Peer Review as a Scheme of Evaluating Faculty Performance: A Critical Perspective

Dr. Mohammed Ahmed Abdul Sattar As-Sammer
College of Arts- University of Basra

Abstract

This paper is a critical review of faculty peer evaluation (FPE) scheme adopted by a private higher education institution (PHEI) in Oman. The purpose is to identify the points of weakness in this scheme, and then to propose an alternative model of peer evaluation (PE). This model is built on the discrepancies routed in the available version of (PE), and on the different ideas proposed by scholars interested in quality assurance and faculty performance evaluation. The whole process of faculty evaluation at the (PHEI) is reviewed with due emphasis on the analysis of (FPE). Relevant literature has been surveyed where the methodology adopted, and the findings are highlighted.

The points of drawbacks elicited in the current model are: (i) it is a one-dimensional version constructed on rating scale only with a complete ignorance to the criteria on which evaluation is based, (ii) it shows low degree of coverage since many important areas relevant to teaching quality are neglected, (iii) questionnaire items are inadequately and improperly arranged, and (iv) the rating resulted from this model is of a high degree of subjectivity.

The suggested version is characterized by the following: (i) it is more comprehensive where five major areas relevant to faculty performance are covered; teaching, research, institution service, adherence to bylaws and regulations, and contribution to community service, (ii) It is evidence-based in that the response scale is governed by the evaluator's knowledge of the item being responded to, (iii) it is a multi-functional version since it can be used for formative, summative, and other types of faculty evaluation, (iv) it

leads to more reliable and objective peer rating, and (v) it provides sufficient data that can be implemented in different evaluation areas.
The paper is concluded by a number of recommendations and suggestions for further studies.

<div dir="rtl">

تقييم الاقران بوصفها طريقة لمراجعة اداء اعضاء هيئة التدريس دراسة نقدية

د. محمد احمد عبد الستار السامر
قسم اللغة الانجليزية ـ كلية الاداب ـ جامعة البصرة

الخلاصـــة

تعد هذه الورقة دراسة نقدية لطريقة تقييم اداء اعضاء هيئة التدريس بوساطة اقرانهم والمطبقة في احدى مؤسسات التعليم العالي الخاص في سلطنة عمان. وتهدف هذه الدراسة الى تحديد نقاط الضعف في هذه الطريقة، ومن ثم اقتراح انموذج بديل لتقييم الاقران. يتسم الانموذج المقترح بالمواصفات الاتية : (١) انه اكثر شمولية حيث تم تغطية خمسة مجالات متعلقة باداء عضو هيئة التدريس: التدريس والبحث وخدمة المؤسسة والالتزام باللوائح والانظمة والمساهمة في خدمة المجتمع. (٢) تعتمد عملية التقييم على الدليل اذ ان درجة التقييم ترتبط بمعرفة المقيم بالفقرة التي يجيب عنها . (٣) انه انموذج متعدد الاغراض يمكن استعماله لتطوير اداء عضو هيئة التدريس واغراض الترقية والاستمرار في الخدمة (مؤسسات القطاع الخاص) وانواع اخرى من تقييم اداء عضو هيئة التدريس. (٤) انه يؤدي الى نتائج اكثر مصداقية وموضوعية. (٥) يوفر هذا الانموذج بيانات كافية يمكن الاستفادة منها في مجالات تقييم مختلفة.

</div>

ABBREVIATIONS

AACP	The American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy
BPRS	Brass Performance Rating Scale
CFES	Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System
FPE	Faculty Peer Evaluation
FPR	Faculty Peer Review
HEPs	Higher Education Providers

IT	Instructional Technology
NGOs	National Goal Organizations
PE	Peer Evaluation
PER	Peer Evaluation Reports
PHEI	Private Higher Education Institution
PR	Peer Review
QAD	Quality Assurance Department
SET	Student Evaluation of Teaching
WTRC	Walker Teaching Research Centre
WWU	Western Washington University

1.Introduction

Evaluating teaching performance has recently become a common practice for higher education providers (HEPs). It is regularly carried out for formative and summative purposes. These providers seek to maintain student enrollment in the face of the great competition among higher education institutions, and to raise the level of their output to meet the demanding challenges of the labour market. The feedback obtained from this practice is considered a major criterion to grant tenure to higher education staff, and as a feedback to enhance classroom performance (cf. Menges, 1985; Osborne, 1998).

Peer evaluation (PE) as a means of evaluating faculty performance first appeared in the scene in the early 199os (Berk, 2005). It was the product of the views advocated by Boyer (1990) and Rice (1991) in their attempt to redefine scholarship. They considered teaching a scholarly activity; therefore, it should be subjected to the same restricted peer review (PR) applied to published research in a refereed journal. They state that college professor should follow a number of steps as a part of his scholarship activity: conducting a comprehensive up-to-date review of literature, developing content outlines, preparing a syllabus, choosing the most appropriate print and nonprint resources, writing and/ or selecting handouts, integrating instructional technology (IT) support(e.g. audiovisuals,

website), designing learning activity, and constructing and grading evaluation measures.

Due to the discrepancies of using a single method of evaluating teaching effectiveness, the current trend of evaluation moves toward the direction of a multi-source evidence where comprehensive models are proposed (cf. Braskamp and Ory, 1994; Middendrof and Kalish, 1995; Marsh and Roche, 1997;Seldin and Associates, 1999; Arreola,2004; Knapper and Cranton, 2001,   Berk,op.cit.). Accordingly, evaluation is based on a variety of sources to attain a multi-dimensional validity. These sources include student ratings, peer ratings, self evaluation, class observation, student interviews, exit and alumni ratings, administrator rating, employer ratings, learning outcomes, teaching scholarship, etc. However, our literature navigation reveals that greater emphasis was given to student and peer ratings rather than self-evaluation, alumni ratings, administrators ratings and others.

