, the t statistic for all criteria is greater than the critical value 1.96 and it is in the critical region of the test. In other words, mean difference of all the criteria is significant in the number 3, therefore, mean of all the criteria is

above average (3). Therefore, we can say that the educational performance assessment criteria are confirmed during faculty members' teaching and according to the students of the population.

The items	Number	Average	Standard deviation	Test value: 3		
				t	Degrees of freedom	Significance level
Skill in selecting and arranging content	50	8.16	0.424	5.1	49	0.000
View photos, posters and...	50	6.4	0.65	5.8	49	0.000
Establish a significant relationship between previous and new learning	50	6.4	0.717	6.35	49	0.000
Proper communication between teacher and student	50	7.6	0.564	7.7	49	0.000
Voice and Speech role in understanding and conveying material	50	5.6	0.352	8.3	49	0.000
Motivation and creativity in students	50	8.5	0.384	7.2	49	0.000
Discipline and training regulations	50	5.6	0.69	6.7	49	0.000
Promoting the active participation of students in discussions and...	50	4.26	0.428	5.3	49	0.000
Interest, patience of professor to answer the questions	50	7.5	0.69	8.5	49	0.000
Select appropriate teaching methods to provide lessons	50	6.3	0.453	5.4	49	0.000
Summary and conclusions of the lesson;	50	6.7	0.47	6.4	49	0.000
Evaluation (mid-term exams)	50	5.8	0.69	7.3	49	0.000

Table 5 one-sample t-test results about the items related to the educational performance evaluation criteria during the faculty members' teaching according to faculty members

As shown in Table 5, the one-sample t-test P level, to examine the second question is smaller than the 0.05 that has evaluated the statistical significant difference between two actual and assumption averages of educational performance evaluation criteria during the faculty members' teaching according to the faculty members. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the average value of criteria is equal to 3, will not be approved. On the other hand, the average of respondents' views about these

criteria is greater than the number 3 and in total, average data analysis results show that, the t statistic for all criteria is greater than the critical value 1.96 and it is in the critical region of the test. In other words, mean difference of all the criteria is significant in the number 3, therefore, mean of all the criteria is above average (3). Therefore, we can say that the educational performance assessment criteria are confirmed during faculty members' teaching and according to the faculty members.

The items	Number	Average	Standard deviation	Test value: 3		
				t	Degrees of freedom	Significance level
Skill in selecting and arranging content	30	3.6	0.924	4.1	29	0.000
View photos, posters and...	30	4.64	0.55	7.8	29	0.000
Establish a significant relationship between previous and new learning	30	4.04	0.437	4.35	29	0.000
Proper communication between teacher and student	30	9.5	0.645	8.7	29	0.000
Voice and Speech role in understanding and conveying material	30	6.71	0.532	9.3	29	0.000
Motivation and creativity in students	30	5.61	0.823	9.2	29	0.000
Discipline and training regulations	30	6.16	0.59	4.7	29	0.000
Promoting the active participation of students in discussions and...	30	5.1	0.824	6.3	29	0.000
Interest, patience of professor to answer the questions	30	7.6	0.55	7.5	29	0.000
Select appropriate teaching methods to provide lessons	30	6.8	0.534	6.4	29	0.000
Summary and conclusions of the lesson;	30	7.9	0.417	4.4	29	0.000
Evaluation (mid-term exams)	30	4.8	0.667	9.3	29	0.000

Table 6 one-sample t-test results about the items related to the educational performance evaluation criteria during the faculty members' teaching according to the experts.

As shown in Table 6, the one-sample t-test P level, to examine the second question is smaller than the 0.05 that has evaluated the statistical significant difference between two actual and assumption averages of educational performance evaluation criteria during the faculty members' teaching according to the faculty members. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the average value of criteria is

equal to 3, will not be approved. On the other hand, the average of respondents' views about these criteria is greater than the number 3 and in total, average data analysis results show that, the t statistic for all criteria is greater than the critical value 1.96 and it is in the critical region of the test. In other words, mean difference of all the criteria is significant in the number 3, therefore, mean of all the criteria is above average (3). Therefore, we can say that the educational performance assessment criteria are confirmed during faculty members' teaching and according to the experts of the population.

**The third question: What are educational performance evaluation criteria after the faculty members' teaching?**

The items	Number	Average	Standard deviation	Test value: 3		
				t	Degrees of freedom	Significance level
Preparing students for lessons the next session	100	6.2	0.59	5.12	99	0.000
Giving practice and homework to acquire skills and more information	100	3.68	0.89	6.9	99	0.000
Review and summarize the lesson	100	4.13	0.67	6.4	99	0.000

Table 7 one-sample t-test results about the items related to the educational performance evaluation criteria after the faculty members' teaching according to the students.

