The Evaluation of Performance of Faculty Staff at the Hashemite University as Perceived by their Students

[1]Ibrahim Jumia'an, [1]Ali Alelaimat and [2]Najati Younis
[1]Department of Child Education,
[2]Department of Special Education, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan

Abstract: This study aims to evaluate the performance of faculty member at The Hashemite University as perceived by their students. To fulfil the study objectives, a questionnaire was developed and distributed; it consisted of 36 items categorized into three areas: personalized attitudes and social relationships, instructional design and plan for teaching and students evaluation. The study tool reliability and validity tests were conducted. Then, the study tool was implemented on a sample size of 436 male and female undergraduate students from all academic levels both scientific and humanities colleges at The Hashemite University in during the academic year 2016/2017. Results revealed that the total mean score of the performance of the faculty members as perceived by students was of 3.83 which indicated a high level of performance. Also, the mean scores of the personalized attitudes and social relationship was of 3.93 which referred to a high level too. Moreover, the mean scores of the instructional design and plan for teaching was of 3.87 which referred to a high level as well. Whereas the mean scores of the students evaluation was of 3.58 which also indicated a high level.

Key words: Performance evaluation, faculty member, The Hashemite University, instructiona, attitudes, indicated

INTRODUCTION

The progress of nations have become dependent on their knowledge, advanced technology and educated human resources capable of creativity, production and discussion, achieving the best rates in the field of human development and the positive investment of natural resources. The honourable nations are the strong nations which see the educational sector as one of the main pillars of the development of society. The progress of countries and societies is also based on the efficiency of university education which in turn depends on the efficiency of the university Professor, who is responsible for preparing the human cadres that advance the development process in the society.

One of the indicators of the efficiency of the university Professor is his teaching performance which is considered one of the most important inputs in achieving the educational goals. It is considered the main research of university faculty members. It is also considered the most influential factor in making changes required by university students.

As for the role of the universities in the progress of society and its development and its contribution to solving its problems and in order to improve its outputs, it has been found that the evaluation of the educational process in all its components, especially faculty members is necessary and aims to raise their competencies, correcting imbalances if any (White, 1995)

In order to keep pace with the modern educational trends, the faculty member must possess some of the performance competencies that qualify him to carry out his research efficiently and efficiently such as planning, teaching, evaluation and classroom management, in addition to the positive personal traits and not only to give theoretical lectures and commitment to routine lectures. These programs should extend to different activities and situations and utilize modern technologies that contribute to building the personality of the student, refining his talents, increasing his effectiveness and developing his abilities to solve the problems he faces in a scientific way (Batah and Al-Saud, 1999; Al-Najjar, 2009).

The evaluation of the performance of the university faculty member in developing the level of teaching and raising the efficiency in the various departments of the university, recognition of excellence in teaching and appreciation of the distinguished professors and promote high-level teaching and improve it and demonstrate the commitment of faculty members inside and outside the university and encourage linking between the task of teaching and other tasks in scientific research and

---

Corresponding Author: Ibrahim Jumia'an, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt

community service and strengthening the moral aspect in the university community. The results of the evaluation can also be used in designing the various education programs and in taking many decisions related to incentives and scientific promotions.

Although, most universities put the development of performance for the university faculty member as a major goal, however, the majority of the methods used in the evaluation does not raise or promote the development of faculty effectively. Development activities do not involve faculty members in the evaluation process. Previous studies dealt with the performance of faculty members in universities in various aspects. In this study, a number of studies will be presented to examine the performance of faculty members at universities from the student's perspectives.

Al-Jafreh (2015) conducted a study on a sample of the students from Al-Zarqa University aimed at evaluating the effectiveness of the faculty members of the university from the very consideration of its students in the light of the quality standards of education. The results showed that the level of student evaluation for the performance of faculty members was high, there were statistically significant differences due to the variable of the college in favor of the students of the scientific colleges as well as the existence of differences of statistical significance due to the variable of the academic level at the macro level and in favor of second, fourth and third year students and there is no statistically significant differences due to the gender variable.

