IJSSP

المجلة الدولية لنشر الدراسات العلمية
المجلد العاشر – العدد الثالث – البحث الثاني (ص: 19 - 49)

15 – أيلول – 2021 م

www.ijssp.com ISSN: 2707-5184 International Journal of Scientific Studies Publishing

[The Reality of Evaluation Practices in Palestinian Universities from the Point of View of Faculty Members]

[Israa Mahmoud Qashou]
[(PhD Student – Educational Administration – American Arab University – Palestine) 2020/2021]

Abstract:

The study aimed to identify the evaluation practices in Palestinian universities from the point of view of the faculty members, and the study sample which amounted to (247) faculty members was chosen in a random stratified method, and to achieve the study purpose a questionnaire was designed and developed to collect data. And to analyze the results means, standard deviations, one _way ANOVA, Scheffe test, and Pearson correlation coefficient were calculated.

1. The evaluation practices in Palestinian universities from the viewpoint of the faculty members were high.

2. The existence of statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in evaluation practices in Palestinian universities from the viewpoint of faculty members due to the variable (university, grade, experience).

The study recommends developing the competencies of faculty members in the areas of evaluation practices, especially with regard to building and designing tests in light of good test design standards, through the establishment of training courses and specialized workshops.

Key words: Evaluation practices, Faculty members, Palestinian universities

Introduction:

The world today lives in an era full of renewable variables in various scientific, technological, cultural and educational fields, which have become so intertwined that the world is similar to one society. Since nowadays, information moves from one place to another at a very fast pace, which makes its parts, regions and peoples affected by all the transformations and changes taking place in any part of the world. Hence, the reality in which people live is different from what it was in the past, and in this sense, education is the backbone of the changes and renewable developments that guarantee nations rapid development in human resources.

Higher education institutions have witnessed rapid and successive developments in recent years that have affected their vision, mission, values and goals. These institutions are no longer traditional institutions based on performing normal functions. The developed and developing societies have become dependent on them for their renaissance, development, maintaining their leadership, or upgrading them from developing countries to advanced countries. Education with its institutions is the title of the renaissance of nations along with their progress and prosperity. Education, in general, is the

basis for any meaningful development. Investment in the workforce has been recognized over the years as a basis for increasing productivity and promoting economic development (مراد، 2016).
The process of advancing higher education requires an integrated system of evaluation practices that includes all decision-making parties, whether it is at the level of the sector as a whole or at the level of universities. Evaluative practices are the key to accessing higher education of high value, level and content (دعمس، 2014).

The evaluation process is important for all levels within the organization, starting from the top management and ending with the employees. In order for the process to achieve the intended results, it must be dealt with in a systematic and accurate manner, with the participation of all parties that can benefit from the results. Such as his performance methods, the change in the skill and knowledge characteristics of the employees, and the change in the natural factors, which was reflected in fundamental changes in the nature of the organizations' work, impose on the organizations the need to think seriously about defining systems for evaluating the performance of their employees and investing the results of the crisis in charting paths for the activities of human resources departments (Pepe, 2010).

The evaluation process is based on several principles that must be observed or paid attention to in order to be effective and lead to correct decisions. Perhaps the most important of these principles (Abbott, 2016): The necessity of determining the purpose of the evaluation or defining what we want to do, if the purpose is not clear, it is difficult to judge the feasibility of the evaluation process. Also, paying attention to the selection and development of appropriate evaluation tools for the purpose of the evaluation is very important. Furthermore, (العبسي، 2010) sees the need for the evaluator or evaluation team to be aware of the potential sources of errors in the evaluation process, which in its entirety depend on the construction, application, and interpretation of the evaluation tools.

Hence, it must be emphasized the need to move in the field of educational evaluation towards adopting a new type of evaluation based on performance, which is known as the real evaluation. This evaluation has many names in the literature of education such as: realistic evaluation, alternative evaluation, authentic evaluation, and so on. No matter how many and varied it is, all of them aim towards showing the student's achievements and measuring them in real situations, through evaluation of academic programs and student services, evaluation of human, material and financial resources, and evaluation related to management, scientific research and creativity (Mueller, 2012). Therefore, this study comes to find out the evaluation practices in Palestinian universities from the point of view of the faculty members, given the importance of the evaluator's awareness of the different evaluation process. The faculty members' awareness of the evaluation process, through decisions that provide ideas and support freedom and equality through its standards of transparency, accountability and participation, has increased interest in it in order to achieve a qualitative shift in the administration from the traditional to the orientalist administration of the future in order to improve performance for the quality and excellence of the outputs and due to the positive impact evaluative practices had on organizations that are considered leaders in their field of work in terms of management through improving performance and the quality and excellence of outputs.

Study problem:

Evaluation practices are one of the basic elements in the educational process as a whole. Rather, they are considered an urgent and necessary need to find out the real reality of the learner's education in order to avoid the negatives and weaknesses immediately, and to transform the educational evaluation process from a mere recollection of information to a real practice that is measured on the ground. The successive developments in various fields have been imposed on contemporary organizations, including universities, to respond, adapt and change with these developments, to ensure their continuity and interaction with society and the environment, and all the influential factors surrounding them. However, many organizations, including Palestinian universities, have not kept pace with the change in the direction of employing evaluation practices in the performance of their tasks, functions and operations; which makes it in need to employ and use evaluation practices in the required development and change processes.

In order to achieve this, it is necessary to develop an organizational policy characterized by experimentation and boldness in decision-making, striving for creativity, innovation and full knowledge of work and its requirements, and focusing on adopting organizational policies to improve work, whether at the level of regulations, laws and legislation, or at the level of work, organizational structure, provided services, and the policies followed, and accordingly, the problem of this study lies in an attempt to measure the evaluation practices in Palestinian universities from the point of view of the faculty members. Hence, the main study question is: What is the reality of evaluation practices in Palestinian universities from the point of view of faculty members?

