



Pelagia Research Library

European Journal of Experimental Biology, 2013, 3(4):165-172



An investigation of performance evaluation index from the perspective of Islamic Azad University of Tabriz faculty members in 2012

Akbar Jesarati¹, Nasser Rahmat², Salar Ghanbari Erdi³, Hossein Babazadeh³, Yosef Hajnazary³ and Asgar Jesarati⁴

¹Young Researchers and Elite Club, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

²Department of Educational Administration, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran

³Department of Educational Administration, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

⁴Department of Geography, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the performance evaluation index from the viewpoint of faculty members of Islamic Azad University of Tabriz (IAUT) in 2012 year. This study population consisted of all faculty members of Islamic Azad University of Tabriz in the year 2012 to 2013 to 475 people, 365 males and 110 females separately and the sample was based on Korjersy and Morgan, 212 faculty members have been selected from the population. To select a sample multi-stage sampling method was used. For this purpose, four faculties were then randomly selected among the existing universities, including faculties of (Humanities and Education, Economics and accounting, Science and Engineering), respectively. In second stage minimum of 40 and maximum of 60 people were randomly selected. The data collection methods: methodology is descriptive survey and regarding purpose is of fundamental research. Research findings showed that the highest average score for the Index of Teaching is devoted to the component of "encouraging students to research" with an average of (4/31), for scientific and Administrative services index is devoted to the component of "managing scientific publications." with an average of (3/92), for Professional advice and Service index is devoted to the component of "providing scientific advice to organizations" with an average of (3/65), the Professional Research and Development Initiatives, index is devoted to the component of "designing and operating laboratories and workshops." with an average of (4/91), for flagship program index is devoted to the component of " participation in sports activities " with an average of (3/66), for Cultural and Educational Activities index is devoted to the component of " giving priority to research and development in cultural activities " with an average of (3/48), for Educational Activities index is devoted to the component of "MS thesis Supervisor" with an average of (3/76). Results showed that the most significant index in performance evaluation of IAUT faculty members was teaching index and educational activities the least important criteria

Key words: index, performance assessment, viewpoint, faculty members, university

INTRODUCTION

The performance evaluation is the process of formal evaluation and notify employees about the duties and Responsibilities assigned and traits, qualities and characteristics desired and identify potential employees for growth

and prosperity in various aspects [1]. One of the most challenging issues that the universities are facing is appropriate methods for evaluation of the faculty members' performance. Today, the evaluation system regarding the capabilities and performance of faculty members is an obvious need. But in practice it is not easy to establish such a system. Several methods and approaches for evaluating teaching faculty there [15]. Most researches in the field suggested using four approaches to assessment, including assessment by students, peer assessment, self-evaluation and evaluation by managers [11]. Faculty members' performance evaluation is one of the main tools in training activities, it can be acknowledged that evaluation is a systematic way to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the program and that sometimes awareness of the results and feedback will lead to effective decisions and improving performance [14]. Accordingly, evaluation of training and education is also important, and each year, universities and institutions of higher education, in order to enhance the quality of education, improvement of teaching methods, increasing scientific and research level, and make use of reasonable decision on how to hire, promote and financial assessment of faculty members performance' evaluation [10]. Undoubtedly, given the central role of faculty academic programs, research and teaching universities, can be effective in their performance evaluation. In this regard, there are two main points which considering them will make more effective processes evaluation, evaluation Method of determining and defining indicators and issues that must be tested [13].

Therefore, for a comprehensive evaluation of faculty members' performance evaluation purposes and to provide a consistent and reliable data for future decisions, university faculty members' performance evaluation should be conducted in a comprehensive process. A comprehensive approach to the different data sources and multiple criteria should be used to collect data. While in the practice of teaching faculty members, other aspects are also tested. For example, research performance, counseling and services, are among significant functional aspects of faculty members' performance evaluation [7]. Designing and evaluation of performance indicators, including those that are of particular interest in academic circles and in the community, has been applied. What is more important than anything in this section is the relevance of these indicators with the goals of the organization [15][11].