Al-Ashqar *et al.* (2012) conducted a study aimed at knowing the degree of the faculty member's practice of human relations from the point of view of students in Palestinian universities. The results revealed that the student's assessment of the performance of the faculty members was high as a whole.

Another study conducted by Al Tal which aims to know the availability of the personal qualities of the university Professor in the Faculty of Education from the perspective of university students. The results revealed that there are a large number of characteristics available and high while some of them are available on average. Also, results revealed statistical significance differences due to the specialization of the course for the benefit of literary disciplines as well as differences in favor of the level of study for the fourth year students.

In the study of Al Jarrah and Sherifeen (2010) which aimed to identify the characteristics of the effective faculty member from the student's point of view, the results showed that the university students pointed out that the most important personality traits were followed by the management of the class and finally the planning

of teaching. Moreover, results revealed statistically significant differences due to gender variable. While there are no significant differences attributed to the variables of the college and the level of education on the tool as a whole and after the management of grade and personal attributes.

Al-Habbaha (2008) conducted a study aimed at evaluating the teaching performance of faculty members at Al-Balqa Applied University on a sample of (180) graduate students at the university. The results showed that the level of student evaluation of the faculty performance was at the intermediate level which is below the acceptable level. And showed no significant differences attributed to gender variable while revealed statistical significance differences attributed to the variable college and for benefit of humanities colleges.

Al Hadabi and Khan conducted a study examined the level of performance of faculty members at the Yemeni University of Science and Technology from the student's point of view on a sample of 102 students. The results of the study showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the teaching performance of the teaching staff, due to gender (male/female).

The study was conducted by Mokhlafi (2007) in a sample of 212 students at the University of Science and Technology in Yemen, evaluating the faculty members from their student's point of view in a number of teaching competencies. The results showed that there are no statistically significant differences due to the college variable and gender of students.

In the study conducted by Al-Ghazewat (2005) on a sample of students of the Faculty of Educational Sciences at Mu'tah University, the aim was to identify some of the competencies of faculty members from the student's point of view. The results showed that students were less satisfied with the competencies of faculty members in all fields.

Abulhuk and Bubshait (2004) conducted a study on a sample of 447 female students of King Faisal University aimed at knowing the human relations between the faculty members and the students. The results showed that there are statistically significant differences between the responses of female students in human relations and for human specialties.

The study conducted by Al-Jafri (2002) in order to identify the views of postgraduate students on the teaching performance of faculty members at Umm Al-Qura University on a sample of 298 female students of Master's degree in six colleges at Umm Al-Qura University (Education, Social, Applied Sciences, Arabic, Sharia and Da'wah. The results of the study indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the

mathematical averages of the student's responses to the teaching performance of male and female faculty members in the different faculties as well as the absence of statistically significant differences between these averages on the teaching performance of female faculty members attributed to the different faculties while there were statistically significant differences between the mathematical averages of the sample responses of the study on the teaching performance of male faculty members due to different colleges.

The study of Shehata and Al-Khail (2001) which was conducted on a sample of 120 members of the teaching staff and 350 university students in the faculties of education in Riyadh, aimed at identifying the factors that help in the development of teaching and academic evaluation, The views of faculty members on these variables and the impact of both nationality and scientific research and academic specialization on the efficiency of the performance of the faculty member. The study found a number of results, including: There were statistically significant differences between the averages of the estimates of the students and the estimations of the faculty members and for the benefit of the teaching staff members, after the professional efficiency of the faculty member. There were also significant statistical differences between the literary and scientific disciplines for the members of the faculty and in favor of the scientific specializations compared to the educational and psychological disciplines in the post-professional efficiency of the faculty member, according to the views of faculty members. The study also found that there are no statistically significant differences in the post-professional efficiency of the faculty member due to the nationality of the faculty member or the scientific research according to the opinions of the faculty members.