Incorporating a number of data sources of teaching performance contributes to broaden and deepen the evidence base used to evaluate teaching quality (Arreole, op.cit.; Cranton,op.cit.). Other scholars (e.g. Marsh and Roche, op.cit.) justify the need for the multi-dimensional sources of teaching evaluation to the heat debate concerning the shortcomings of students' evaluation that dominated the area for decades. They also maintain that teaching is a complex activity which consists multiple dimensions (p.1187).

(PR) of teaching takes two forms; peer observation of in-class teaching performance and (PR) of the written documents used in the course (Berk, op.cit.: 50). The former requires a rating scale which covers those aspects of instruction that peers are better qualified to measure than students. According to Berk et al. (2004), the relevant scale items include the instructor's content knowledge, teaching methods, learning activities, etc.

The application of (PE) for formative *and* summative purposes has been criticized for many drawbacks. Bergee (1993), for example, states the

following discrepancies: lack of knowledge of the evaluator on which he bases his judgment on a particular peer, judgments are often made via unstated criteria that differ from one evaluator to another, and different peers in different cognitive and social contexts measure a given scientific contribution rather differently. Keig and Waggoner (1995) point out other shortcomings: non clarity of the freedom given to the academic institution in conducting (PE) , who will be the best representative for evaluation, typicality of what is evaluated, lack of criteria of objectivity of assessment, lack of criteria for institution's reward and incentives, and dissatisfaction of the faculty in the suggested areas for improvement.

This paper critically reviews the mechanism of (PE) adopted by a private higher education institution (PHEI) in Oman. The aim is to point out the drawbacks, if any, and to suggest a new version for (PE) in this institution. Our review will be conducted in view of the literature routed in the area of faculty evaluation. It is hoped that the suggestions offered by the researcher together with the recommendations contribute to enhance the effectiveness of (PE) activity in this academe. Findings might be of significance to those interested in quality assurance and teaching enhancement as well.

2- Literature review

Studies on faculty (PE) mostly revolve around reviewing the strategies adopted in this type of performance assessment. They mainly intend to identify the effectiveness of these strategies in enhancing staff instructional potentialities. Many scholars are in favour of applying well-stated criteria that guarantee valid and reliable evaluation results. Other scholars propose a variety of models for evaluating staff performance. Their ultimate goal is to find a compromise and a comprehensive review model. The variables affecting (FPE) have their touches on the available literature. Other research work shed light on the factors lying behind faculty peer review (FPR) .

Berger (1993) compares the efficacy of peer and self-evaluation of applied music skills performed by university students. University faculty

members evaluate live brass jury performances implementing an author-constructed Brass Performance Rating Scale (BPRS). Peer- group rate the same performances using the same scale. The main conclusions are: the high correlation between faculty and peer-group evaluations (.86-.91), and the low correlation of self-evaluation which makes it a less reliable technique.

In (1995), Keig and Waggoner propose a theoretical framework of collaborative

(PR). They review the arguments concerned with the effectiveness of the two types of instructional evaluation, namely, formative and summative.

They admit that collaborative (PR) should offer the opportunity for faculty to learn how to teach more effectively, to practice new techniques and approaches, to get regular feedback on their classroom performance, and to get feedback from their colleagues. For them, the core of (PE) is developmental rather than critical.

They propose that (FPR) should involve the following techniques; classroom observation, videotaping of classes, evaluation of course materials, an assessment of the instructor evaluation of the academic achievement of students, and analysis of teaching portfolios.

Middendrof and Kalish (1995) review the common methods of (PR), showing the urgent need of (PE) of teaching as a result of the increasing pressure from the public regarding the validity of this practice. They state that many universities and departments consider (PE) a complementary assessment procedure to students' evaluation. However, they point out that other people think that classroom observation for tenure and promotion decisions is the best technique, adding that unfortunately the available literature on classroom observation reports that this type of evaluation is neither valid nor reliable. On the other hand, they criticize the rarity of studies on the effectiveness of (PE) of course materials.

They conclude that if (PE) is intended for tenure or promotion purposes, it should be based on clearly articulated criteria. They consider these criteria as the starting point that results in consistent (PE).

The efficacy of formative and summative evaluations of faculty teaching is investigated by Cavanagh (1996). He stresses on the fact that both types of review should be subjected to rules, criteria, and standards so as to identify the effectiveness of teaching. These criteria are decided via peer conversation among members of a scholarly unit. The intrinsic aim for the criteria agreed upon is, he thinks, to clarify the expectations for curriculum design, teaching methodologies, and the potential learning outcome.

Implementing (PR) in the assessment of faculty research work is an area of interest elicited in the literature. For example, Meho and Sonnenwald(2000) investigate the correlation between commendation ranking and (PE) in assessing senior faculty research performance. In addition to the data delivered by the referees regarding (PE) of research work, these two authors depend on two additional sources; commendation content analysis and book review content analysis. The paper is built on two main questions; To what extent does commendation ranking correlate with data from citation content analysis, book reviews, and peer ranking?, Is commendation ranking a valid evaluative indication of research performance of senior faculty members?

