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#### Abstract

One of the main challenges facing the future of the country's universities, is defining the role of teacher and student, and educating worthy graduates. In a research titled "the views of professors and students of Islamic Azad University Marvdasht, Shiraz" about evaluation of professors by students that performed by Descriptive survey method on statistical population of 19791 students and 944 professors with using of 1700 questionnaire for students and 944 questionnaires for professors, the results showed that $61 / 3$ percent of teachers believed that all students can evaluate professors but 76/9 percent of students believed that teachers should be evaluated by the department manager. In general, this study highlights the importance of student evaluation but this method should not be the only teacher evaluation tool and colleagues and especially the department manager's view also should be used. According to results we can demonstrate strategies such as release education system from previous constraints, changing attitude towards teaching and learning, designing, providing students with the future roles, changing relationships between professors and students for proper and reasonable attitude toward presented challenges.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

Evaluation existed long ago in education and particularly higher education and have important role as one of the function on university management for proper planning, implementing successful educational programs and improving educational quality in universities.

One important evaluation in all the educational systems, is evaluation of activities of teachers (Educational evaluation is a process through which data associated with the training data collected and converted into useful for decision making [4].

Evaluation of teachers is measuring success rate of teachers and for reaching this we must collect needed information about educational actions of teachers and selecting criteria for comparing obtained information and then judging about the extent to which predetermined objectives have been achieved. Although teachers must have positive attitudes toward evaluation as a tool for professional development of themselves but educational system must to promote and implement scientific evaluation in ways that should be applicable, equitable, humane and objective as possible (2).

The evaluation aims to help teachers to improve teaching methods and activities and help managers to make reasonable decisions about hiring, promotion of professors and promotion of teaching as a profession. Proper implementation of the education system requires careful and scientific planning and implementation of those, and undoubtedly is one of the measures that education officials could be informed of how their program goals is the evaluation of manpower. Educational activities in each country can be considered investment of one generation for another generation (7).The main objective of this investment is human development. In fact, this is a very important tool that can be used for major and important steps in improving the education goals. Performance evaluation of human resources, especially teachers and professors in universities can double their motivation and encourage them for continuous, dynamic and conscious activity. Evaluation could have an effective role in the diagnosis of efficient and effective force and to promote a culture of meritocracy in the education system. All higher education systems investigate and evaluate function of each of its faculty members. Aim of this study is to determine the most important priorities of students about different and varied characteristics of function of a teacher.

### 1.1. The research objective

The objectives of this study include:

1- to determine the most important priorities of students about different and varied characteristics of function of a teacher

2- identify the most credible people to evaluate teaching performance
3- Providing information to provide convenient and reliable tool for teacher evaluation system.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study is a descriptive survey. the obtained data were analyzed without any manipulation and survey results are interpreted according to the research questions. In this study questionnaires have been considered the most appropriate tool for data collection.

### 1.2. Statistical Population

We studied two population, faculty members (Full time, part time, scholarships, and TA professors), and students studying in all fields of Marvdasht unit of Islamic Azad University of Shiraz.

## Sampling methods and sample size estimation

Considering the variance of the studying trait was not available, with using the formula of sample size statistical population of students was determined.

$$
n=\frac{n^{2} s^{2}}{n d^{2}+t^{2} s^{2}}=\frac{19791 \times 1 / 96^{2} \times 2 / 28^{2}}{1979 \times 103^{2} \times 1 / 96^{2} \times 2 / 28^{2}}=1700
$$

$d^{2}=$ Desired accuracy
$t^{2}=95 \%$
$\mathrm{n}=$ population
$s^{2}=$ pre estimated variance

### 2.2. Sampling:

Sampling is a categorization according to volume. For selecting sample population of this study, the number of samples selected proportional to the number of professors and students of Islamic Azad Universities of Shiraz and Marvdashta and academic disciplines and gender of teachers and students. 1700 questionnaires distributed among the students who 1640 questionnaires returned with return rate of $96 \%$.