Al-Mahboob (2000) conducted a study on a sample of 273 male and female students in King Faisal University aiming to identify the teaching performance of the university professor through the student's estimations of the teaching practices. The results of the study indicated that the student's assessment of the teaching performance of the university teacher in the human specialization is greater than the estimates of students of scientific specialization.

In the Greenwald and Gillmore (1997) study, a sample of 200 students from Washington University aimed to identify the relationship between student estimates of faculty performance and expected grades. The study found a positive correlation between grades and the student's assessments of the performance of their teachers. There was also a negative correlation between the requirements of the material and the student's assessments of their teachers in these subjects.

Through the previous studies, it is important to evaluate the performance of university faculty members on an ongoing basis which is positively reflected in improving performance. The results of the studies differed according to the variables studied. On the one hand, some studies showed that the level of performance of faculty members from the student's point of view was high (Al-Jafreh, 2015, Al-Ashqar *et al.*, 2012). On the other hand, performance was acceptable (Al-Habahabah, 2008; Al-Ghazewat, 2005).

As for the sex variable (male/female), most studies showed no significant differences attributed to sex (Al-Jafreh, 2015; Al-Jarrah and Al-Sherifeen, 2010; Al-Hafahbeh, 2008). The results of the studies differed, some found differences in favor of the second year (Al-Jafreh, 2015; Al-Ashqar *et al.*, 2012) while other studies did not find statistically significant differences due to the variable of the academic level.

The study problem: The performance of teaching is one of the most important functions carried out by a faculty member at the university. This performance requires a continuous, comprehensive and objective evaluation process to ensure its effectiveness on the one hand and its development on the other hand. As the performance evaluation process contributes effectively to improving the educational process and developing it, of information about the performance of the faculty member leads to the development of its abilities to achieve outstanding academic performance which reflects positively on the quality of outputs of university education. Therefore, this study was conducted to survey the views of the beneficiary and affected students about the performance of the teaching staff which may help the faculty members in particular and the university in general to improve their level and improve their outputs.

The importance of the study: The importance of this study is as follows: the target group are members of the faculty of The Hashemite University and evaluate their performance from the student's point of view.

This study contributes to satisfying the need of The Hashemite University to conduct a scientific study on the impact of variables: sex of students and the level of education and colleges enrolled in their estimates of the performance of faculty members researching to take into account the impact of these variables when making judgments regarding their performance, more honest and objective provisions.

The results of this study and its recommendations may help in the development of the performance of faculty members at The Hashemite University.

Objectives and questions of the study: The aim of this study is to evaluate the performance of the teaching staff at The Hashemite University from the student's point of view and to know the extent to which the degree of total evaluation obtained by the faculty member varies according to the variables (gender, cumulative average, total). In the degree of the overall assessment of faculty members in The Hashemite University. This study attempts to answer the following questions:

- What is the reality of evaluating the performance of faculty members at The Hashemite University from the point of view of their demand?
- Are there significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the reality of the calendar due to the variable type of student (male/female)?
- Are there statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the reality of the calendar due to the variable of the student college (human/scientific)?
- Are there statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the reality of the calendar due to the variable level of the student (first, second, third, fourth)?

Terminology; The Hashemite University: A public university established in 1995 that includes several humanities and scientific colleges.

Teaching staff members: They are meant to research for teaching PhD holders at the rank of professor or associate professor or assistant professor during the second semester of the academic year 2016/2017.

Students of The Hashemite University: They are students registered with the Department of Admission and Registration and study at The Hashemite University in the humanitarian and scientific faculties and at the level of the first, second, third and fourth years in the second semester of the academic year 2016/2017.

Performance evaluation: It is intended to give a judgment through the student's views and their perceptions of all the activities of the faculty members of the activities and practices and the characteristics, relationships and trends that enable it to perform its functions. It was expressed through the degree and sub-dimensions of the study tool for individual's sample.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Population of the study: The study population consist of all the students of The Hashemite University during the second semester of the academic year 2014-2015 which is 26675 students including 12139 students in the humanitarian faculty and 14536 students in scientific faculties and the number of males 10405 and the number of females 16270. The sample consisted of 436 male and female students 170 males and 266 females and were randomly selected.