Among the prominent results of this work are: the validity of using

commendation data to evaluating research performance of senior staff, peer ranking performs similarly for higher –ranked and lower –ranked senior scholars, the need for additional evaluation method and measures that take into account the context of research, and evaluation based on peer ranking is significantly influenced by the level of knowledge and research biases of the evaluators.

In (2002), Hansen presents a description of (PE) system adopted by Western Washington University (WWU). He reviews two types of evaluation; accountability (judgmental model), and assessment (non-judgmental model). The first is conducted for judgment purposes where the teaching ability of the professor is evaluated, and the second is made for the intention of self-correction rather than accountability. In his view, the second model represents the best practices of faculty (PE). This is because it is built on multi-mode of input. Three evaluation sources are evaluated here;   frequent observations, departmental presentations, and

students' feedback. He adds that this form is preferable due to the fact that it is rooted in an atmosphere of trust.

Arreola (2004), among other scholars, suggests a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. This system requires integrating the technical requirements needed in evaluation with the political process of building consensus around shared values. Such evaluation, he believes, implies systematic observation of relevant faculty performance to decide the degree to which that performance is in alignment with the educational institution's values and needs.

To build that system, eight steps are needed; determining the faculty role model, identifying the parameter values of that model, defining all roles in the faculty role model in terms of documentable achievements, products of performance, defining roles component weights, determining appropriate source of information, determining source and source impacts weight, determining how information from each source should be gathered, and designing or selecting appropriate forms of data gathering.

 A comprehensive survey of the common strategies used to evaluate teaching effectiveness is carried out by Berk (2005). He conducts an analytical study of 12 strategies including (PE) ,student rating, peer rating, self-evaluation, videos, student interviews, alumni rating, employer rating, teaching scholarship, teaching awards, learning outcome measures, and teaching portfolios.

Berk (ibid.) is in favour of adopting a multi-source of evidence to ensure an accurate and reliable base for both formative and summative evaluations, suggesting that this multiple-model is built on the strong points of all evaluation strategies so as to compensate for the discrepancies of any single strategy. He justifies this necessity by the complexity of measuring the act of teaching, and the variety of the sources and tools employed to offer the required evidence to perform this process. He proposes a number of national benchmarks as a guide for defining and measuring effective teaching.

The American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP) (2006) establishes a model for (PE). This model is designed by a (PE) task force with a goal of enhancing faculty teaching. It has been developed after an

access to extensive literature, internet searches, extensive input and training at similar academic institutions, and extensive input and training at a centre of effective teaching. The model consists of a revision of the lecture syllabus, handouts, teaching pedagogy, multi-reviewers classroom observations, and a review of students' assessment. The implication for this version is that a reliable and a valid (PE) method should enhance teaching effectiveness in large classroom setting, and to contribute to faculty development.

  Recently (2009) Ackerman et al. conduct a comparative study to explore the perceptions of university faculty regarding two forms of teaching evaluation; Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET), and Peer Evaluation Reports (PER). The
core of this study is to decide who are the real experts in judging teaching quality. They conclude that an integration technique of evaluation gives better results. They uphold the view that (SET) and (PER) provide complementary feedback from different perspectives. The authors also highlight the advantages and disadvantages of both techniques.

   Another model of (PE) was devised in (2009) by the Centre for Learning and Professional Development (CLPD) at the University of Adelaide, Australia. This model is based on the criterion that the peer evaluator has to give a description of the basis of his knowledge to the faculty being evaluated. It is built on six questions relevant to six teaching areas; overall education, scholarship in teaching, quality of the administration of teaching, formal regulatory matters, the assessment of student learning, and contribution to curriculum development and evaluation. The peer evaluator has to respond to each question via a response scale (where the options outstanding, competent, and very poor are given), and an open-ended comment. The model ends with a space given for any further comments that could be given about the quality of the faculty members' teaching.

  The Department of Extension at Ohio University (DEOU) suggested an approach for (PE) in (2009). The approach is primarily a narrative one with qualitative data that is used as a foundation to foster a faculty member's teaching. The report takes a form of a letter forwarded to the reviewed staff member by the reviewer. By no means, the reviewer should provide copies

of the letter to others. The areas that are reviewed include curriculum choice and development, how faculty member promotes learning, faculty member's preparedness, methods for instruction, and student evaluation. The reviewed instructor receives the letter of evaluation within three weeks after the observation. On his part, the reviewer should provide an oral preliminary report within 24 hours after the observation.

The criteria suggested by this approach are: the faculty member should select the peer evaluator, peer evaluators should be volunteers, at least one peer evaluator should make an evaluation to the evaluated staff member the following year to determine his progress, and the faculty member under evaluation can submit 3-5 specific questions to the peer evaluator prior to the evaluation.

Lately (2009) Walker Teaching Research Centre (WTRC) suggests performance criteria for faculty member that could be incorporated as a part of (PE) system. These criteria fall into three categories: instructional process, interpersonal relations, and professional responsibilities. The category includes a number of standards such as demonstrating evidence of lesson planning, showing knowledge of curriculum and subject matter, using effective teaching techniques and strategies, exploiting instructional time effectively, evaluating student's progress effectively, etc.

Interpersonal relationship has one main standard; demonstrating positive interpersonal relations with students and academic staff. Some of the professional responsibilities standards are: following the policies of the institution, handling confidential information ethically, keeping personal interests and problems separate from professional responsibilities and duties, and assuming responsibilities outside the classroom.