As shown in Table 7, the one-sample t-test P level, to examine the third question is smaller than the 0.05 that has evaluated the statistical significant difference between two actual and assumption averages of educational performance evaluation criteria after the faculty members' teaching according to the students. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the average value of criteria is equal to 3, will not be approved. On the other hand, the average of respondents' views about these criteria is greater than the number 3 and in total, average data analysis results show that, the t statistic for all criteria is greater than the critical value 1.96 and it is in the critical region of the test. In other words, mean difference of all the criteria is significant in the number 3, therefore, mean of all the criteria is above average (3). Therefore, we can say that the educational performance assessment criteria are

confirmed after faculty members' teaching and according to the students of the population.

The items	Number	Average	Standard deviation	Test value: 3		
				t	Degrees of freedom	Significance level
Preparing students for lessons the next session	50	6.68	0.709	7.6	49	0.000
Giving practice and homework to acquire skills and more information	50	5.67	0.49	8.7	49	0.000
Review and summarize the lesson	50	5.43	0.87	6.3	49	0.000

Table 8 one-sample t-test results about the items related to the educational performance evaluation criteria after the faculty members' teaching according to the faculty members.

As shown in Table 8, the one-sample t-test P level, to examine the third question is smaller than the 0.05 that has evaluated the statistical significant difference between two actual and assumption averages of educational performance evaluation criteria after the faculty members' teaching according to the faculty members. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the average value of criteria is equal to 3, will not be approved. On the other hand, the average of respondents' views about these criteria is greater than the number 3 and in total, average data analysis results show that, the t statistic for all criteria is greater than the critical value 1.96 and it is in the critical region of the test. In other words, mean difference of all the criteria is significant in the number 3, therefore, mean of all the criteria is above average (3). Therefore, we can say that the educational performance assessment criteria are confirmed after faculty members' teaching and according to the faculty members.

The items	Number	Average	Standard deviation	Test value: 3		
				t	Degrees of freedom	Significance level
Preparing students for lessons the next session	30	4.78	0.709	6.6	29	0.000
Giving practice and homework to acquire skills and more information	30	3.98	0.49	5.7	29	0.000
Review and summarize the lesson	30	4.3	0.87	4.3	29	0.000

Table 9 one-sample t-test results about the items related to the educational performance evaluation criteria after the faculty members' teaching according to the experts.

As shown in Table 9, the one-sample t-test P level, to examine the third question is smaller than the 0.05 that has evaluated the statistical significant difference between two actual and assumption averages of educational performance evaluation criteria after the faculty members' teaching according to the experts. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the average value of criteria is equal to 3, will not be approved. On the other hand, the average of respondents' views about these criteria is greater than the number 3 and in total, average data analysis results show that, the t statistic for all criteria is greater than the critical value 1.96 and it is in the critical region of the test. In other words, mean difference of all the criteria is significant in the number 3, therefore, mean of all the criteria is above average (3). Therefore, we can say that the educational performance assessment criteria are confirmed after faculty members' teaching and according to the experts of the population.

## CONCLUSIONS.

Here is a summary of findings:

Performance evaluation criteria of training before faculty members' teaching were confirmed in terms of the students, faculty members and educational experts. The average benchmark of determining the objectives for the lesson, according to the students and faculty members and



educational experts shows that, the three groups pay attention to the human side of teaching, more than other dimensions. In addition, the choice of educational tools, as the last priority has shown that students and faculty members pay less attention to the technological and physical aspect, which is due to their knowledge to the lack of educational tools in all courses. However, educational experts, given that, are not in the context of teaching; they have chosen the diagnostic evaluation as a last priority, which, it is because of the lack of their attention to the importance of this component.

Performance evaluation criteria of training were confirmed in addition to the teaching of faculty members, according to the students, faculty members and educational experts. Selecting the proper communication between students and teachers according to the students and faculty members, indicates that both of these groups emphasize on the promotion of human and ethical dimension of teaching and have less attention to the choice of educational tools in their class. However, educational experts, with selecting a motivation component in the students as the highest priority, have shown that, a creative and motivated student in the class is demonstrating an effective teaching and success of a faculty member.

Criteria for evaluating educational performance, after faculty members' teaching according to the students, faculty members and educational experts were confirmed. The average benchmark of preparing students for the next session lessons according to the three groups, as a first priority, suggests that, arousing the curiosity of students, to motivate, to collect more topics related to the next session course, which help the student's self-centered is of great importance. Component selection of practice and homework to learn more skills to students, has a lower priority in terms of students, which can consider it, due to two reasons: the practice and homework in the educational system has most of the time considered as a punishment, lack of exercise and class assignments in the final assessment from the faculty members, which makes the student does not care.