The instrument: To achieve the objectives of the study, the two researchers built the study tool, enlightened by theoretical and theoretical literature and previous studies in the field of assessment of the performance of faculty members in universities (Al-Jafreh, 2015; Al-Jarrah and Al-Shirfeen, 2010; Al-Habahbeh, 2008; Mokhlafi, 2007; Abulhuk and Bubshait, 2004; Al-Mahboob, 2000). The tool included in its initial form 41 paragraphs, so that, each paragraph expresses the student's view of the performance of faculty staff at the university. It was divided into three domains: personal characteristics and human relations, planning for teaching and evaluation. The sections of the instrument were designed according to the Likert scale. The sample is asked to determine the degree of approval which ranged as in strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree.

The researchers determined that the evaluation scale of each of the paragraphs of the tool is less than the mean of (2.5) is considered low and the paragraph that falls between "2.5-3.5" is considered to be medium and the mean score above 3.5 is considered high.

Instrument validity and reliability: In order to verify the validity of the instrument, the researchers presented it to 8 faculty staff specialized in the curriculum and psychology at The Hashemite University to take their opinions about the tool's suitability, clarity of words, degree of representation and comprehensiveness of paragraphs. In light of the Arbitrator's remarks, five paragraphs were deleted and some other paragraphs were amended.

To ensure the reliability of the study instrument, it was applied to a sample of 35 students who were not randomly selected from the study sample in the test method and returned with a 2 weeks interval. The correlation coefficient between the two applications was at 0.86. The reliability coefficient was in the internal consistency method according to the equation of Cronbach alpha where the reliability coefficient for dimensions: personal characteristics and human relations

was at 0.83, planning for teaching was at 0.86 and evaluation was at 0.84. For the instrument as a whole was at 0.87 which is satisfied for the purposes of this study.

Study design and statistical processing: The researcher used the analytical descriptive method to identify the student's opinions on the performance of faculty members at The Hashemite University and its relation to the study variables. To answer the study questions, SPSS were used the averages and standard deviations were obtained and the appropriate statistic was used to answer each of the study questions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to identify the performance evaluation of faculty members at The Hashemite University from the student's point of view, the study revealed the following results.

Results related to the first question: what is the reality of evaluating the performance of faculty members at The Hashemite University from the student's point of view? In order to answer this question, the arithmetical averages, the standard deviations of the opinions of the members of the study sample on the performance of the teaching staff were extracted.

As shown in Table 1, the total mean score was 3.83 which is high according to the standard of the approved study. The dimensions (personal traits and human relations, planning of teaching and evaluation) means were 3.93, 3.87 and 3.58, all of which according to the criteria of the study were high. These results are consistent with the results of the studies by Al-Jafreh (2015) and Al-Ashqar *et al*. (2012). But these results are different from the results Gazeyowat (2005)'s which both indicated that the performance of faculty staff from the student's perspective was unsatisfactory. Regarding to student's abilities on the sub-dimensions, the results were as follows.

First dimension: personal traits and human relations: The following table shows the means and standard deviations of the reality of student's assessment of faculty staff after personal traits and human relations and the overall scale arranged by descending. Table 2 indicates that the means of student's estimations on this dimension reached at 3.93 which is higher than the criteria adopted in this study. While the first-level item which states (he looks decent) reached a mean of 4.37, followed by the item of the second rank which states (uses polite language in dealing with others.) with a mean of 4.23. Also, all items of this dimension were also high with a