In one of the studies conducted by Zafarghandi et al (1997) in relation to the examination of Tehran University problems and its affiliated faculties from the perspective of faculty members, they mentioned most of the problems were lack of law, lack of planning, lack of Educational considerations, management problems, lack of financial problems consideration [21]. Gorji and Siyami (2008) in their study investigated and identified criteria to evaluate the performance of faculty members of Azad University. The main question of this study was: What are the criteria for optimal performance evaluation of faculty members at the University? After identification and introducing common criteria from students and professors, they analyzed the results of the research hypotheses; results showed among the evaluation criteria scores and scores of faculty members, there are significant differences. Therefore, the research hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between evaluation criteria and the performance of faculty members, is confirm and statistical hypotheses is rejected [4].

Rajabi and Popzan (2010) in a research investigated the integration of qualitative and quantitative methods in order to design a tool to evaluate the performance of faculty members. After investigating students, professors, etc views. ((Faculty members' performance evaluation packet)) (FMPE) is designed which includes a variety of parts and faculty members from different directions and by different people, are tested. Academic performance, research performance, and personal features and professional responsibilities of faculty members, are among the areas that they tested in their research through FMPE [13].

Malekshahi et al (2010) in a study investigated faculty members' views on some educational indicators in Lorestan University of Medical Sciences. Their findings showed that 9% of the faculty members said teaching methodology workshops did not fit with their educational needs. But the majority said the continuous workshops were necessary. Also faculty members asked for education officials' consideration of educational problems, field coordination with community needs participatory decision making, the proportion of students with learning facilities and manpower. Their research appears in such high regard to quality and quantity of the authorities and continuing education workshops and solving educational problems and thus they recommend using greater faculty members' involvement in educational planning and management [12].

Georgia State University studied faculty members' annual performance evaluation by the philosophy that evaluation must be something more than a mere evaluation. Flexibility, encouraging, professional development, and efforts to improve school standards are among their aims. Faculty evaluation will be based on two main criteria. Evaluation of teaching, research and service and evaluation of developmental activities for flexibility, five-set or job description

(traditional, educational, research, service and management), with clear expectations and objectives [8]. At Sam Houston State University studied faculty members' evaluation in a systematic and comprehensive way. The system is designed to increase objectivity and reducing bias. There are four criteria: effective teaching approach, working professionals and researchers, and professional development activities and non-academic activities of the faculty members and each of these criteria are weighted. The system attempts to take the subjectivity out of the evaluation and consider the effectiveness criteria [9].

Underlying philosophy of valuation model of faculty members at the University of North Carolina Pembroke is that evaluation is a complex process and should improve equal logical and consist level for all individuals. The model must be performed in such a way that improves development, success and satisfaction of faculty members while advancing the mission of the university. All faculty members' activities are evaluated in the three areas of teaching, research and service [14]. Because of the great importance of education 50 to 70% devoted to education. Research and Evaluation Services, each allocated between 10 to 40 percent of evaluation. Kansas State University evaluated faculty member's performance in these three dimensions qualitatively and quantitatively [11]. In the evaluation of faculty members' qualifications and quality of work done at the University of Minnesota sixth criterion - reference is based on a 1 to 10 scale. Product quality and performance standards will be judged based on [16]. In this system, special attention is paid to the quality of the faculty members [8]. Many colleges know profile 8 as valid tools to examine the performance of faculty members. Profile of a faculty members' performance may include a description of the objectives and philosophy of education, his responsibilities, performance standards, course details 1, and techniques of teaching, activities, self-development and professional development and written evidences of effective teaching which is revised annually and shows the overall enhancement [6].

A criterion of faculty members' performance at the University of Missouri (2006) is based on its mission and goals. University faculty members are expected requirements and ethical standards in all areas of their performance. Educational mission of the University of Missouri is training educated people. Criteria and aims training effectiveness evaluation of faculty members are in two parts: the development of educated people and providing exceptional quality of teaching style. Up to 50 percent of the weight of training field evaluation is by students. Research mission of the university is that research process is to support the development and transfer of knowledge, student participation, enhancing the quality and effectiveness of public education from basic and applied research results. Service performance of the faculty members has three aims: supporting collaborative management, supporting the needs of the organization and the benefit to society [3].

Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing in America provided a comprehensive and evidence-based evaluation system for faculty members which end-stage data is provided for horizontal and vertical ongoing development and promotion decisions. In this system, three sources (students, peers, and school records) are used for evaluation. Both the coaching and management structure are created for effective use. Using such comprehensive and evidence-based systems is necessary to documentation, analyze and improve the effectiveness of training, ensuring the quality of teaching and learning [1].