The importance of the study:

The importance of the current study emerges from the nature of the evaluation process itself and its practices on which judgments and decisions are based. Therefore, studying the reality of these evaluation practices in universities would provide faculty members and educational decision-makers with feedback that helps them to know to what extent these practices are consistent or to what level they differ with the nature of the continuous evaluation method in order to develop and improve the evaluation process, and then the teaching and learning process. In addition to providing continuous feedback on weaknesses in both traditional and modern of the evaluation practices.

The importance of this study can be summarized in the following points:

1- Subjecting the factors affecting evaluation practices to study and application may give a clear importance within the scientific framework of modern management methods in acquiring knowledge and skills, making them more efficient and effective.

2- It is possible to give faculty members feedback on their efficiency in carrying out their duties, as well as directing them to develop their performance in the future. From this, it becomes clear to us how important assessment practices are in order to highlight training needs, and urge faculty members to exert their utmost efforts in order to achieve the standards required for good performance, and then prove his entitlement to rewards and promotion (merit).

3- It may specify the criteria and standards on which evaluation practices are based, which may lead to judging average or acceptable performance as bad performance, or the opposite may happen, i.e. judging bad performance as outstanding performance. Therefore, the evaluation practices program

must be effective, and both university administrations and faculty members must understand the criteria against which the evaluation will be conducted.

Objectives of the study:

The current study aims to:

1- Identifying the evaluation practices in Palestinian universities from the point of view of the faculty members.
2- 2- To identify if there are statistically significant differences for the average estimates of the study sample about the practice of evaluation practices by Palestinian universities from the point of view of the faculty members due to the variables (gender, cumulative average, and college)?

Limitations of the study:

Human limitations: faculty members in Palestinian universities with the rank of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor.

Spatial boundaries: An-Najah National University, Palestine Technical University- Kadoorie, Al-Quds Open University with its branches.

Time limits: applied during the first semester 2021/2020. The results of this study are determined by the response of the sample members to the paragraphs of the questionnaire prepared for this purpose, according to which the information was collected, and by the psychometric characteristics of the study tool. The results of the study may only be generalized within the Palestinian environment and its similar environments.

Procedural limits: represented by the response of the study community members to the study tool, the questionnaire, and the statistical methods used in quantitative data analysis.

Previous studies:
This study aimed to identify the evaluation practices in Palestinian universities from the point of view of the faculty members. A number of previous Arab and foreign studies were presented, which focused on the opinions of the evaluation practices of faculty members, as follows:

(محاسنة، ومراد، 2020) conducted a study aimed at assessing the quality of teaching practices of university faculty members from the students' point of view. In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the study used the descriptive survey method through the questionnaire tool, which consisted of (44) items distributed over six areas (planning and commitment, teaching methods, classroom management, evaluation methods, scientific content, general behaviors) and after verifying its validity and stability, it was applied to the study sample consisted of (360) male and female students. The results of the study concluded that the level of students' appreciation of teaching practices came to a medium degree, as the total arithmetic mean of their estimates for all areas was (3.65), and the field of planning and commitment came in the first place with an average of (4.12) with a high practice, while the field of classroom management came in the sixth (last rank) with an arithmetic mean (3.26), and an average estimate of practice, and the average values of the rest of the fields ranged between (3.54-3.63) - at the average level, and the results showed that there were no statistically significant differences between the average estimates of students due to the study variables (gender, school year, and GPA).

2019 ،نصار) conducted a study aimed at identifying the attitudes of faculty members towards student evaluation at Palestine Technical University - Kadoorie. The descriptive approach was used in the study, using a questionnaire divided into three areas (relationships, teaching, and evaluation). The number of faculty members on whom the study was conducted was (96), males and females, and they were selected by stratified random sampling method. The study revealed that the impact of student evaluation on faculty members from the lecturers' point of view is positive. Where it obtained a general average of (3.44) out of (5), and at the level of domains, the first domain of relations got a general average of (3.50), the second domain was teaching got an average of (3.74), and the third domain was evaluation with (3.08), and it was found that there are no statistically significant differences between the results of the averages of the faculty members in the three fields due to the variables of gender, years of experience, educational qualification and workplace.

The study of (Shevlin & Banyard & Davies & Griffiths, 2018) sought to ascertain the degree of credibility of the student evaluation process for university faculty members, and the study found that there are some factors that affect the evaluation results, such as: university student specifications, personal specifications of the university teacher, his class behavior, and the degree of control over the classroom and its management. So, the researchers recommended the need to educate students in advance of the assessment process in order to achieve its objectives effectively.

A study by (Jaggia and Kelly, 2017) aimed to identify a set of factors that affect the level of academic performance of a sample of undergraduate students using the cumulative average as a measure of the student's academic performance. The study found that there are many factors that affect the student's academic performance, some of these factors are related to the curricula, the method of teaching, the faculty member, and the characteristics of the student. The study also showed that the characteristics of the student's family, the educational level in it, and the stability of the family community in which the student lives is the most important factor that affect the student's academic performance. Moreover, the study also found that the period the student spent in the university on a daily basis and his income level is not related to his academic level.

(2016 ،حسين) conducted a study aimed at identifying the students' opinions about the performance of the faculty members at Al-Istiqlal University, and tended to know the suggestions that the students want to improve and develop the performance of the faculty. The researcher used the descriptive approach analysis in his study by building a questionnaire to obtain information from the study sample of (100) students at Al-Istiqlal University. The researcher used the SPSS statistical package to analyze the questionnaire. Then, the study reached several results, the most important of which are: that the lecturer adheres to the lecture times and presents the elements of his lecture in a coherent and sequential manner. Also, the lecturer records the names of attendance and absence regularly, and makes sure that the voice of the lecturer is audible and clear. He begins and ends the lecture on time, adheres to the time specified for the lecture, communicate the information to the student, and the lecturer does not understand the students' problems. Furthermore, the lecturer is late in correcting exams and with an average degree of answer. Not to mention, the results of the study indicated that the time allotted for exams is not appropriate, and the lecturer does not use other references in the lecture. Eventually, the results of the study showed that (there are no statistically significant differences between the average response of students to assess the performance of faculty members at Al-Istiqlal University according to the study variables).