Table 1: The means and standard deviations for the performance of faculty staff

Dimensions	Gender	No.	Mean	SD
Personal traits and	Male	170	3.97	0.68
human relations	Female	266	3.93	0.76
Planning for teaching	Male	170	3.94	0.61
	Female	266	3.86	0.63
Evaluation	Male	170	3.64	0.76
	Female	266	3.57	0.70
Scale as a whole	Male	170	3.87	11.02
	Female	266	3.80	13.01

Table 2: The means and standard deviations of the personal traits and human relations

Items	Mean	SD
He looks decent	4.37	0.73
He uses polite language in his dealings with others	4.23	0.86
The lecture time is used effectively	4.19	0.97
He maintains discipline during the lecture	4.13	0.93
He presents the material in a clear and audible voice	4.08	1.08
He allows free expression to express their views	4.04	1.07
He is humble with self-confidence	3.97	1.07
He treats students affectionately and cooperatively	3.92	1.09
He treats all students fairly and impartially	3.81	1.19
He participates in solving student's school problems	3.77	1.11
He takes student's circumstances in consideration and respects their feelings	3.54	1.36
He is flexible in dealing with others	3.51	1.31
The dimension as a whole	3.93	0.68

mean between 4.19-3.51. So, the researchers attribute the total dimension of personality traits and all its items to a high degree of evaluation to the good selection of faculty staff and high standards of selection, especially, that most of the staff had been sent to Foreign and Arab prestigious universities.

Second dimension: Planning for teaching: The following table shows the means and standard deviations of the teaching layout and the dimension as a whole by descending.It is clearly shown from Table 3 that item 1 which states (students know and abide by its content plan) has the highest mean of 4.36, followed by item 2 which states "He enriches his lectures with examples of reality" with mean of 4.16 while item 14 which states "Attracts student's attention and attracts their attention" has scored the lowest mean of 3.56. Then, item 13 which states (Gives students the opportunity to conduct their own experiments in practical courses.) with mean of 3.61. It is also noted that the total dimension of the planning of teaching and all the items have been obtained a high degree of performance by standards approved in the study. This indicates the interest of a faculty staff.

The mean was of 3.93 for this dimension. Calculation of means and standard deviations of the data for the questionnaire items were on the dimension of evaluation. The following table shows the means and standard deviations of student's responses to items after the evaluation and the dimension as a whole is arranged by descending.

Table 3: The means and standard deviations of student's responses to the items

Items	Mean	SD
The students know the content plan and abide by its content	4.36	0.84
He enriches his lectures with examples of reality	4.16	0.95
He presents his lectures in an organized manner	4.10	2.31
Conducts the lecture well and effectively	4.06	0.95
The lecture starts and ends on time	4.01	1.06
Provides information clearly and comprehensively	3.99	2.78
Asks questions to provoke thinking	3.86	1.03
Abides by office hours and guides students	3.78	1.17
He is always interested in his own field	3.77	1.18
Selects bibliography covers the course content	3.69	1.21
Uses educational means to suit the nature of the course	3.66	1.17
The spirit of competition among students	3.63	1.16
Gives students the opportunity to conduct their own experiments in practical courses	3.61	1.25
Attracts student's attention and attracts their attention	3.56	1.29
The dimension as a whole	3.87	0.86

Table 4: The means and standard deviations of student's responses to items after the evaluation

Items	Mean	SD
Tells the students about the results of their exams and the other duties they are assigned to perform	4.11	1.11
His tests are comprehensive	3.69	1.15
All types of tests are used according to the nature of the course, whether practical, objective or essay, and other types of tests	3.63	1.17
The marks are distributed to test questions at reasonable rates and according to the importance of the question	3.62	1.24
He is fair in terms of evaluating students	3.56	1.21
Provide students with correct answers to test questions	3.55	1.29
Allows students to discuss and review tests	3.47	1.28
He is accurate when evaluating students	3.44	1.18
Prepares clear and understandable test questions	3.39	1.29
Makes the test time sufficient to answer all questions	3.29	1.35
Total dimension	3.53	1.21

Table 4 indicates that the means of the total dimension of the evaluation is of 3.53 and at a high level according to the criteria adopted in the study. It is also noted that the mean of the items of this dimension ranged from 3.29-4.11. While the item states "Tells the students about the results of their exams and the other duties they are assigned to perform" was at the highest mean 4.11, followed by item "His tests are comprehensive" with a mean of 3.96. Generally, it is noted that the first six items in the table in this dimension obtained a high score while the other four had a mean between 3.29-3.47 and it is a medium degree according to the criteria adopted. It is indicated that university faculty staff should allow students to discuss and review tests and give them sufficient time for the exam.