Samples were from Marvdasht in 37 bachelor and undergraduate fields and two graduate fields and at the University of Shiraz in 55 bachelor and undergraduate fields and 6 graduate fields.

The desired values for sample size are as follows. The total number of surveyed teachers were 944 people and total number of students were 19791 and selected sample of teachers was /17 of Society or 160 people and selected sample of students was $/ 08$ of society or 1,700 people.

### 3.2. The research questions:

Who have competency for teacher evaluation?
Evaluation results should be given to whom?
Evaluation results should be used for what?
In the evaluation of professor is his teaching skills involved most?
In the evaluation of professor is his personal characteristics involved most?
In the evaluation of professor is his evaluation skills involved most?
In the evaluation of professor is performing principles and laws of training involved most?
In the evaluation of professor is his communication involved most?
Conclusions resulting from findings of the research questions

### 1.3.2. Who are qualified to evaluate teachers?

61/3 percent of teachers believe that all students could evaluate their teachers. 76/9 percent of student's believe that teachers should be evaluated by the Department. Overall, this study highlights the fact that although evaluating of students and teachers is important it should not be the only evaluation tool and we must be use viewpoint of colleagues and especially the Department. (Tables1 and 2).

### 2.3.2. The evaluation results should be given to whom?

79/6 percent of students believe that the evaluation results should be given to the Dept. $62 / 6$ percent of teachers also believe that the evaluation should be given to the Dept. (Table 3 and Table 4)

### 3.3.2. Evaluation results should be used for what?

68/2 percent of teachers believe that the evaluation results should be considered as one of the criteria for increasing wages and $75 / 2$ percent of students believe that the evaluation results should be used solely for improving teaching methods.

### 4.3.2. Is teaching skills of teacher involved in his evaluation most?

$92 / 6$ percent of teachers believe that in teacher evaluation, announcing new scientific content and creating new opportunities for the students thinking is important. 97percent of students believe that dominating the subject is very important in teacher evaluation. (Tables 7 and 8 )

### 5.3.2. Whether in the evaluation of teacher his personal characteristics are involved most?

$92 / 6$ percent of students view eloquently expressing skills of teacher very important in teacher evaluation and $91 / 3$ percent of teachers express that in evaluation self-esteem is very important (Tables 9 and 10).
6.3.2. Does in the teacher evaluation process, his evaluation skills has the most involvement role?
$75 / 6$ percent of students believe that teacher must be master inaccurate and comprehensive exam at the end of the term also according to $86 / 9$ percent of teachers believe that teachers must be master in accurate and comprehensive exam at the end of the term.

### 7.3.2. Does in the teacher evaluation, regarding instructional principles and laws by him involved

 most?69/8 percent of students believe that the start time and end time of the class according to his educational program is effective in his evaluation while 85 percent of teachers believe that the start time and end time of the class according to educational program is effective in his evaluation.

Undoubtedly, requiring of higher education has increased importance in our central reasoning future.
Therefore, academic centers must be helping students to develop understanding that knowledge is a creatable feature. Quoted by Johnson, E. Marcia: "This time is the best time and worst time, the era of wisdom and foolishness, the era of belief and disbelief, the season of light and darkness, spring of hope and winter of despair". Indeed, ourhigher education institutions will face which future? As we live in a world that have not the slightest resemblance to the old world it is not that far-fetched to assume that the world we now live in it have any resemblance with the modern and future world. This can be an alarm call for higher education that it must change its structure and management and planning for the unthinkable future.

## 3. The main challenges facing higher education in the future:

1 - Uncertainty in the values recognition, fears of the future and the various crises of human life. Education systems have an important role in reducing these problems (1). Supports the idea that education serves as a renewal of society and protect spiritual reserves and is a type of planned activities that the adults are trying to help young people develop their spiritual life with that. This view and hundreds others in this manner all demonstrate that in broad sense what is difference between automatic limited training and intentional training (6). Another challenge is to determine the role of teacher and student (Figure 1-1).