Commenting on previous studies:
All previous s

tudies were similar in their fields and objectives. All of them focused on the necessity of implementing evaluation practices in Palestinian universities from the point of view of faculty members. The study benefited from previous studies in the formation and formulation of theoretical literature by making use of what was mentioned in it in terms of arrangement, formulation and building of the study tool, and benefiting from the tools prepared in these studies in line with the study's objectives, procedures, methodology and design.

After reviewing previous studies, the researcher found that there are few studies that have examined evaluation practices in Palestinian universities from the point of view of faculty members.

Study methodology:

The methodology used in this study is based on the descriptive analytical approach, which includes a desk survey with reference to references and sources to build the theoretical framework of the study, and a field survey to collect data using the study tool and analyze it statistically to answer the study questions.

Study population and sample:

The study population consists of all faculty members in Palestinian universities (An-Najah National University, Al-Quds Open University, and Palestine Technical - Kadoorie) and those with the rank of (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor) and their total number is (1358) faculty member, according to the statistics of the Ministry of Education. Higher education for the year 2020/2021 distributed among the mentioned universities, and this sample was distributed into layers according to the academic rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor), and the college (scientific, humanitarian), and then a stratified random sample was drawn (20%) from each layer in each university, the number of sample members was 247 members. Table (1) shows the distribution of study sample members according to the levels of their variables.

Table (1)
Distribution of the study sample according to the levels of its variables

Variable	Level	Number	Total
Gender	Male	197	247
	Female	50	
University	Al-Quds Open University	110	247
	Palestine Technical - Kadoorie	90	
	An-Najah National University	47	
College	Humanitarian	139	247
	Scientific	108	
Rank	Professor	63	247
	Associate Professor	80	
	Assistant Professor	104	
Experience	Less than 5 years	62	247
	From 5 – 10 years	82	
	More than 10 years	103	

Study tool:

A questionnaire was developed to measure the reality of evaluation practices in Palestinian universities from the faculty members' point of view, and this questionnaire consisted of two parts:

Part One: It includes general information (gender, experience, university, academic rank, and college).

The second part: It contains paragraphs covering the independent study variable (evaluative practices in Palestinian universities from the point of view of the faculty members). The paragraphs of this variable were guided by the study of (المصري ومرعي، 2017؛ نصار، 2019), and identified with five answers that are (strongly agree, agree, neutral, opposed, strongly opposed). The answers were given numbers from (1-5), so that the number (1) indicates (strongly opposed), the number (2) indicates (opposed), and the number (3) indicates (neutral) and the number (4) on (agree) and number (5) on (strongly agree).

Accordingly, if the arithmetic mean value of the paragraphs is greater than (3.68-5), the level of practices will be high, but if the arithmetic average value ranges between (2.34-3.67) then the level of perceptions is average, and if the arithmetic average is less than (2.33), the level of perceptions low, according to the upper-lower criterion.

The validity of the study too:

First: Validity face

To verify the validity of the questionnaire paragraphs, the study tool was presented to a number of arbitrators who were professors of educational administration and faculty members in Palestinian universities. They were asked to revise the paragraphs of the questionnaire in terms of the clarity of the paragraphs, the quality of their linguistic formulation, the extent to which they belong to the field that is being measured, and the modification or deletion of any of the paragraphs that they believe do not achieve the objective of the questionnaire, as the data were collected from the arbitrators after that, and they were reformulated according to what was agreed upon by (80%) of the arbitrators.

Second: Constrict validity

In order to extract the constrict validity indications, it was applied to an exploratory sample from outside the study sample, which is (25) faculty member. The value of the reliability coefficient was used for the study areas for the tool as a whole, and table (2) illustrates this.

Stability of the study tool:

The reliability coefficient was extracted, using Cronbach's Alpha equation, where the questionnaire was distributed to a pilot sample, whose number was (25) faculty members, and the

results were as shown in table No. (2) as follows:
The value of the reliability coefficient for the study areas and the tool as a whole:

Paragraph number in the questionnaire	Variable name and dimension	Reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha)
15-1	Teaching and lectures	0.88
25-16	Interact with students	0.89
35-26	Exams and marks	0.87
40-36	University research and community service	0.90
total	The questionnaire as a whole	0.91

It is clear from table (2) that the stability coefficients for all variables and fields of the study are high, and they are research-acceptable stability coefficients for conducting the study.

Statistical processing :

After the study data was entered on the computer using the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS.22. v1), the following statistical treatments were performed:
The first question: Descriptive Statistic Measures were used to describe the characteristics of the study sample, and to answer the study questions, arithmetic averages and standard deviations were used.
The second question: One-way analysis of variance and Scheffe's test for statistically significant variables were used.

Presentation and discussion of the results:

Results related to the first question, which states: What is the reality of assessment practices from the point of view of faculty members?

To answer the question, the arithmetic averages and standard deviations were calculated for each paragraph in each domain and for the total domains. The tables (3, 4, 5, 6, 7) show the results of that.

First: Total fields

Table (3)

Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the total fields

Field No.	The field	Arithmetic mean	standard deviations	Evaluation
1	Teaching and lectures	3.98	.600	High
3	Interact with students	3.88	.730	High
2	Exams and marks	3.62	.700	Average
4	University research and community service	3.41	.760	Average
Total		3.81	0.59	High

Table (3) shows that the two field (teaching, lectures and interaction with students) were highly rated, and the two fields (exams, grades, university research and community service) were averaged,

and the lowest evaluation was for the field (university research and community service) and the arithmetic mean value was (3.41). The highest estimate was for the field (teaching and lectures) and its mean value was (3.98), and the overall estimate was high, and its mean value was(3.81) .