Question 2: are there significant level of differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the reality of the evaluation due to the variable type of student (male/female)? To answer this

Table 5: The results of (T) test for the estimates of the participants of the sample according to gender variable

Dimensions	Gender	Number	Mean	SD	t-values	Sig.
Personal traits and human relations	Male	170	3.97	0.68	0.433	0.665
	Female	266	3.93	0.76		
Planning for teaching	Male	170	3.94	0.61	0.910	0.364
	Female	266	3.87	0.63		
Evaluation	Male	170	3.64	0.76	0.766	0.444
	Female	266	3.57	0.70		
Scale as a whole	Male	170	3.87	11.02	0.824	0.410
	Female	266	3.80	13.01		

Table 6: The results of t-test for the student's estimates according to college variable

Dimensions	Gender	Number	Mean	SD	t-values	Sig.
Personal traits and human relations	Humanities	220	4.03	0.68	1.973	0.049*
	Scientific	216	3.86	0.67		
Planning for teaching	Humanities	220	3.91	0.66	2.081	0.067*
	Scientific	216	3.74	0.51		
Evaluation	Humanities	220	3.63	0.75	1.897	0.059*
	Scientific	216	3.49	0.63		
Scale as a whole	Humanities	220	3.87	0.59	2.021	0.089*
	Scientific	216	3.066	0.48		

*Statistical significant at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

question and to know whether there are statistically significant differences between the means and the standard deviations of the student's evaluation of the performance of the faculty according to the gender variable (male/female), the t-test was used to determine this.

The results of Table 5 indicate that there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) which are attributed to the effect of the gender variable of the three dimensions and the scale as a whole. Also, the results are consistent with the results of most of the studies on the same variable in the absence of statistically significant differences due to the gender variable such as Al-Jafreh, 2015; Al-Habahbeh, 2008).

Question 3: are there any statistically significant differences at the level at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the reality of the evaluation due to the variable student college (humanities/scientific)? To answer this question and to know whether there are statistically significant differences between the means and the standard deviations of the student's estimates of the performance of faculty staff according to the college variable (humanities, scientific)? t-test was used.

Table 6 obviously, show that there are statistically significant differences due to the variable of the college and in favor of the humanities colleges on both the macro scale and all dimensions (personal traits, human relations, planning of teaching and evaluation). This result is therefore, consistent with the results of studies. Differences in this particular dimension may be attributed to the favor of the faculties of humanities for the nature and flexibility and to allow them time to express their views better than in scientific ones.

Table 7: The results of the analysis of the variance according to academic level

Variables/Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean of squares	t-values	Sig.
Personal traits and human relations					
Among groups	2.097	3	0.699	1.514	0.211
Within groups	153.321	432	0.462		
Total	155.481	435			
Planning for teaching					
Among groups	1.197	3	0.399		
Within groups	130.861	432	0.349	1.012	0.387
Total	132.058	435			
Evaluation					
Among groups	1.205	3	0.402	0.782	0.505
Within groups	170.495	432	0.514		
Total	171.700	435			
Scale as a whole					
Among groups	1.093	3	0.364	1.109	0.345
Within groups	109.085	432	0.329		
Total	110.178	435			

* Statistical significant at $(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

Question 4: are there statistically significant differences level at $(\alpha \leq 0.05)$ in the reality of the evaluation due to the variable level of the student (first, second, third, fourth)? To answer this question and to know if there were statistically significant differences between the means and the standard deviations of the student's estimates of the performance of the faculty according to the variable of the academic level (first, second, third or fourth year) on the three dimensions and on the scale as a whole.