According to the results, criteria for evaluating educational performance of the faculty members in three areas before, during and after teaching is accredited by students, faculty members and experts in education. Therefore, it is suggested, the culture of evaluation will be expanded in the educational system.

According to the results, in the survey of students, faculty members and educational experts, about the criteria for evaluating educational performance of faculty members, component of diagnostic evaluation, before teaching in terms of students and professors are in the third priority and in terms of education experts is in the last priority. This is because of the lack of awareness to the importance of this component. Thus, according to the importance of diagnostic assessment in the evaluation of student learning, workshops to improve the understanding of students, faculty members and educational experts, with respect to this important issue, seems essential.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.**

1. Dadman Mitra; Yamani, Nikoo, Changiz, Tahere, Mousavi, Arefeh (2014). The scholarship of faculty members in Isfahan University of Medical Sciences 2012-2009. *Journal of Medical Sciences*, Volume 14, Issue 6.
2. Mahdavi, Sakine; Zare, Soudabeh; Naimi, Nayere (2014). Comparative evaluation of faculty members' teaching by students with their self-assessment. *Research in Medical Education*, Volume 6, Number 2, pp. 51-58.
3. Abdul Samadi, Hamid Reza; Dalband, Mohsen; Davoodi, Puran Dokht; Bakhtiari, Behnush; Moghimbeigi Abbas, Ahmadi Motemayel, Fatemeh (2012). Comparing the results of self-evaluation of teachers and students' evaluation from the educational performance of faculty members in the School of Dentistry, Hamedan University of Medical Sciences. *Journal of Medical Sciences*, Volume 12, Number 2, row 40, pp. 101-109.

4. Sanjari Karahroudi, Ahmad Reza (1994). Investigating the relation between the management MA students' attitudes of Air University School of Management faculty about the faculty members and the evaluation of faculty members by students. Master's thesis, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences of Tehran.
5. Bazargan, Abass (2001). Educational Evaluation. Tehran: Publication side.
6. Seif AA. (2004). Andazegiri, Sanjesh va arzeshyabye amoozeshi. 4th ed. Tehran: Doran.
7. AhmadyS, Taghavinia M, Rahmani H, Khabaz M (translator). [How to succeed at medical school: an essential guide to learning]. Evans D, Brown J (Author). Qom: hagh yavaran; 2009. [Persian]
8. Ejtehad M. [Tahlili bar tavanmandiha va kastihaye nezame amouzeshe ali]. Research and planning in higher education; 1998; (17): 33-58. [Persian][Cited 30 August 2014] available from: <http://www.noormags.com/view/fa/articlepage/42425>
9. Isfahan university of medical sciences. [Fehrest kooli sharh vazayef asatide daneshgah va mizan arzeshe anha]. Isfahan: educational development center; 2007. [Persian]
10. Storey C. Innovation in services. Aust marketing J. 2002;10(1):59-70.
11. Rector, jeff (2009). faculty perception of faculty evaluation programs at selected private colleges/universities in the southeast united states. dissertation presented in the university of Tennessee, Chattanooga.
12. Nowell, Clifford; Gale, Lewis R.; Handley, Bruce (2010). Assessing faculty performance using student evaluations of teaching in an uncontrolled setting. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. Vol. 35, No. 4
13. Robinson Wolf Z. (2004). Strengths and Weaknesses of Faculty teaching Performance reported by undergraduate and graduate nursing student: a descriptive study. Journal of Professional Nursing. (pp.118-128).

14. Griffin B.W. (2002). Instructor Reputation and student Ratings of Instruction. Contemporary Educational Psychology. (pp.534-552)
15. Hassett M.F. (2000). What Markes A Good Teacher?  
<http://www.Sabes.org/resources/adventures/vol12/12hassett.htm>
16. Centra, J.A.; & Gaubatz, N.B. (2000).Is there gender bias in student evaluation of teaching? Journal of Higher Education, (pp.17-33)
17. Basow, S.A. (2000). Best and worst professors: Gender patterns in student' choices. Sex Roles (pp.417).
18. Rueda V.C. (1989). Student Evaluation of the professor's performance and its effects on teaching effectiveness May- Jun(pp.151-159).
19. Seldin, P. (1993). The use and abuse of student ratings of professors. The Chronicle of Higher Education.

#### **DATA OF THE AUTHORS.**

**1. Robab Emami.** Ph.D. student in Department of Educational Management, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

**2. Nadergholi Ghoorchian.** Ph.D. in Supervision and Curriculum Development (corresponding author), Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

**3. Parivash Jafari.** Ph.D. in Educational Administration, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

**RECIBIDO:** 7 de agosto del 2019.

**APROBADO:** 22 de agosto del 2019.