Second: Teaching and Lectures field

Table (4)

Arithmetic averages and standard deviations for the teaching and lectures field

Paragraph No.	Paragraph's statement	Arithmetic averages	Standard deviations	Evaluation
3	I run the educational meeting efficiently within the teaching hall	4.20	.820	High
14	I direct the students to the literature on the subject of their study and methods of citation and documentation.	4.14	.790	High
2	Introduce students to the educational objectives of the lecture, orally or in writing.	4.12	.840	High
13	Supervise and follow up the students' work during the implementation of their research.	4.12	.780	High
4	I use modern non-traditional teaching methods (cooperative learning, problem solving, and brainstorming).	4.11	.890	High
5	I use references other than scheduled in the teaching process.	4.11	.850	High
6	Begin the lecture by reminding the students of the previous lecture.	4.07	.860	High
15	I discuss the results of recent research related to the topic of the lecture with the students.	4.07	.870	High
1	I prepare myself by reading the course I am teaching.	4.04	.960	High
11	I develop my students' thinking skills.	4.03	.810	High
12	I host one or more specialists to speak on the topic of the lecture.	3.93	.780	High
10	I gain my students scientific research skills and research capabilities.	3.78	.830	High
7	I use my experiences and studies to increase students' knowledge.	3.70	.950	High
9	Explain the educational material in a way that is easy for students to understand.	3.68	.870	High
8	Encourage students to search for learning resources.	3.62	.940	Average
Total		3.98	.600	High

Table (4) shows that the paragraph (I encourage students to search for learning resources) had the lowest rating, and it was the only one whose estimation was average and the arithmetic mean value was (3.62). The rest of the paragraphs were highly rated, and the highest estimate was for the item (I run the educational meeting efficiently within the teaching hall) and its mean value was(4.20) .

Third: Exams and marks field

Table (5)
Arithmetic averages and standard deviations for the exams and marks field

Paragraph No.	Paragraph's statement	Arithmetic averages	Standard deviations	Evaluation
17	I use formative assessment while presenting the course material.	3.86	.950	High
18	Return examination papers to students as soon as possible.	3.69	.910	High
16	In the test questions, I take into account the individual differences between the students.	3.67	.950	Average
24	Give weight to students' attendance at lectures when marking.	3.66	0.97	Average
23	Assign weak students additional assignments to improve their grades.	3.64	0.98	Average
20	I am keen to provide feedback in light of the results of the evaluation.	3.63	.970	Average
25	I dedicate the last lecture before the final exam to review the course content.	3.61	1.00	Average
22	Distribute the students' scores in most exams in a normal distribution (Most of the students are in the middle and a few percentages are on the sides).	3.58	.940	Average
21	My exam questions contain paragraphs with graded levels of difficulty.	3.49	1.02	Average
19	Involve students in collaborative group	3.40	.930	Average
Total		3.62	.700	Average

Table (5) shows that the paragraph (I used formative assessment during the presentation of the study material) had the highest estimate and its arithmetic mean value was (3.86), and the paragraphs (17, 18) were highly rated, and the rest of the paragraphs were average and the lowest estimate was for the paragraph (Involve students in cooperative group duties) and its mean value was(3.40) .

Forth: Interact with students field

Table (6)
Arithmetic averages and standard deviations for interacting with students field

Paragraph No.	Paragraph's statement	Arithmetic averages	Standard deviations	Evaluation
30	Show respect for students' personalities regardless of their political affiliation.	3.96	.860	High
26	Provide a democratic atmosphere in the lecture characterized by dialogue and discussion.	3.95	.850	High
32	I offer academic advising to students if I can.	3.92	0.92	High
34	Shy students are encouraged to participate during the lecture.	3.90	0.91	High
28	I act as a counselor and therapist for students' errors and problems.	3.89	.830	High
33	I care about students who do not understand the idea discussed during the lecture.	3.86	0.93	High
35	I am ready to accept the student's apology for the delay and absence.	3.85	0.96	High
27	I openly accept the opinions of students contrary to mine.	3.83	.890	High
31	I allow students to express their thoughts and views, even if they contradict my own.	3.81	0.99	High
29	Provide the appropriate social and psychological environment for the educational process based on good interaction and mutual respect.	3.78	.870	High
Total		3.88	.730	Average

Table (6) shows that the paragraph (showing respect for the students' personalities regardless of their political affiliation) had the highest estimation, and its arithmetic mean value was 3.96. All items were highly rated, and the lowest value was for the paragraph (providing an appropriate social and psychological environment for the educational process based on good interaction and mutual respect) and its mean value was (3.78).

Fifth: University research and community service

Table (7)

Arithmetic averages and standard deviations for university and community service fieldParagraph No.	Paragraph's statement	Arithmetic averages	Standard deviations	Evaluation
36	I maintain the continuity of scientific research activities.	3.90	.970	High
37	I provide services to professional institutions related to the college (university).	3.70	.870	High
38	I have a constant desire to search for the truth in my field of expertise.	3.37	.960	Average
39	My university makes it easy for me to attend seminars and conferences.	3.09	1.14	Average
40	I make sure to participate in committees and seminars that are concerned with the local community.	2.97	1.05	Average
Total		3.41	0.76	Average

It is evident from table (7) that the paragraph (Keep the continuity of scientific research activities) had the highest estimate, and the two paragraphs (36, 37) were highly rated, and the arithmetic mean value was (3.90). The rest of the paragraphs were rated average and the lowest estimate was for the paragraph (Make sure that I participate in committees and symposia that are concerned with the local community) and its mean value is (2.97).

Results related to the second question, which states:

Are there statistically significant differences at the significance level ($0.05 \geq \alpha$) in the average estimations of the study sample members about the reality of the Palestinian universities' practice of evaluation practices from the point of view of the faculty members due to the variables (sex, cumulative average and college)?

In case of gender:

The arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated for the two gender levels, and table (8) shows the results.

Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the two gender levels evaluative practices from the point of view of faculty members

Field	Gender	Arithmetic averages	Standard deviations
Teaching and lecturing	Male	3.97	.590
	Female	4.06	.630
	Total	3.98	.600
Exams and marks	Male	3.59	.700
	Female	3.72	.670
	Total	3.62	.700
Interacting with students	Male	3.87	.740
	Female	3.96	.680
	Total	3.88	.730
Scientific research	Male	3.42	.760
	Female	3.36	.750
	Total	3.41	.760
Total	Male	3.79	.590
	Female	3.87	.600
	Total	3.81	.590

Table (8) shows that there is an apparent difference in the values of the arithmetic means for the two sex levels for the performance of the study sample members. In order to find out if these differences were statistically significant, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted, and table (9) shows the results of that.