Cuenin (1994) in a study investigated performance indicators at 70 universities in 15 countries, and came to the conclusion that universities which use more performance indicators (including indicators of excellence) when compared to other universities have higher quality of promotion [2].

Generally, it seems that using the experiences and viewpoints of faculty members can play an important role in the development of more appropriate performance evaluation index and help solve existing problems and improve the educational levels, research and administration. Evaluation parameters in this study for determining evaluation status of to improve the three levels in IAUT were teaching, academic administration services, consulting and professional services, research and development of professional extracurricular, cultural and training activities, educational activities. It seems investigating opinions of those involved in education, research and administrative activities increase the validity of faculty members' performance evaluation and help authorities achieve an evaluation purpose which is improving quality. Therefore, his study aimed to determine the performance evaluation index of IAUT in 2012. Therefore, this study aims to investigate points which investigate performance evaluation index of IAUT from the view point of faculty members in 2012.

Research Question

1. What are performance evaluation components of faculty members of IAUT?

2. How are priority indicators of faculty performance evaluation of IAUT?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study population consisted of all faculty members of Islamic Azad University, Tabriz; which were employed in academic units in 2011-2012 according to gender (male or female) were of 475 cases. The sampling method is Multi-stage sampling. For this purpose, among the existing faculties 4 faculties were randomly selected including, (Humanities and Education, Economics and Accounting, Science and Engineering), respectively. In the second phase minimum of 40 and maximum of 60 people were selected randomly.

and the sample size is 212 people based on korjesy and Morgan tables separately for men and women. The data collection methods: methodology is descriptive survey and regarding purpose is of fundamental research.

A questionnaire was used to collect the required information which consists of 30 questions and 7 components and a 5 item Likert scale (high importance, relatively high, moderate, low, and very low). The respondent can choose one scales of 1-5 in a way that (that higher numbers indicate more agreement than is lower number). After data collection, they were analyzed using SPSS 18 software. Information obtained was in the form of descriptive statistics (mean, percentage and relative and absolute frequency) and statistical tests were used for data analysis. To calculate the reliability of each component and to check the validity of each of the seven components after completing the questionnaire, the Cronbach's Alpha was used. The ratio obtained is 0/921.

Table 1: Faculty Member's Population

Total	Male		Female		Gender Indicators
	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	
475	%76	365	%24	110	Total

Table 2: Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Faculty Member's

Total	Male		Female		Gender Indicators
	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	
212	%76	162	% 24	50	Total

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study showed that the highest percentage in male faculty members (162) with a frequency of 76% and female group (110) people with a frequency of 24%.

In terms of academic rank, the frequency of coaches and instructors was (47/16), assistant professors (36/79) Associate Professor (12/73) and Professors (3/32) were respectively the highest. Results showed that the highest percentage of participants (46/69) had less than 10 years of work experience (42/45) of participants had over 10 years of experience. Based on literature review and theoretical studies, performance evaluation index in the study were categorized under 7 components and 30 subcomponents. Components and subcategories of each category separately identified and were evaluated by questionnaires. Data for each category were analyzed separately.

The First Question of the Study: What are performance evaluation components of faculty members of Islamic Azad University of Tabriz?

Considering the review of the related literature and research, extracted components are:

A – Teaching B – Scientific and executive Services C - Consulting and Professional Services D - Research and professional development E - Extra activities F - Cultural and educational activities G - Educational Activities

The results showed that the highest mean score for each of the components of teaching in order to "encourage students to research" mean (4/31), "a plan to teach" average (4/22) and " holistic and deep in content, " with a mean (4/18) was awarded.

The Highest mean score for the component Services administrative science as "scientific managing editor of" The Average (3/92), "Manager internal prestigious journal" with a mean (3/86) and "accept part of the responsibility of management." the mean (3/83) was awarded.

Most of the results of the principal component scores consulting and professional services in order to "provide scientific advice to organizations" with a mean (3/65), "the consulting services offered to students" with mean (3/63) and "number of short-term counseling provided by "average (3/43) was awarded.

Average score for the professional component of most research and development in order to "Design and operation of laboratories and workshops," with a mean (4/91), "Design and operation of workshops and research" mean (4/83) and "Translation and authored the book "mean (4/81) was awarded.