3- Research Questions

The current paper explores the following questions:

1-   What are the schemes implemented by the (PHEI) to evaluate faculty's performance?

2-   What are the discrepancies of the current (PE) scheme?

3-   What is the degree of subjectivity in the existing (PR) model?

4-   How can the suggested (PR) model minimize the drawbacks of the existing (PR) practice?

4-   Method and Procedure

This paper is mainly based on reviewing the related literature, and on a critical analysis of the (PR) policy adopted by the (HPEI). The questionnaire used to evaluate peers' performance is reviewed with a focus on the weak points elicited. Related statistics of two departments are critically highlighted. These statistics are selected as samples to attain feedback about the ratings obtained.

5- Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness by the (PHEI)

Teaching performance is evaluated in the (PHEI) by different techniques; student ratings, peer ratings, and department chairman evaluation. Student rating is conducted by means of a two-section questionnaire distributed at the end of the semester. The first section, which consists of 17 items, is devoted to measure student's satisfaction with the course, and the second is allocated to judge the efficiency of the course instructor through 18 items (Appendix 1). The scale used in both sections is a five-option one; strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree.

Staff members are informed through the department's chairman individually (in an informal way) to have an access to the questionnaire's ratings. Critical issues revealed by the questionnaire, particularly those concerned with course content, course difficulty, teaching techniques and supplementary materials used, textbook substitution, assessment procedures, modifying study plans, are usually approached within departmental sessions. Ad hoc committees are sometimes formed to remedy crucial situations. Final decisions are taken by departments' councils. Points related to adapting study plans (especially elective courses) are discussed within the scope of the institution's bylaws.

To achieve a comprehensive view regarding teaching effectiveness, the (PHEI) adopts the other methods mentioned above. Department's chairmen

usually write evaluation reports forwarded to the Dean at the end of the academic year. These reports are used for tenure purposes. A chairman sometimes conducts a class visit (a class observation) to get feedback about the staff performance. (PE) is carried out via a questionnaire distributed to the peer's colleagues. The peer is evaluated by all teaching staff members in the department.

6- A Review of Peer Evaluation Schemes in the (PHEI)

Apart of its faculty evaluation procedures, the Quality Assurance Department (QAD) at the (PHEI) distributes a (PE) questionnaire at the end of the academic year. The rating resulted from this questionnaire is mostly used for tenure purposes.

The questionnaire is made up of 12 items where each item is rated against a five– grade scale (1-5) (Appendix 2). The first two items are instructional eliciting feedback about the peer's practical contributions in the department activities, and his capability to develop the

department. Item number three is a professional one seeking the potentiality of the peer to act in the department and college environment. Item 4 and 5 are interpersonal asking whether the peer is cooperative, and having an influential personality. Items 6,7,8,9 are professional. Item 6 seeking information about the peer's desire to enhance the department.

Item 7 elicits feedback about the peer's knowledge of his role as a teaching staff member. In item 8, a feedback about the peer's initiative to take instant decisions is investigated. Item 9 inquires about the peer's knowledge of the institution's bylaws. Item 10 inquires about the peer's productivity in academic research. The last two items are interpersonal. Item 11 inquires about the   peer's interpersonal relation with the department general staff. Last item (12) is about the peer's neatness.

7- Questionnaire Analysis

As stated above, the questionnaire consists of 12 items eliciting information about   three areas; instructional, interpersonal, and professional. These items are not   arranged properly where a state of

overlapping is clearly observed. Poor wording of some items results in vagueness of the intended concept of evaluation. A number of items (1,2,6 , 5 and 12) almost signify similar ideas. Instructional questions about scholarship in teaching, quality of the administration of teaching (including course planning, course monitoring and assessment arrangement, and the related systems of feedback of the course content), teaching methodology, exploiting the necessary supporting materials, assessment of students' learning, the peer' contribution to curriculum development and evaluation, course profile, etc. are totally ignored. The major professional area related to adherence to the college bylaws and regulations is another point that is not clearly included in the questionnaire.

Broadly speaking, the questionnaire is not criterion based. The evaluation made does not accurately reflect the evaluator's knowledge of the faculty being evaluated. Therefore, expectation of bias is highly predicted. This is due to the effect of the lack of knowledge, friendship, and power effect.

The questionnaire should include a brief outline of the basis from which the evaluator makes his evaluation. A reference has to be made to the period of time the evaluator has worked with this person , and the contexts in which they work together. Insufficient knowledge about the staff member being evaluated will definitely affect the objectivity and reliability of the rating of the questionnaire.

The items of the questionnaire should be dealt with in two ways; via a response scale and-open ended comment. The areas included in the questionnaire should be explained clearly where a brief summary is given below each area. After approaching the scale of each item, the evaluator has to write a comment showing the criteria or the basis on which the judgment on that area is made.

The questionnaire is analyzed by obtaining the mean value for each item. The average of all mean values is then calculated. The percentage is obtained by treating this average (Table 1 and 2).