Univariate analysis of the effect of gender on evaluation practices from the point of view of faculty members

Source of variance	Dependent variable	Total squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	P-value	Significance level
Gender	Teaching and lecturing	.30	1	.300	.84	.350
	Exams and marks	.70	1	.700	1.42	.230
	Interacting with students	.32	1	.320	.600	.430
	Scientific research	.14	1	.140	.240	.620
	Total	.22	1	.220	.650	.420
The error	Teaching and lecturing	89.20	245	.360		
	Exams and marks	119.97	245	.490		
	Interacting with students	130.75	245	.530		
	Scientific research	143.18	245	.580		
	Total	86.32	245	.350		
Total	Teaching and lecturing	89.51	246			
	Exams and marks	120.67	246			
	Interacting with students	131.07	246			
	Scientific research	143.32	246			
	Total	86.55	246			

Table (9) shows that there are no statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the evaluation practices from the point of view of the faculty members due to the gender variable.

In regards of the university:

The arithmetic means and standard deviations of the university levels were calculated, and table (10) shows the results.

Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of university levels evaluation practices from the point of view of faculty members

Field	Level	Standard deviations	Arithmetic averages
Teaching and lecturing	An-Najah National University	4.35	.400
	Palestine Technical University-Kadoorie	3.42	.440
	Al-Quds Open University	4.26	.410
	Total	3.98	.600
Exams and marks	An-Najah National University	3.87	.530
	Palestine Technical University-Kadoorie	3.10	.630
	Al-Quds Open University	3.98	.560
	Total	3.62	.700
Interacting with students	An-Najah National University	4.15	.550
	Palestine Technical University-Kadoorie	3.28	.570
	Al-Quds Open University	4.33	.570
	Total	3.88	.730
Scientific research	An-Najah National University	3.78	.630
	Palestine Technical University-Kadoorie	2.81	.620
	Al-Quds Open University	3.70	.580
	Total	3.41	.760
Total	An-Najah National University	4.14	.390
	Palestine Technical University-Kadoorie	3.24	.410
	Al-Quds Open University	4.13	.420
	Total	3.81	.590

Table (10) shows that there is an apparent difference in the values of the arithmetic means of the university levels for the performance of the study sample members. In order to find out if these differences were statistically significant, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted, and table (11) shows the results of that.

Univariate analysis of the impact of the university on evaluation practices from the point of view of faculty members

Source of variance	Dependent variable	Total squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	P-value	Significance level
The university	Teaching and lecturing	46.01	2	23.00	129.03	.000
	Exams and marks	38.74	2	19.37	57.69	.000
	Interacting with students	52.07	2	26.03	80.41	.000
	Scientific research	50.52	2	25.26	66.42	.000
	Total	45.49	2	22.75	135.19	.000
The error	Teaching and lecturing	43.50	244	.1780		
	Exams and marks	81.92	244	.330		
	Interacting with students	79.00	244	.320		
	Scientific research	92.80	244	.380		
	Total	41.05	244	.160		
Total	Teaching and lecturing	89.51	246			
	Exams and marks	120.67	246			
	Interacting with students	131.07	246			
	Scientific research	143.32	246			
	Total	86.55	246			

Table (11) shows that there are statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the evaluation practices from the point of view of the faculty members due to the university variable. In order to find out if the differences were statistically significant, dimensional comparisons were made using the Scheffe method, and Table (12) shows the results of that.

The results of Scheffe comparisons of the impact of the university on evaluation practices from the point of view of faculty members

Dependent variable	Setting 1	**Setting 2**	Differences between the two settings	Significance level
Teaching and lecturing	An-Najah National University	Al-Quds Open University	.930	.000
		Palestine Technical University- Kadoorie	0.09	.430
	Al-Quds Open University	Palestine Technical University- Kadoorie	-0.84	.000
Exams and marks	An-Najah National University	Al-Quds Open University	.770	.000
		Palestine Technical University- Kadoorie	-0.11	.470
	Al-Quds Open University	Palestine Technical University- Kadoorie	-0.88	.000
Interacting with students	An-Najah National University	Al-Quds Open University	.870	.000
		Palestine Technical University- Kadoorie	-0.17	.150
	Al-Quds Open University	Palestine Technical University- Kadoorie	-1.04	.000
Scientific research	An-Najah National University	Al-Quds Open University	.970	.000
		Palestine Technical University- Kadoorie	0.08	.700
	Al-Quds Open University	Palestine Technical University- Kadoorie	-0.88	.000
Total	An-Najah National University	Al-Quds Open University	.890	0.00
		Palestine Technical University- Kadoorie	0.07	0.99
	Al-Quds Open University	Palestine Technical University- Kadoorie	-0.88	0.00

Table (12) shows that the differences in all areas of evaluation practices from the point of view of the faculty members were between An-Najah National University and among faculty members at Al-Quds Open University and in favor of faculty members at An-Najah National University, as were the differences between faculty members at An-Najah National University. Palestine Technical University (Kadoorie) and among the faculty members at the University of Al-Quds Open University and for the benefit of the faculty members at Palestine Technical University (Kadoorie).

As for the college:

The arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated for the two college levels, and table (13) shows the results.

Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the two college levels assessing practices from the viewpoint of faculty members

Field	Level	Arithmetic averages	Standard deviations
Teaching and lecturing	Humanitarian	3.96	.640
	Scientific	4.02	.550
	Total	3.98	.600
Exams and marks	Humanitarian	3.65	.760
	Scientific	3.57	.600
	Total	3.62	.700
Interacting with students	Humanitarian	3.91	.780
	Scientific	3.85	.650
	Total	3.88	.730
Scientific research	Humanitarian	3.41	.770
	Scientific	3.40	.740
	Total	3.41	.760
Total	Humanitarian	3.81	.630
	Scientific	3.81	.530
	Total	3.81	.590

Table (13) shows that there is an apparent difference in the values of the arithmetic means for the two college levels for the performance of the study sample members. In order to find out if these differences were statistically significant, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted, and table (14) shows the results of that.