According to studies students can get a general approach to learning from the shallow, deep, and strategic approach. Shallow approach students, mainly concerned with finishing the course, and fear of failure... but students, who are motivated to use the deep approach, owe their motivation to interest in the subject of course and need to understand the content and interpretation of knowledge. Strategic learning process, is used by multidimensional students, they use retaining for understanding and a deep approach to learning. These students motivated by earning high scores, competing and understanding the material. (5). Teachers must accept the fact that their role is changing. Teachers gradually reduced their roles information providers and they will be more as motivator and ideas entrepreneurs that are responsible for providing in-depth understanding of the underlying scientific field (9). We must accept this fact that higher education is passing an era and entering a completely different period other than current period.


3 - Figure 1-1. A pattern of student learning
According to Mathews, John (1988) thirty years away will remain the only remains of the large university units and universities will not survive. Magnitude of this change will be like when we reached the printing industry.

The third great challenge facing universities is academic vision such as university should be aware of its existence and functioning and mission. Mission of universities is ethical commitment and obligation to
contribute in improving economic, cultural and intellectual conditions of committed community. For universities to fulfill this commitment they should try to cover up the discovery of new knowledge and inspire students to understand their value. Therefore, they must live together as a help for rational life and economic welfare and create trained citizens. The fourth challenge is creating new learning environments. Info sphere(human progress in all areas) suggests various progresses in information technology including the Internet (chat rooms -Facebook - Twitter - e-mail and information sites, etc.) that have very sensitive and key role in all learning environments from formal and conscious to informal and unconscious and ignoring the role of this informational environment is futile and useless and therefore universities not only must be prepared to change to new leaning environments but also should be compatible and consistent with this new informational and educational environment (through performing changes in curriculum and physical environment) one of the most dramatic changes in the performance of higher education in past decade has been a movement toward accountability meaning to provide clear and transparent evidences of what occurs in teaching and learning section of higher education. It can be very effective in changing the attitude of teacher toward teaching and learning. therefore teacher should be aware of new subjects of his field of specialization with help of academic communities, the studying of scientific publications, accessing to information and educational resources, and through the World Wide Web (Internet) but unfortunately with regard to learning environment we understand that teachers teach variable number of students and with programs developed already, their teaching style is more as a traditional education. The fifth challenge is ethics and the new informational environments. Here it is noteworthy that whether our students have information literacy and the necessary morality for responsible and beneficial using of the Internet? So it should be noted that knowledge creation and its proper application can be effective. The sixth challenge is teaching worthy students. Clearly, the future learning environment for the new millennium in no way would be like today. As a result, the role of trainers is not trustee of the past heritage and their thoughts and orientation about the future must be changed. Challenge of technical and humanities disciplines is the seventh challenge. Unfortunately, the Humanities is engaged in several fronts. Scholars of the humanities, as the guardians of intellectual and cultural of the past, would be victim more than their colleagues in other disciplines because of their commitment to the "past". Many of them are past-oriented, some are present-oriented and very few are future-oriented so they can't adequately reflect the efforts of modern humans. Unfortunately training in humanities decreased to analysis of great works and past characters and even their greatness has been relegated to a marginal issue. As a result, now humanities have lost its past role in determining the quality of human life.

## 4. Suggested strategies for facing these challenges

1 -We must give human identity to learning:
With linking of different classes and inviting students to participate in the classroom this goal can be achieved.

2 - Providing models of the future roles of students:
Teachers should gather experts, educated people, discoverers, educators, writers, poets and scientists in an electronic classroom, to provide students with patterns of positive roles.

3 -Educational system should not be captive of past prison
Education system must be flexible and should create opportunities for accelerated, easier and cheaper learning.