8- Overview of the PHEI Peer Ratings

(Table 1)

A Summary of the Mean Values and Percentages of the Questionnaire

Items as Scored in Department A*

#	Item	Mean Values and Percentages							
		First Peer	**Second Peer**	**Third Peer**	**Fourth Peer**	**Fifth Peer**	**Sixth Peer**	**Average**	**Percent age**
1	Has practical contributions in the department activities	4.4	4.8	4.2	4.6	4	4.4	4.4	88%
2	Is competent to develop the department	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.2	4.6	4.5	90%
3	Is able to act in the department and college environment	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.4	4	4.8	4.33	89%
4	Is cooperative with his colleagues	5	4.8	4.2	4.8	4.2	5	4.66	93.3%
5	Is with influential personality	4.2	4.8	4.4	4.4	3.6	4.2	4.26	85.33
6	Has desire to enhance department	5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.2	4.6	4.56	91.33%
7	Is knowledgeable of his role as a teaching staff-member	5	4.8	4.6	5	4.8	5	4.86	97.33%
8	Is initiative with instant decision-making capability	4.2	4.4	4.8	4	4.2	4.6	4.36	87.33%
9	Be acquired with the college, and the sources and opportunities offered by local community	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.53	91%
10	Academically productive (regarding research)	4.4	4.2	4.6	4	3.4	3.4	4	80%
11	Is cooperative with the department's officials	4.8	4.8	4.4	5	4.6	4.8	4.73	95%
12	Is organized person and encourages others to be organized	4.8	4.6	4.2	4.6	4.6	5	4.63	93%
	Average	4.65 93%	4.61 92.3%	4.4 88%	4.55 91%	4.18 83.6%	4.58 91.6%	4.48 89.7%	90%

* For confidentiality and privacy, the departments concerned are referred to as

Department A and Department B.

In order to get an overview on the statistics obtained by the peer's review questionnaire, ratings of two departments have been treated. Two representative departments have only been selected due to the inaccessibility of data. This points in the direction of one aspect of the limitation of the current study. The average and percentage scored by each peer have been calculated together with the average and percentage of each item. For ease of presentation and consistency, the data has been distributed within two separate tables.

Broadly speaking, the ratings of table (1) (Scores of six peers including the chairman) are very high in that the average of the whole items reads (4.48) with a percentage of (90). Four staff members register above ninety (91%, 91.6%, 92.3%, and 93%). The highest rating of these (93%) was obtained by the chairman. The other two peers got above eighty (83.6% and 88%).

The item that registers the highest rating (97.33%) is the one which is relevant to the staff 's knowledge of their roles as college professors. This rating is too much and points out a high level of subjectivity, simply because it lacks any sort of evidence. On the other hand, this item shows that the available teaching staff is an ideal.

Items 4,11, and 12,which are interpersonal also score high ratings, (93,3%, 95%, and 93%), respectively. They give strong evidence that the staff in general is very cooperative and organized. Other items that also read high rating are 2, 6, and 9. The percentages obtained are (90%, 91%,33%, 91%). These ratings offer the feedback that most staff members have the desire to improving the department, and acquired with the college and the sources offered by the community. These ratings are still high lacking any sort of evidence.

The remaining items read above 80 . They are items (1,3,5,8, and 10). The percentages scored are (88%, 89%, 85.33%, 87.33%, and 80%). As it is evident, the lowest rating was registered by item (10) which is concerned with research production. Once again, these conclusions are subjectively based with no evidence.

(Table 2)

A Summary of the Mean Values and Percentages of the Questionnaire Items
as Scored in Department B

#	Item	Mean Values and Percentages								
		First Peer	Second Peer	Third Peer	Fourth Peer	Fifth Peer	Sixth Peer	Seventh Peer	Average	Percentage
1	Has practical contributions in the department activities	4.7	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.5	3.5	3.5	4.14	83%
2	Is competent to develop the department	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.7	4	80%
3	Is able to act in the department and college environment	4.4	4	4.1	4.5	4.1	3.7	4	4.1	82%
4	Is cooperative with his colleagues	4.5	3.8	3.7	4.5	4.7	5	4.5	4.38	88%
5	Is with influential personality	4.4	4	3.8	4.1	4.4	3.8	3.5	4	80%
6	Has desire to enhance department	4.8	4.1	4.1	4	4.1	4	3.8	4.1	83%
7	Is knowledgeable of his role as a teaching staff-member	4.8	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4	3.7	4.3	86%
8	Is initiative with instant decision-making capability	4.5	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.5	3.2	3.9	78%
9	Be acquired with the college, and the sources and opportunities offered by local community	4.8	3.8	4.7	4.4	4.5	3.8	3.7	4.2	85%
10	Academically productive (regarding research)	4.4	4	4.4	3.2	4	3.1	3.2	3.7	75%
11	Is cooperative with the department's officials	4.7	4	4	4.4	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.4	90%
12	Is organized person and encourages others to be organized	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.4	88%
	Average	4.6 92.3%	4.07 81.42%	4.2 85%	4.25 85%	4.38 88%	3.98 80%	3.88 78%	4.13 83%	83%

Table (2) outlines mean values and percentages of peer review at another department. Seven peers including the chairman are involved in this process. The mean value of the whole items is (4.13) with a percentage of (83%). The mean values are generally less than the ones scored by sample (1). However, they are relatively high and do not represent the actual situation. The highest rating once again is scored by the chairman (92.3%). This could be interpreted in terms of face saving and power effect.

Five peers register above (80%), whereas one peer scores (78%). The items that read the highest ratings are (11) and (12) (90% and 88%). They give the feedback that most staff members in this department are responsive and organized. The next two items are 4 and 7   (88% and 86%). They show that most staff members are knowledgeable about their roles as academics, and acquired with the college environment and the opportunities offered by the social community.

Items (1) and (6) read (83%) each. They provide positive feedback that the majority of the staff at this department have practical contributions to enhancing the department. Item (2) also scores good rating (80%). It falls within the area of the competency to developing the department.