One-way analysis of the impact of the college on evaluation practices from the point of view of faculty members

Source of variance	Dependent variable	Total squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	P-value	Significance level
College	Teaching and lecturing	.260	1	.260	.740	.390
	Exams and marks	.430	1	.430	.880	.340
	Interacting with students	.180	1	.180	.340	.550
	Scientific research	0.01	1	0.01	.019	.890
	Total	0.00	1	0.00	.006	.930
The error	Teaching and lecturing	89.24	245	.360		
	Exams and marks	120.23	245	.490		
	Interacting with students	130.89	245	.530		
	Scientific research	143.31	245	.580		
	Total	86.55	245	.350		
Total	Teaching and lecturing	89.51	246			
	Exams and marks	120.67	246			
	Interacting with students	131.07	246			
	Scientific research	143.32	246			
	Total	86.55	246			

Table (14) shows that there are no statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the evaluation practices from the point of view of the faculty members due to the college variable.

In respect of rank:

The arithmetic means and standard deviations of the rank levels were calculated and the table (15) shows the results.

Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of rank levels evaluation practices from the point of view of faculty members

Field	Level	Arithmetic averages	Standard deviations
Teaching and lecturing	Professor	3.84	.680
	Associate professor	3.97	.560
	Assistant professor	4.08	.560
	Total	3.98	.600
Exams and marks	Professor	3.45	.800
	Associate professor	3.65	.670
	Assistant professor	3.69	.640
	Total	3.62	.700
Interacting with students	Professor	3.66	.870
	Associate professor	3.89	.630
	Assistant professor	4.01	.670
	Total	3.88	.730
Scientific research	Professor	3.35	.760
	Associate professor	3.36	.750
	Assistant professor	3.48	.770
	Total	3.41	.760
Total	Professor	3.66	.670
	Associate professor	3.80	.530
	Assistant professor	3.90	.560
	Total	3.81	.590

Table (15) shows that there is an apparent difference in the values of the arithmetic means of the rank levels for the performance of the study sample members, and to find out if these differences are statistically significant, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted, and table (16) shows the results of that.

Univariate analysis of the effect of rank on evaluation practices from the point of view of faculty members

Source of variance	Dependent variable	Total squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	P-value	Significance level
The rank	Teaching and lecturing	2.45	2	1.22	3.43	.030
	Exams and marks	2.36	2	1.18	2.44	.080
	Interacting with students	4.73	2	2.36	4.57	.010
	Scientific research	.860	2	.43	.740	.470
	Total	2.32	2	1.16	3.36	.030
The error	Teaching and lecturing	87.06	244	.3570		
	Exams and marks	118.30	244	.480		
	Interacting with students	126.33	244	.510		
	Scientific research	142.45	244	.580		
	Total	84.23	244	.340		
Total	Teaching and lecturing	89.51	246			
	Exams and marks	120.67	246			
	Interacting with students	131.07	246			
	Scientific research	143.32	246			
	Total	86.55	246			

Table (16) shows that there are statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the evaluation practices from the point of view of the faculty members due to the variable of rank in the two domains (teaching, lectures, interaction with students and the total), and to find out if the differences are statistically significant, a dimensional comparisons using Scheffe method was conducted and table (17) shows the results.

Results of Scheffe comparisons of the effect of rank on evaluation practices from the point of view of faculty members

Dependent variable	Setting 1	**Setting 2**	Differences between the two settings	Significance level
Teaching and lecturing	Professor	Associate professor	-0.13	.390
		Assistant professor	-0.24	.030
	Associate professor	Assistant professor	-0.11	.450
Interacting with students	Professor	Associate professor	-0.22	.180
		Assistant professor	-0.34	.010
	Associate professor	Assistant professor	-0.12	.500
Total	Professor	Associate professor	-0.14	.340
		Assistant professor	-0.24	.030
	Associate professor	Assistant professor	0.10	.520

Table (17) shows that the differences in the two fields and the total were between the faculty members of the rank of professor and the evaluation practices from the point of view of the faculty members of the rank of assistant professor and in favor of the faculty members of the rank of assistant professor. As for the field of interaction with students, there were differences between faculty members of the rank of professor.

In respect of experience:

The arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated for the levels of experience and the table (18) shows the results.

Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of experience levels Evaluative practices from the point of view of faculty members

Field	Level	Arithmetic averages	Standard deviations
Teaching and lecturing	Less than 5 years	4.16	.570
	From 5 – 10 years	4.00	.480
	More than 10 years	3.87	.680
	Total	3.98	.600
Exams and marks	Less than 5 years	3.82	.630
	From 5 – 10 years	3.66	.560
	More than 10 years	3.47	.800
	Total	3.62	.700
Interacting with students	Less than 5 years	4.08	.640
	From 5 – 10 years	3.88	.640
	More than 10 years	3.77	.810
	Total	3.88	.730
Scientific research	Less than 5 years	3.57	.750
	From 5 – 10 years	3.46	.730
	More than 10 years	3.27	.770
	Total	3.41	.760
Total	Less than 5 years	3.99	.550
	From 5 – 10 years	3.83	.460
	More than 10 years	3.68	.670
	Total	3.81	.590

Table (18) shows that there is an apparent difference in the values of the arithmetic means of the levels of experience for the performance of the study sample members, and to find out if these differences are statistically significant, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted, and table (19) shows the results of that.

One-way variance analysis of the impact of experience on evaluation practices from the point of view of faculty members

Source of variance	Dependent variable	Total squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean squares	P-value	Significance level
The experience	Teaching and lecturing	3.31	2	1.65	4.68	.010
	Exams and marks	5.01	2	2.50	5.28	.000
	Interacting with students	3.78	2	1.89	3.62	.020
	Scientific research	3.67	2	1.83	3.21	.040
	Total	3.722	2	1.86	5.48	.000
The error	Teaching and lecturing	86.204	244	.350		
	Exams and marks	115.66	244	.470		
	Interacting with students	127.29	244	.520		
	Scientific research	139.65	244	.570		
	Total	82.83	244	.330		
Total	Teaching and lecturing	89.51	246			
	Exams and marks	120.67	246			
	Interacting with students	131.07	246			
	Scientific research	143.32	246			
	Total	86.55	246			

Table (19) shows that there are statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the evaluation practices from the point of view of the faculty members due to the variable of experience in all fields and all**.** In order to find out in favor of whom the differences are due, dimensional comparisons were used by using the Scheffe method, and table (20) shows the results of that.