The highest mean score for program components in order to "participate in sports activities" mean (3/66), "Participation in political activities" mean (3/47) and "participation in social activities" mean (3 / 46) Was Awarded The highest mean score for cultural activities and educational initiatives in order to "give priority to research and Development in cultural activities" mean (3/48), "having interest in extracurricular activities" with mean (3/26) and "Cooperation in the cultural programs of the agency" to mean (3/25) was awarded.

Highest scores, respectively, for components of educational activities, "the master's dissertation supervisor" mean (3/76), "the judgment of master's thesis" mean (3/58) and "Master thesis, Course Guide PhD "with Average (3/42) was awarded.

Table 3: Distribution of comments by faculty members on consulting and professional services

Consulting And Professional Services Index	very low	Relatively low	Average	Relatively high	highly important
Providing scientific advice to organizations	5.2%	7.5%	31.6%	28.3%	27.4%
The delivery of services to students	2.4%	8.0%	38.2%	26.9%	25.4%
The number of short-term counseling courses offered	3.8%	16.0%	33.0%	29.7%	17.5%
Knowledge sharing between partners in training sessions	2.8%	14.2%	37.3%	28.8%	17.0%

The results in Table (1) showed more than 56% of faculty members considered academic advising to organizations of great importance and relatively high importance while only 12% considered it insignificant. Provision of services to students with 51% and short-term counseling courses offered with 47 percent by faculty members as relatively important.

Table 4: Distribution of comments by faculty members on the educational and cultural activities index

Educational And Cultural Activities	very low	Relatively low	Average	Relatively high	Highly important
Having an interest in cultural activities	6.1%	14.2%	39.2%	25.0%	22.2%
Give priority to research and development in cultural activities	1.9%	16.5%	34.9%	19.3%	21.7%
Cooperation in cultural programs of the University	9 %	18.4%	32.5%	18.4%	20.8%
Participation in Group Cultural Events	5.7%	23.1%	31.6%	20.8%	18.9%
participating in the cultural program of the faculty	11.3%	17.0%	37.7%	20.3%	13.7%

According to (Table 4) more than 47 percent of faculty members believed tha having an interest in cultural activities and nearly 41 percent of faculty members" giving priority to research and development was of high importance, andt the relatively high. Cooperation in cultural programs of the university and program components of cultural groups included with respectively 39% and a relatively high importance from the perspective of faculty.

Table 5: Distribution of comments by faculty members on research and professional development index

Research And Professional Development	very low	Relatively low	Average	Relatively high	highly important
Design and operation of a laboratory or workshop etc.	9%	3.8%	25.9%	30.7%	38.7%
Design and operation of workshops and research	6.1%	11.3%	22.6%	33.0%	31.6%
Translation and book authorship	6.1%	9.9%	19.3%	28.3%	32.6%
Participation in professional associations	2.8%	6.6%	36.3%	27.8%	26.4%

According to Table (5) components of lab design and set up shop and close to 69% of component.

According to faculty members design and operation of workshops and research with 64% and 59% of translation shows importance of these components are pretty much out of sight.

Table 6: Distribution of faculty attitudes toward teaching Index

Teaching Index	very low	Relatively low	moderate	Relatively high	Highly important
Encouraging students to research	0 %	3.3%	17.0%	30.2%	54.7%
Having a plan for teaching	9%	3.3%	20.3%	25.0%	51.4%
Holistic and deep content,	0 %	8.5%	13.2%	24.1%	48.1%
Having a lesson plan	9%	6.1%	18.4%	30.2%	44.3%
Providing opportunities for students to think	0%	8.5%	17.7%	29.2%	44.3%
Student participation in teaching	2.8%	5.2%	27.4%	27.8%	36.8%

Results Table (6) shows that according to faculty members, encouraging students to research was awarded to nearly 85 percent, with 76 percent planning to teach, Holistic and deep content a 72%, respectively, relatively important.

Table 7: Distribution of faculty members' perspectives on the indicators of Extracurricular

Extracurricular Index	very low	Relatively low	Average	Relatively high	Highly important
Participation in sports activities	2.8%	14.6%	25.9%	27.4%	29.2%
Participation in political activities	9%	14.6%	24.5%	25.0%	26.9%
Participation in social activities	5.7%	14.6%	32.1%	22.2%	25.5%
Participation in artistic activities	4.7%	19.8%	29.7%	31.1%	14.6%

The results in Table (7) showed that according to faculty members, participation in sporting activities was awarded to 56 percent of high importance, nearly 52 % of the components involved in political activities and social factors contribute with 47 percent of the utmost importance.