The next rating is scored by item 8 (78%). It reveals a great contradiction with the other items of interpersonal implications. According to this rating, academic staff is less initiative with instant decision-making. The lowest percentage is attained by item 10 (75%). It shows that staff members are less productive in academic research. However, this rating is not evidence-based.

These discrepancies strongly necessitate a model that avoids all types of drawbacks, so that peer evaluation is evidence-based.

9- The Suggested Model

To build a comprehensive faculty evaluation system (CFES) that can be applied by the (PHEI) and by other (HEPs), the researcher had surveyed the respective systems routed in (PE) literature. It is a compromise of the current system advocated by the (PHEI) ,and a

variety of models suggested by other scholars (Appendix 3). However, we have adapted many elements of these models to have a certain contribution in this area, and to leave our

touches in the resulted system. This includes adding many areas of evaluation, and modifying the layout of the questionnaire. The ultimate goal of proposing this model is to avoid the gaps elicited in the applied model, and to enhance the effectiveness of (PE) schemes. The system is primarily designed for personnel decisions.

The devised version(questionnaire) is criterion-based. It is mainly constructed on the peer evaluator knowledge of the faculty being evaluated,

and is organized on two main building blocks; response scale, and open-ended comment. The first step followed was to determine the faculty roles where five major areas are covered; teaching, research, institution service, formal regulatory matters, and community service.

The questionnaire is introduced with a brief account of the intended objectives, and the instructions to the peer evaluator. These instructions offer clear idea on how to approach the questionnaire's items. The evaluator is requested not to attempt any item if no sufficient knowledge is available. The rates given are adequately described. Within the instruction page, the evaluator has to provide brief knowledge of the faculty being evaluated. This includes the period and the contexts where both members have worked together.

Fifteen items are included in the questionnaire, the first seven of which are relevant to discipline scholarship. They elicit information about instructional issues. Item (8) deals with research productivity. Items (9) and (10) elicit feedback on the faculty's awareness and adherence to the institution's regulations and bylaws. Item (11) reveals information about institution's service. Questions (12,13, 14) are of personal nature. The last question is about community service. The questionnaire is concluded by a space for other comments provided by the evaluator.

10- Conclusion

 To sum up, evaluation of faculty performance is a part of higher education institutions schemes to enhance teaching process, and to respond to the pressures imposed by quality assurance requirements to compete with counterpart institutions. Nobody ignores the significance of this activity; however, the way evaluation is carried differs from one institution into another depending on the purpose of evaluation (formative or summative), and procedures of evaluation. Generally speaking, literature review clearly points out that the widely-accepted trend of evaluation goes for a multi-source evidence approach.

 (PR) has been considered an important channel of faculty performance evaluation. In most cases, it occupies the second rank after students' rating. Precisely, It has been viewed by many specialists as complementary to

students' ratings. The procedures used to conduct this type of judgment show great variation. Emphasis was placed on basing (PE) on well-established criteria to obtain better results and to eliminate crucial factors in evaluation,

particularly subjectivity, effect of personal ties, and administration power.

  As stated earlier, the model of (PE) applied by the (PHEI) has many drawbacks that negatively affect the intended objectives of evaluation, and that may lead to non-objective and unreliable evaluation ratings. The crucial inadequacy is that it is one-dimensional model. It was built on rating scale only, with complete ignorance to the criteria of

evaluation. Many important areas relevant to teaching quality are neglected. Questionnaire items are not properly arranged.

   The suggested model is a more comprehensive one via covering the major areas relevant

to the faculty. It is criterion-based where the response scale is checked against the evaluator's knowledge of the item being responded to. In case where the criteria used are neither valid nor satisfactory, the rating of the item is canceled. The open-ended comment and the further information provided by the evaluator can be used as a document for evaluation and as a feedback for further summative judgment. The rating obtained by this version contributes to better objective and reliable evaluation conclusions.

11- Recommendations

   Based on the literature routed in the area of the current study, and as feedback of the so far mentioned conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed:

1- Activating (PE) results so seriously in a way to improve the negative areas
   in the faculty performance, and to reinforce the positive ones.

2- Negative areas should be followed up immediately after evaluation where a volunteer or assigned staff member, or the department chairman takes action to remedy the situation.

3- To arrive at a comprehensive feedback of faculty performance, a multi-source of data should be gathered, particularly students' rating, classroom observation, and self-evaluation.

4- The faculty should be urgently informed by the results of (PE) both verbally and via written reports or letters.

5- (PE) mechanism has to be constantly revised by the academic departments, and the Quality Assurance Department to cope with the updated trends in (PE).

6- Professional bodies in quality assurance and evaluation should be involved in the planning and implementation of (PE) measures.

7- Clear criteria for (PE) should be articulated and included in the evaluation scheme.

8- Areas for improvement in faculty performance should be seriously reconsidered. Ad hoc committees are required here to critically study the situation to propose the urgent actions

9- Adopting sophisticated statistical analysis is of immense significance to get more accurate and more useful evaluation results.

10- Documents used in (PE) have to be kept on hard and soft copies to be included within quality assurance literature, and the academic departments data-base.

12- Suggestions for Further Studies

 The following are proposals for future studies in the area of (PE).

1- Investigating the correlation between students' rating and peers' rating. This may support the final assessment and to contribute to solid evaluation.

2- Eliciting Peer evaluators' trends in evaluation is a good area of research. This may result in conclusions regarding the intention of the evaluator, his seriousness, and the psychological motives standing behind evaluation.