4-Teaching and learning must replace each other role
We must change the rule that only teaching in classroom is suitable. Teaching must be go to wherever humans are and must be permanent. Educational system should be responsive to changing and consider technology as a means to achieve the goal.

5 - Design training programs based on infrastructure needs and social aspirations
Regulatory educational systems are not the only ways for teaching. Educational program should be designed from scratch to be sure that the student has access to education in all of lifetime and understand this fact that testing and exam is not the end of measuring intelligence and obtained knowledge.

6 - Emphasis on pleasuring learning
Training should be pleasurable. In this educational method, student takes curiosity about everything especially in time of learning new things. In fact, he involved with subject and thinks about it and enjoys doing that.

7 - Emphasis on information literacy.
Another important change we are looking is a new informational environment. Setting this point that teachers now are not science sources and replace of books but play most important role in the designing, development and implementation of educational program.

8 - Changing the relationship of teacher and apprentice (student)
Dry relationship of teacher and apprentice neither creates creativity nor must the innovations. We work to work to form innovation outside of the chalk and the blackboard.

Table1.Frequency distribution and percentage of responses to questions from teachers for who are qualified to evaluate professors

| Question | Very <br> negative | negative | No <br> comment | positive | Very <br> positive | average | Standard <br> deviation | percent of positive and <br> very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 22 | 27 | 23 | 50 | 38 | 3.34 | 1.36 | 55.1 |
|  | $13 / 8$ | 16.9 | 14.4 | 31.3 | 23.8 |  |  | 35 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 16 | 37 | 51 | 43 | 13 | 3 | 1.11 | 27.5 |
|  | 10 | 23.1 | 31.9 | 26.9 | 8.1 |  |  | 1.17 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 22 | 67 | 27 | 31 | 13 | 2.66 |  | 39.4 |
|  | $13 / 8$ | 41.9 | 16.9 | 19.4 | 8.1 |  | 1.22 | 61.3 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 22 | 46 | 28 | 49 | 14 | 2.91 |  |  |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 13.8 | 28.8 | 17.5 | 30.6 | 8.8 |  | 1.32 |  |

Table2. Frequency distribution and percentage of responses to questions from students for who are qualified to evaluate professors

| Question | Very <br> negative | negative | No <br> comment | positive | Very <br> positive | average | Standard <br> deviation | percent of positive <br> and very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 79 | 159 | 141 | 55 | 709 | 4 | 1.15 | 76.9 |
|  | 4.8 | 9.7 | 8.6 | 33.7 | 43.2 |  |  | 60.6 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 78 | 175 | 392 | - | 358 | 3.62 | 1.08 | 30.5 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 4.8 | 129 | 495 | 515 | 274 | 227 | 2.98 | 1.15 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 7.9 | 30.2 | 31.4 | 16.7 | 13.8 |  |  | 48.7 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 99 | 347 | 394 | 556 | 242 | 3.30 | 1.13 | 66.9 |
|  | 6 | 21.2 | 24 | 32.9 | 14.8 |  |  |  |

Table3. Frequency distribution and percentage of questions answered about the evaluation results should be given to whom (from student viewpoint)

| Question | Very <br> negative | negative | No <br> comment | positive | Very <br> positive | average | Standard <br> deviation | percent of positive <br> and very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 35 | 92 | 209 | 693 | 611 | 4.06 | $0 / 955$ | 79.6 |
|  | 2.1 | 5.6 | 12.7 | 42.3 | 37.3 |  |  | 68.6 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 58 | 148 | 310 | 690 | 434 | 3.78 | $1 / 04$ | 70.1 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 3.5 | 57 | 159 | 274 | 510 | 640 | 3.92 | 1.11 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 3.5 | 9.7 | 16.7 | 31.1 | 39 |  |  | $37 . / 9$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 126 | 399 | 494 | 411 | 210 | 3.10 | 1.14 | 37.2 |
|  | 7.7 | 24.3 | 30.1 | 25.1 | 12.8 |  |  |  |