Table 8: Distribution of comments by faculty members on scientific administrative Services Index

Index of Administrative Scientific Services	very low	Relatively low	Average	Relatively high	Highly important
Managing scientific publications	0%	10.4%	25.5%	39.6%	36.8%
Scientific publications manager	1.4%	10.4%	31.1%	27.4%	31.6%
Accepting part of the responsibility of management	4.2%	1.9%	24.5%	25.5%	29.7%

Results Table (8) shows according to faculty members, managing editor of validated scientific journals was awarded more than 76 % very important and relatively important, nearly 59% of internal scientific publications manager and acceptance of managerial responsibility by 55 percent, to relatively and highly important

Table 9: Distribution of comments by faculty members on educational activities index

Educational Activities	very low	Relatively low	Average	Relatively high	Highly important
Supervisor of Masters Theses	3.80%	13.7%	21.7%	24.5%	36.3%
Arbitration of Masters Theses	10.4%	17.0%	18.4%	28.3%	25.9%
Supervisor of PhD thesis	2.8%	15.6%	27.8%	28.8%	25.0%
Participation in the formulation of strategic plans	3.8%	8.5%	32.1%	31.6%	24.1%

The results in Table (9) shows that according to faculty members, nearly 61 percent of master's thesis supervision, more than 54 percent of the judgment of masters theses and PhD supervisor of more than 53 percent had high importance

Second Research Question: how are priority performance indicators for evaluating faculty of Islamic Azad University of Tabriz?

In order to determine the difference between the performance evaluation indexes of Tabriz Islamic Azad University faculty members from each of the seven factors Friedman test1 was used according to Table (10), that ultimately it was observed that from the view point of teaching staff rank of 6/75, research and professional development rating of 6/15, consulting and professional services ranking of 5/09 , executive and Scientific Services executive rating criteria of 3/00 , extra activities ranking of 2/75 , educational activities ranking of 2/46, and cultural and educational factor ranking of 1/80 were obtained that this difference is based on criterion F (SGR) = 10/61 with a significant level of $P=0/000$ (which actually means less than 0/0001). The difference between university faculty members' Viewpoint performance evaluation is based on the seven components and the most significant (important) indicators of faculty members' Viewpoint performance evaluation is "Teaching" and the lowest (least) is index of "Cultural and Training Activities".

Table 10: Friedman test for differences in faculty members' Viewpoint performance evaluation of University

cultural and training activities	Educational activities	Extra activities	Scientific and executive activities	Consulting and professional activities	Research and professional development	Teaching	Factors
1/80	2/46	2/75	3/00	5/09	6/15	6/75	Average Rankings

Significance level	Range of Freedom	Chi Square	Number
0/000	6	1061/597	212

CONCLUSION

1. The first and most important factor of the proposed model is teaching
2. The least important component is cultural and training activities index.
3. From the perspective of faculty members, the second index was research and development, the third consulting and professional services, fourth, scientific and administrative services index, fifth Extracurricular, sixth educational activities and seventh training and cultural activities.

The results of this study is aligning with PapZan and Rajabi's (2010) results which considered the educational performance, academic performance, research performance, characteristics, and professional responsibilities, including the areas of faculty performance. The results of Malekshahi et al (2008) who believe that educational initiatives, research, teaching and professional development should be considered in the evaluation of faculty performance are aligning with the results of this research study. Georgian and Siyami (2008), which measures faculty members' performance evaluation consists of several various components in a teaching, research, training and implementation services in universities which are aligning with this study result. also the three components (education, research, and executive services) which are used in performance evaluation of the faculty members at Johns Hopkins University in America, University of Georgia, University of North Carolina Pembroke (2006), University of Kansas, University of Minnesota (2003), Missouri State University (2005), and Sam Houston state University and is with similar results. According to the research results and experiences gained during the implementation of the research, the researcher offers the following two proposals:

Practical Suggestions

1. Summary and abstract of research is programmatically available to all faculty members, managers, departments, deans, and assistants of university. And binding upon, each of them was responsible to form a functional certificate recorded in their workbook. In fact in this way we can improve self-reporting, and self-regulation in the performance of faculty members.
2. Supervision and evaluation office of University uses approved indicators in faculty members' performance Evaluation.
3. Indicators of faculty Members' Performance evaluation shall be communicated clearly to faculty and academic staff.
4. Managers and officials of the Islamic Azad University of Tabriz paid close attention to main indicators and sub-divisions of the proposed model in faculty members' evaluation and ranking promotion.