The results of Scheffe's comparisons of the impact of experience on evaluation practices from the point of view of faculty members

Dependent variable	Setting 1	**Setting 2**	Differences between the two settings	Significance level
Teaching and lecturing	Less than 5 years	From 5 – 10 years	.150	.310
		More than 10 years	.290	.010
	From 5 – 10 years	More than 10 years	.130	.290
Exams and marks	Less than 5 years	From 5 – 10 years	.150	.390
		More than 10 years	.350	.000
	From 5 – 10 years	More than 10 years	.190	.160
Interacting with students	Less than 5 years	From 5 – 10 years	.200	.230
		More than 10 years	.310	.020
	From 5 – 10 years	More than 10 years	.100	.610
Scientific research	Less than 5 years	From 5 – 10 years	.110	.680
		More than 10 years	.290	.050
	From 5 – 10 years	More than 10 years	.180	.250
Total	Less than 5 years	From 5 – 10 years	.150	.280
		More than 10 years	.300	.000
	From 5 – 10 years	More than 10 years	.150	.210

Table (20) shows that the differences in all areas of assessment practices from the faculty members' point of view were between experienced faculty members (less than 5 years) and experienced faculty members (more than 10) and in favor of faculty members from experienced (less than 5 years). As for the field of exams and marks, the differences were between experienced faculty members (less than 5 years) and experienced faculty members (more than 10) and in favor of experienced faculty members (less than 5 years).

Discussion of the results:

Discussing the results of the first question: What are the evaluation practices from the point of view of the faculty members? The results indicated that all fields were highly rated, and this may be attributed to the keenness of each faculty member at the university to exert his utmost energies when performing the roles entrusted to him. He diversifies his teaching methods, for example, he uses presentation, lecture, dialogue and discussion, and other methods. The reason for the rise may be due to the fact that the study sample consisted of faculty members. The results indicated that the field of (teaching and lectures) was highly appreciated, and this may be due to the fact that every faculty member strives to apply modern methods in education and exerts his utmost in applying the latest scientific findings, which is at the core of the work of faculty members in universities.

The paragraph (I manage the educational meeting efficiently in the classroom) got the highest rating in (the field of teaching and lectures) and this may be attributed to the emphasis of each faculty member to provide a general presentation of the course he presents to students before starting teaching so that each student has a prior mental image of the concepts which the course will address, where each teacher distributes a plan for the course in the first lecture.

The paragraph (I encourage students to search for learning resources) got at least in (the field of teaching and lectures). This may be due to the fact that some faculty members did not pay attention to the final evaluation because they were convinced that the degree of importance of the formative evaluation is greater, as it poses questions directly to students to clarify concepts for them.

The (the field of interaction with students) obtained a high degree, and this may be attributed to the keenness of the faculty members in Palestinian universities in their teaching, to apply the latest methods and methods of teaching, which focus on raising students' motivation to learn, and their positive interaction with the teacher, and among these methods is the method of dialogue and discussion, brainstorming and collaborative learning.

The paragraph (show respect for students' personalities regardless of their political affiliation) received the highest rating in (the field of interaction with students). This may be due to the faculty members' keenness to abide by their office hours throughout showing their office hours for each faculty member so that students can review them and inquire about their observations that they wish to inquire about to better understand the course.

The paragraph (Provide the appropriate social and psychological environment for the educational process based on good interaction and mutual respect) got the lowest rate in (the field of interaction with students). This may be due to the large number of students in the lectures and the lack of knowledge of the faculty members for shy students to be able to allow them to express their ideas and points of view and integrate them with the students in the lecture.

As for the field (examinations and marks), it obtained a medium degree. This may be due to the fact that the application of the tests requires expertise by individuals, because these tests sometimes require analysis such as: calculating the factors of difficulty and discrimination, and these statistics are not clear to some members of the faculty. Therefore, the Center for the Development of the Degree of Practice of Evaluative Practices in Palestinian Universities from the point of view of the faculty members holds courses for teachers to cover the shortfall in this aspect. This may be due to the fact that the faculty members are serious about their teaching of the course, which leads to the absence of bias in the marking of the tests, and it may be attributed to the fact that the majority of teachers use written exams, which may not suit the

students' levels, as well as the students' desire for objective tests more than written tests.

The paragraph (I use the formative assessment during the presentation of the study material) got the highest rating in (the field of exams and marks) and this may be due to the consideration of individual differences between students and the inclusion of questions in the content of the course. Moreover, the paragraph (involve students in cooperative group assignments) got at least in (the field of exams and grades). This may be attributed to the faculty members' keenness to involve all students in jobs, duties and research to improve their performance and increase their educational attainment so that they can better understand the course, which leads to weak students not being given special or additional duties by the faculty.

The field of (university research and community service) got the lowest rating. This could be because of the fact that Palestinian universities do not pay a high degree of attention to scientific research, and this is evident from the support that universities determine from their budget for scientific research. This may also be attributed to the fact that the goal of most research carried out by members teaching staff to transfer from one degree to another regardless of whether they serve the local community or the educational process.

The paragraph (I maintain the continuity of scientific research activities) received the highest rating in (the field of university research and community service). This may be attributed to the faculty members' need to keep up with the developments in their fields of specialization in order to maintain research activities that serve the local community, develop their skills and capabilities, and inform them of developments in the external environment and pioneering methods of work to reach a high degree of effectiveness as they constitute the most important inputs to the university educational system. Their performance levels determine much of the learning outcomes.

As for the paragraph (I make sure to participate in committees and symposia that care about the local community) got the least rate in (university research and community service). This may be due to the fact that Palestinian universities face financial difficulties that limit the attendance of a faculty member at conferences, and this is also due to the lack of transparency in attending seminars and conferences, and it is limited to faculty members and not others.