Table 4.Frequency distribution and percentage of questions answered about the evaluation results should be given to whom (from teacher viewpoint)

| Question | Very <br> negative | negative | No <br> comment | positive | Very <br> positive | average | Standard <br> deviation | percent of positive <br> and very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 13 | 17 | 30 | 66 | 34 | 3.56 | 1.17 | 62.6 |
|  | 8.1 | 10.6 | 18.8 | 41.3 | 21.3 |  |  | 58.8 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 9 | 17 | 40 | 62 | 32 | 3.56 | 1.09 | 29.4 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 5.6 | 10.6 | 25 | 38.8 | 20 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 40 | 47 | 26 | 33 | 14 | 2.58 | 1.30 | 22.5 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 25 | 29.4 | 16.3 | 20.6 | 8.8 |  | 1.20 | 57.6 |
|  | 42 | 58 | 24 | 27 | 9 | 2.39 |  |  |
|  | 13 | 36.3 | 15 | 16.9 | 5.6 |  | 1.29 |  |

Table5. Frequency distribution and percentage of question answered about evaluation results should be used for what (from teacher viewpoint)

| Question | Very <br> negative | negative | No <br> comment | positive | Very <br> positive | average | Standard <br> deviation | percent of positive and <br> very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 11 | 18 | 32 | 67 | 32 | 3.56 | 1.13 | 61.9 |
|  | 6.9 | 11.3 | 20 | 41.9 | 20 |  |  | 68.2 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 8 | 20 | 23 | 67 | 42 | 3.71 | 1.13 | 64.4 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 5 | 12.5 | 14.4 | 41.9 | 26.3 |  |  |  |
|  | 9 | 11 | 37 | 73 | 30 | 3.65 | 1.04 |  |

Table6. Frequency distribution and percentage of question answered about evaluation results should be used for what (from student viewpoint)

| Question | Very <br> negative | negative | No <br> comment | positive | Very <br> positive | average | Standard <br> deviation | percent of positive <br> and very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 148 | 322 | 389 | 472 | 309 | 3.28 | 1.23 | 47.6 |
|  | 9 | 19.6 | 23.7 | 28.8 | 18.8 |  |  | 75.2 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 33 | 123 | 250 | 610 | 624 | 4.01 | 1.00 | 70.8 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 2 | 7.5 | 15.2 | 37.2 | 38 |  |  |  |
|  | $1 / 2$ | 41 | 419 | 677 | 483 | 3.95 | 0.870 |  |

Table7. Frequency distribution and percentage of answers to questions about whether in the evaluation of teacher, his teaching skills has the greatest involvement or not (From student viewpoint)

| Question | $\begin{gathered} \text { Very } \\ \text { negative } \end{gathered}$ | negative | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { comment } \end{gathered}$ | positive | Very positive | average | Standard deviation | percent of positive and very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | 8 | o. 18 | 23 | 280 | 1311 | 0.583 | 0.583 | 97 |
|  | 0.5 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 17.1 | 79.9 |  |  |  |
| 15 | 12 | 10 | 56 | 451 | 1111 | 0.656 | 0.656 | 95.2 |
|  | 0.7 | 0.6 | 3.4 | 27.5 | 67.7 |  |  |  |
| 16 | 13 | 14 | 112 | 540 | 961 | 0.729 | 0.729 | 91.5 |
|  | 0.8 | 0.9 | 6.8 | 32.9 | 58.6 |  |  |  |
| 17 | 18 | 33 | 134 | 546 | 909 | 0.810 | 0.810 | 88.7 |
|  | 1.1 | 2 | 8.2 | 33.3 | 55.4 |  |  |  |
| 18 | 92 | 267 | 282 | 570 | 429 | 1.19 | 1.19 | 61 |
|  | 5.6 | 16.3 | 17.2 | 34.8 | 26.2 |  |  |  |
| 19 | 36 | 234 | 207 | 604 | 559 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 70.9 |
|  | 2.2 | 14.3 | 12.6 | 36.8 | 34.1 |  |  |  |
| 20 | 95 | 163 | 251 | 649 | 482 | 1.14 | 1.14 | 69 |
|  | 5.8 | 9.9 | 15.3 | 39.6 | 29/4 |  |  |  |