Research Proposals

1. The study was conducted on full-time faculty members'; we can set the ground for this study to be replicated with the masters of, part-time and run-time also.
2. These variables will be studied with other tools such as interviews and observation will also be studied.
3. Given the dimensions of faculty members' performance in almost all universities under the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology is the same, so it is suggested that similar studies be carried out in other universities, by other researchers

REFERENCES

- [1] Esnaashari Amiri. A, *European J of Experimental Biology*. **2012**, 3, 6: 4069-4076.
 [2] Cuenin. S, The use of performance indicators in universities. *Jesses caking slay*. **1994**.

- [3] Dailey, A, et al, Park University; Accreditation preparation: Faculty Evaluation Model Based on WCET Best Practice Standards. [Online].< [http: //Chiron. Valdosta .edu/whuitt / files/tcheva l.html](http://www.Conference.wcet.info /2004/ presentations /documents/linda_pass amaneck _ accreditation .ppt >.sss, 2004.</p><p>[4] Gorji, M and S. Siyami, <i>Journal of Knowledge Management</i>. 2007, 5 , 11.</p><p>[5] Ghourchian, N., A. Khorshidi, Performance indicators to improve the quality of management education, Tehran: Farashenakhtiyeh Andishe Publication. 2000.</p><p>[6] Gordon. P.A., Running head: Student evaluations of college instructors. Online .<a href=). **2005** .
- [7] Hejazi, Y and F. Rostami, *J of Agricultural, Economics and Development*, **2010**, 2, 3.
- [8] Kamkary, K, Sharbati, and Sh. Shokrzadeh, *European J of Experimental Biology*,, **2012**, 2, 6: 2505-2511.
- [9] Mahmoudi, J. and Ghahremani, J, *European J of Experimental Biology*, **2012**, 2, 5: 1423-1429.
- [10] Kitchel, T., R.J. Shane and J. Charles Cordell, *NACTA Journal*. **2007**, 3, 52.
- [11] Javadian, M. and M. Ghorbani Kordi, *European J of Experimental Biology*. **2012**, 2 ,3: 708-714.
- [12] Malekshahi, F. Sheikh. Ali and MJ Tarrahi, *J of Nursing Research*. **2010**, 5,19.
- [13] Rajabi, S. and A. Pop Zan, *Journal of Higher Education*, **2010**, 3, 1.
- [14] Hosseini, S.S, Lotfollahzadeh, R. and B. Talebi, *European J of Experimental Biology*, **2013**, 3 , 1 : 312-315.
- [15] Safi, M.H, Falahi Khoshknab, M., Russell, M., and M. Rahgozar, *J of Quarterly monitoring*. **2011**, 1, 4 .
- [16] Staples. J. Department of Family Practice Community Health, University of Minnesota : Faculty evaluation and Merit Review System, Scale Rating the Quality. Productivity of research and research related:[Online]>[[http: //www. med.Umn.edu/ fp/rsrch / pdfs / research. pdf >](http://www. med.Umn.edu/ fp/rsrch / pdfs / research. pdf >)]. [20/05/2005]
- [17] The Missouri State University,. Faculty Handbook Proposed Revision for Section, January. [Online]. <http://www. Missouri state .edu / provest / faculty Evaluation. doc .> [25/05/2006].
- [18] The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, Homepage .[The University of North Carolina at Pembroke (UNCP) Faculty Evaluation Model] .Online> [http://www .uncp.edu /aa/handbook/01-02/pdf/ Chapter_4A-1_11 .6. PDF ,2000].
- [19] University of Minnesota: School of Nursing,.: 10-11(2003) Bylaws. Section C .(Faculty Evaluation Committee) FEC.[Online > .[www . Nursing .umn.edu /img /10404/ By Laws_ 08_13_03 .pdf >],[23/04/2006]
- [20] University of South Carolina, College of Nursing. College of Nursing Evaluation Plan Online. <www.sc.edu /nursing/college of nursing .eval .plan .pdf>.2006 , [23/04/ 2006]
- [21] Zafarghandi, M., A. Fotoohy, Rezaei, A.Sadeghniat and R. Mehrdad. *J of Tehran Uni Med.*, **1997**. 4, 6.