Discussing the results related to the second question, which states: Are there statistically significant differences at the significance level (α<= 0.05) in the degree to which Palestinian universities practice assessment practices from the point of view of faculty members due to the variables (sex, university, college, rank and experience)?

The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the degree to which Palestinian universities practice assessment practices from the point of view of faculty members due to the gender variable. This may be attributed to the fact that the tasks performed by a faculty member are the same for males and females such as teaching and lectures, interaction with students, grades and exams, university research, community service, as they aspire to improve their academic achievement

regardless of gender and are subject to the same regulations and laws.

The results indicated that there were statistically significant differences in the degree of practice of evaluation practices by Palestinian universities from the point of view of faculty members in Palestinian universities. The differences in all areas of evaluation practices from the point of view of faculty members were between the National An-Najah University and between faculty members at the University and Al-Quds Open University and they are in favor of the faculty members at the National An-Najah University. As well as the differences between the faculty members at Palestine Technical University (Kadoorie) and the faculty members at the University of Al-Quds Open University and in favor of the faculty members at Palestine Technical University (Kadoorie). This may be attributed to the great efforts made in developing assessment practices from the point of view of faculty members in the fields of e-learning, knowledge and technology, as there are specialized teams in the computer center that have developed very advanced systems in the service of the educational process, which made their performance better.

The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the degree to which Palestinian universities practice assessment practices from the point of view of faculty members in Palestinian universities from their point of view due to the college variable. This may be due to the keenness of many universities to spread the idea of teamwork among faculty members in each department, and the tasks performed by a faculty member are the same regardless of specialization.

In addition, the results indicated that there were statistically significant differences in the degree to which Palestinian universities practice assessment practices from the point of view of faculty members in Palestinian universities from their point of view, and it was between faculty members of the rank of professor and faculty members of the rank of assistant professor and in favor of faculty members of the rank of assistant professor.

Finally, the results also indicated that there were statistically significant differences in the degree of practice of evaluation practices by Palestinian universities from the point of view of faculty members in Palestinian universities from their point of view due to the variable of experience, and it was between faculty members with experience (less than 5 years) and faculty members from with experience (more than 10 years) and for the benefit of experienced faculty members (less than 5 years). This result may be attributed to the fact that faculty members are at the beginning of their appointment. Hence, they are active in their job performance until they prove their presence in the departments in which they are appointed, and they often need to involve them in training programs to enhance their ability to academic achievement through the employment of knowledge and informing them of everything that is new in their academic work.

Recommendations:

In light of the results obtained, the research presents the following recommendations:

1. Developing the competencies of faculty members in the areas of assessment practices, especially with regard to the construction and design of tests in light of the standards of good test design, through the establishment of training courses and specialized workshops.
2. Professional development for the performance of faculty members, continuous training, development of their skills and abilities, and increasing their awareness of developments in the external environment and leading methods of work to help them reach a high degree of effectiveness,

motivate them to be advocates of change in their universities, and spread positive values in the university with their possessions of guiding roles through their decisions that can encapsulate an ethical framework, and this requires that faculty selection policies be established and based on competency.

3. The necessity for university professors to choose appropriate teaching methods, and to use a variety of methods that take into account the diversity and differences of students focusing on activities and skills to enrich the aspects of higher-order thinking and analytical thinking for students.

4. Attention to the development of students' skills and abilities through curricula and educational attitudes in classrooms in order to increase their motivation towards achievement and work.

5. Conducting other research and using research curricula and tools and other variables for evaluation practices in Palestinian universities from the point of view of faculty members, due to the lack of Arab studies that dealt with this aspect.

English reviews:

Abbott, A, L. (2016). Alternative Assessment and Accountability: A case study of policy Reform and Teacher Tractice at the District Level. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University, Virginia.

Jaggia S.and Kelly-Hawke A. (2017) "An analysis of factors that influence student performance: A fresh approach to an old debate", Contemporary Economic Policy, vol.17,

Mueller, J. (2012). Authentic Assessment Toolbox: What is Authentic Assessment, Procardia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2(2), pp., 31-52.

Pepe, V. (2010). Assessment practices among education evaluators in New York City public schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Columbia University Teachers College.

Shevlin: M. & Banyard: P. & Davies: M. & Griffiths: M.:(2018), "The Validity of Student Evaluation of Teaching in Higher Education: Love Me Love My Lectures?" Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 25(4)397-405.

المراجع العربية:

العبسي، محمد (2010) .**التقويم الواقعي في العملية التدريسية** .عمان :دار المسيرة.

المصري، محمد، ومرعي، توفيق (2017)، اتجاهات طلبة جامعة الإسراء الخاصة نحو أساليب التقويم المختلفة، **مجلة العلوم التربوية والنفسية**، جامعة البحرين، 1(8)، 91- 110.

حسين، عبد القادر (2016) تقييم أداء الهيئة التدريسية في جامعة الاستقلال من وجهة نظر الطلبة، مجلة جامعة الاستقلال للأبحاث، مجلد (19)، العدد (1)، ص 77-110.

دعمس، مصطفى نمر (2014). **استراتيجيات التقويم التربوي الحديث وأدواته**، ط2، عمان، الأردن، دار غيداء للنشر والتوزيع.

محاسنة عمر موسى، مراد عوده سليمان (2020) تقييم جودة الممارسات التدريسية لدى أعضاء هيئة التدريس الجامعيين من وجهة نظر الطلبة، مجلة الجامعة الإسلامية للدراسات التربوية والنفسية، **مجلد (28)، العدد (2)، ص): 551-573.**

مراد، معرف (2016) الممارسات التقويمية في ظل منهجية المقاربة بالكفاءات ومعوقاتها، **مجلة العلوم الانسانية والاجتماعية**، (26)، 1-11

نصار، أحمد سليم (2019) أثر تقويم الطلبة على أعضاء هيئة التدريس في جامعة فلسطين التقنية – خضوري من وجهة نظرهم، **المجلة العربية للعلوم ونشر الأبحاث، مجلة العلوم التربوية والنفسية**، مجلد (20)، العدد (2)، ص توفيق (34-49.