As shown in Table 7 there are no statistically significant differences in the academic level (first, second, third or fourth year) on all dimensions and on the scale as a whole. So, this result is consisted with the study results of Al-Jarrah and Sheriffeen (2010) which showed no differences due to the student's level of education.

CONCLUSION

In addition, the results of the study also showed statistically significant differences due to the effect of college variable and in favor of humanities colleges. While there was no statistically significant difference due to gender and study level. However, the researchers have suggested several recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this study, the researchers recommend several recommendations and suggestions: the necessity to provide students feedback on their performance in the quarterly research, give them sufficient time for examinations and discuss the results with them. The faculty staff should endeavor to develop teaching methods that focus on the self-learning of the students, involve them in the dialogue and reduce the method of direct lecture. Holding training researchshops for faculty staff at the university to develop their teaching skills and develop appropriate assessment tools for the performance of their students.

Exchanging of experiences among faculty staff through attending lectures of distinguished professors and exchanging of teaching experiences among universities. Conducting further studies on the evaluation of teaching performance from the perspective of students on other variables.

REFERENCES

Abdulhak, L.M and A.L. Bubshait, 2004. Student-teacher human relations as perceived by university female students. Sci. J. King Faisal Univ. Hum. Manage., 5: 171-196.

Al-Ashqar, Y.H., E.H. Al-Louh and K.A. Mons, 2012. [The degree of practice of the faculty member in the Palestinian universities for human relations from the perspective of his students (In Arabic)]. IUG J. Educ. Psychol. Sci., 20: 405-435.

Al-Ghazewat, M., 2005. Evaluation of teaching competencies among faculty staff at the Faculty of Educational Sciences at Mu'tah University from the perspective of students of social studies. J. Faculty Educ. United Arab Emirates Univ., 22: 141-157.

Al-Habbaha, A.E., 2008. Evaluation of postgraduate students performance of faculty staff at Al-Balqa Applied University. J. Union Arab Univ., 51: 613-641.

Al-Jafreh, A.S.Y., 2015. Effectiveness of the performance of faculty staff at Zarqa University from the point of view sought in the light of the quality standards of education. Stud. Educ. Sci., 42: 139-155.

Al-Jafri, I.H., 2002. Views of postgraduate students in the teaching performance of faculty staff at Umm Al Qura University. Educ. Mag., 60: 111-152.

Al-Jarrah, A.N. and N. Al-Shirfeen, 2010. The distinctive features of the active faculty staff at Yarmouk University from the point of view of students in the light of some variables. J. Fed. Arab Univ. Educ. Psychol., 8: 87-112.

Al-Mahboob, A.R., 2000. Evaluation of the teaching performance of faculty staff at King Faisal University from the perspective of the students of the University. King Saud J., 12: 241-266.

Al-Najjar, H., 2009. A proposed program to train the faculty staff of Al-Aqsa University on the innovations of educational technology in light of their training needs. J. Islamic Sci. Ser. Human., 17: 709-751.

Batah, A. and R. Al-Saud, 1999. Evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of faculty staff at Mutah University from the point of view of their students. Stud., 26: 472-483.

Greenwald, A.G. and G.M. Gillmore, 1997. No pain, no gain? The importance of measuring course researchload in student ratings of instruction. J. Educ. Psychol., 89: 743-751.

Mokhlafi, A.S., 2007. Evaluation of faculty staff from their point of view and consideration of their students. J. Stud. Educ. Res., 4: 105-120.

Shehata, H. and A.F. Al-Khail, 2001. Teaching and evaluation of the university (future critical study). Message Gulf Arab, 88: 12-50.

White, L.J., 1995. Efforts by departments of economics to assess teaching effectiveness: Results of an informal survey. J. Econ. Educ., 26: 81-85.