3- A critical review of (PE) schemes in private higher education institutions is of a great research value. Such review may highlight many areas of improvement in the
mechanism of faculty performance evaluation.

4- A focus should be given to neglected areas of (PE) research. In this regard, areas such as course content, teaching techniques, students' assessment, programme
revision and updating, and contribution to the local society are good to be approached.

References

Ackerman, D., Gross, B. L., and Vigneron,F. (2009). " Peer Observation Reports and Student Evaluations of teaching", In Alberta Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 55, No.1, pp.18-39.

Arreole, R.A.(2004). " CEDA Workshop Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System" www.cedanet.com. Retrieved on 4/10/2009.

Bergee, M.J.(1993). " A Comparison of Faculty, Peer, and Self-Evaluation of   Applied Brass Jury Performances", In Journal of Research in Music Education, Vol. 41, No.: 1, pp. 19-27.

Berk, R.A. (2005). "Survey of 12 Strategies to Measure Teaching Effectiveness", In International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Vol.17, No.1, pp. 48-62.

Berk, R.A., Naumann, P.L.and Applying S.E. (2004). " Beyond Student Ratings: Peer Observation of Classroom and Clinical Teaching" , In International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship", Vol.1, pp.1-26.

Boyer, E. (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered: New Priorities for the Professoriate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Avancement of Teaching.

Braskamp, L. A., Ory, J.C. (1994). Assessing Faculty Work. San Francisco: Jossey-Brass.

Cavanagh, R.R. (1996). " Formative and Summative Evaluation in the Faculty Peer Review of Teaching", In Innovative Higher Education, Vol. 20. No.4.   pp.235- (n.p.).

Centre for Learning and Professional Development(CLPD) (2009). Peer Evaluation of Teaching. Australia: The University of Adelaide.

Hansen, Th. A. (2002). "Peer Evaluation of Teaching", In Office of Institutional Assessment and Testing. Western Washington University Publications.

Keig, L.W., and Waggoner, M. D. (1995). " Peer Review of Teaching: Improving College Instruction through Formative Assessment, In Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, Vol. 6, No. 3. pp.51-83.

Knapper, C., and Cranton, P. (Eds.). (2001). Fresh Approaches to the

Evaluation of Teaching", In New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No.88. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

   Marsh, H.W., and Roche, L.A. (1997). " Making Students' Evaluations of
  Teaching Effectiveness Effective: The Critical Issues of Validity, Bias, and   Utility", In American Psychologist, Vol. 52, pp. 1187-1197.

Meho, L.I. and Sonnenwald, D.H.(2000). " Citation Ranking Versus Peer Evaluation of Senior Faculty Research Performance: A Case Study of Kurdish Scholarship", In Journal of the American Society for Information Science.Vol. 51, No. 2,pp. 123-138.

Menges, R. J. (1985). " Career-Span Faculty Evaluation", In College Teaching, Vol. 33, pp.181-184.

Middendrof, J. and Kalish, A. (1995). " Peer Evaluation of Teaching" In TRC Newsletter. 6:2.

Osborne, J.L. (1998). " Integrating Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching",In College Teaching, Vol.46.

Rice, R. E. (1991)." The New American Scholar: Scholarship and the Purposes of the University", In Metropolitan Universities, Vol.1, No. 4, pp. 189-193.

Seldin, P. (1999). " Changing Practices in Evaluating Teaching: A Practical   Guide to Improve Faculty Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions", In Seldin, P. and Associates, pp. 97-115.

The Ohio State University. (2009). "Peer Evaluation of Teaching". –extadmin- cms.ag.ohio-state.edu/. Retrieved on 18/10/2009.

The American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. (2006). "Evaluation System in a Department of Pharmacy Practice", In The Annual Meeting of   the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, USA, July, 5th ,2006. URL: http:// www.aacp.org. Retrieved on 28/9/2009.

Walker Teaching Research Centre (WTRC) (2009). "Performance Criteria with Descriptors". www. utc. edu/ Administration/ Walker Teaching Resource Centre/ Faculty Development. Retrieved on 26/9/2009.

Appendix (1)
Course and Tutor Evaluation Questionnaire
Adopted by the (PHEI)

Course Title		Course No.	
Course Tutor		Semester	
Major		Academic Year	

Your View is Very Significant

This questionnaire is designed in two sections. The objective behind the questionnaire is to elicit cognitive and developmental feedback regarding the course you are studying now. This feedback contributes to developing the teaching syllabus in alignment with the scientific, technological, and social developments. The questionnaire also seeks information about your evaluation to the course tutor. This evaluation (which is valuable for the tutor and the department as well) involves both learning and educational areas. Please, read each item carefully, and tick the proper rating honestly. Your cooperation is highly appreciated.

#	Statement	1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Undecided	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
First: Items relevant to the course						
1	The course reinforced my understanding to the subject and major					
2	The course is well-organized.					
3	The course enhanced my interest in the major					
4	I acquired a lot of general knowledge through this course					
5	The course reinforced my critical thinking					
6	The course enhanced my ability in interpretation and argumentation					
7	The course objectives were clear					
8	The teaching material (textbook, PowerPoint presentations, handouts, etc.) was helpful					
9	The amount and level of assignment were suitable					
10	I learnt from the course how to apply the concepts, and how to generalize theories					
11	I learnt many skills through the course					
12	The course enhanced my ability to communicate with others freely					
13	The material of the course is complementary to the materials of other previous courses					
14	Assessment method (examinations, assignments, etc.) was suitable .					
15	I expect to get high mark in the course					
16	(Answer in case this item is relevant to the course) The discussions that took place during the seminars were relevant to the course					
17	(Answer in case this item is relevant to the course) The practical part of the course was useful to understand the course					

Statement	1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Undecided	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
Second: Items Relevant to the Tutor					
18	He is punctual to start and end his lecture					
19	He prepares his lecture in advance					
20	He speaks with clear accent					
21	He adheres to the course plan during teaching					
22	The course schedule was well-organized					
23	He exploits the lesson period in fruitful and productive teaching					
24	He is responsive to the students' questions and queries, and he respects students' views					
25	He presents ideas and concepts in clear and understood way with examples					
26	He takes care of students' learning and progress					
27	He is capable to convey information to students					
28	He encourages students to participate during lectures					
29	He encourages students on independent and innovative thinking					
30	He uses the necessary teaching aids					
31	He is fair to treat and assess his students					
32	He marks test papers and assignments and returns them quickly (maximally within one week period)					
33	He discusses the model answers when he returns test papers					
34	Students can easily consult him during consultation hours					
35	Students receive sufficient feedback on their test papers and assignments					

Appendix (2)
The (PHEI) Peer Evaluation Questionnaire

The following questionnaire aims to evaluate the below mentioned teaching staff-member. Please respond to each item according to the scale given.

Name	
Rank	
Department	

Scale

5= very important

4= important

3= undecided

2= unimportant

1= very unimportant

#	Item	1-5
1	Has practical contributions in the department activities	
2	Is competent to develop the department	
3	Is able to act in the Department and College environment	
4	Is cooperative with his colleagues	
5	Is with influential personality with his colleagues	
6	Has desire to enhance department	
7	Is knowledgeable of his role as a teaching staff-member	
8	Is initiative with instant decision – making capability	
9	Be acquired with the college, and the sources and opportunities offered by local community	
10	Academically productive (regarding research, articles, conferences, etc.)	
11	Is cooperative with the department's officials	
12	Is organized person and encourages others to be organized	
	The following is calculated by the committee (Department Head + Quality Assurance Member)	
	Total	
	Average (Total\ 12)	
	Average % (Average X 20)	

(Appendix 3)
The Suggested Peer Evaluation System

This questionnaire is intended to evaluate the teaching quality of the academic staff at our institution. The feedback you give is complementary to the data we obtain from the Students' Evaluation, Questionnaire. The information provided remains confidential.

Your evaluation should reflect your knowledge about the faculty being evaluated. In case when you feel unsure, or you have no knowledge about the item concerned, please leave it blank.

Faculty Name ………………………………………….

Name of Peer Evaluator ………………………………………...

Instructions to the Peer Evaluator:

At the bottom of this page, you are kindly requested to brief your knowledge about the staff member being evaluated. In the remaining pages, you are given 15 questions. Your answer to each question is two-folded. First, you have to circle the rate you choose from the scale rate given. Later, an open-ended comment on the basis of evaluation is provided. In case, when you have no sufficient knowledge about any questionnaire item, please leave both parts blank and go to the next item.

Outstanding rate means the instructor has superior skills and knowledge, and excels in the performance of teaching. Competent rate implies that the instructor has sufficient skill and knowledge, and adequately performs his teaching. Very poor rate indicates that the instructor has inadequate skills and knowledge, and is not competent in the performance of teaching.

Knowledge of the Faculty

Please, outline briefly your knowledge to the instructor being evaluated. A reference should be made to the period you have worked with this person, and the contexts where you have worked together.

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

1- How would you rate this person's effectiveness as a university teacher?

      Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor

          7   6   5   4   3   2   1

EvaluationBasis:

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………

1- Is he competent in preparing course material?
       Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
              7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis:…………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………

3-Does he practice his scholarship in his discipline, understanding of learning and teaching principles?
       Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
              7   6   5   4   3   2   1
 EvaluationBasis: …………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………

 4-Does he adopt modern methods in teaching?
       Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
              7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis: …………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………

5- Is he competent to assess his students?
    Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
           7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis: …………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………

6- Is he efficient to revise and develop the teaching programme?
Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
           7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis: …………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………

7- Is he competent to develop the department?
Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
        7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis: ………………………………………………………….
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
8- Is he academically productive (regarding research, articles, conferences, etc.)?
Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
        7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis: ……………………………………………………….
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………

9- Is he aware of the college bylaws and regulations?
Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
        7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis……………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
 10-Does he adhere to the college policies and regulations?
Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
        7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis: ……............………………………………………......…….
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
11- Is he competent to develop the college?
Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
        7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis: …………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
12- Is he initiative with instant decisions?

Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
      7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis:………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

13- Is he cooperative with his colleagues and the college administrative staff?
Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
      7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis: ………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

14- Is knowledgeable about quality assurance and evaluation schemes?
Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
      7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis: ………………………………………………………..………

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

15- Does he contribute to community service through teaching, research work, and consultancy?
Outstanding   Competent   Very Poor
      7   6   5   4   3   2   1
EvaluationBasis: …………………………………………………………….

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

Any Other Comments?
If you have further information about this staff member, please state them below. This information contributes to better evaluation of this person. It may include your knowledge about the committees he has worked in, the conferences and symposiums he has contributed in, his role in developing the college curriculum, his contribution to the local society as a whole and to the National Goal Organizations (NGOs), etc.

Thank you four your cooperation