Table8.Frequency distribution and percentage of answers to questions about whether in the evaluation of teacher, his teaching skills has the greatest involvement or not (From teacher viewpoint)

| Question | Very negative | negative | No comment | positive | Very positive | average | Standard deviation | percent of positive and very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 33 | 114 | 4.52 | 0.970 | 91.9 |
|  | 5 | 0.6 | 2/5 | 20.6 | 71.3 |  |  |  |
| 15 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 42 | 106 | 4.50 | 0.897 | 92.6 |
|  | 3.8 | 0.6 | 3.1 | 26.3 | 66.3 |  |  |  |
| 16 | 7 | 15 | 81 | 57 | 160 | 4.13 | 0.911 | 35.6 |
|  | 4.4 | 9.4 | 50.6 | 35.6 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 17 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 62 | 86 | 4.38 | 0.868 | 92.6 |
|  | 3.1 | 1.3 | 3.1 | 38/8 | 53.8 |  |  |  |
| 18 | 6 | 14 | 26 | 65 | 49 | 3.85 | 1.06 | 71.2 |
|  | 3.8 | 8.8 | 16.3 | 40/6 | 30.6 |  |  |  |
| 19 | 12 | 30 | 32 | 60 | 26 | 3.36 | 1.17 | 53.8 |
|  | 7.5 | 18/8 | 20 | 37.5 | 16.3 |  |  |  |
| 20 | 9 | 8 | 19 | 69 | 55 | 3.95 | 1.08 | 77.5 |
|  | 5.6 | 5 | 11.9 | 43.1 | 34.4 |  |  |  |

Table9. Frequency and percentage distribution of answers to question whether in the evaluation of teacher his personal characteristics are involved most (From student viewpoint)

| Question | Very <br> negative | negative | No <br> comment | positive | Very <br> positive | average | Standard <br> deviation | percent of positive <br> and very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 11 | 48 | 45 | 46 | 10 | $2 / 97$ | $1 / 05$ | 35.1 |
|  | 6.9 | 30 | 28.1 | 28.8 | $6 / 3$ |  |  | 37.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 20 | 34 | 46 | 3 | 3 | 3.10 | 1.28 | 91.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 3}$ | 12.5 | 21.3 | 28.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 3.8 | 6 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 64 | 82 | 4.33 | 0.922 |
|  | 318 | 3 | 40 | 51.3 |  |  | 90.7 |  |

Table10. Frequency and percentage distribution of answers to question whether in the evaluation of teacher his personal characteristics are involved most (From teacher viewpoint)

| Question | Very <br> negative | negative | No <br> comment | positive | Very <br> positive | average | Standard <br> deviation | percent of positive and <br> very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 28 | 180 | 391 | 453 | 588 | 3.84 | 1.08 | 63.5 |
|  | 1.7 | 11 | 23.8 | 27.6 | $35 . / 9$ |  |  | 64.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 24 | 196 | 365 | 428 | 627 | 3.87 | 1.09 | 90.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 3}$ | 1.5 | 12 | 22.3 | 26.1 | 38.2 |  |  | 9.773 |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 0.5 | 43 | 102 | 445 | 1041 | 4.50 |  | 92.6 |
|  | 8 | 2.6 | 6.2 | 27.1 | 63.5 |  | 0.706 |  |

Table 11.Frequency distribution and percentage of answer to questions related to whether in the teacher evaluation process, his evaluation skills has the most involvement role (from student viewpoint)

| Question | Very <br> negative | negative | No <br> comment | positive | Very <br> positive | average | Standard <br> deviation | percent of positive <br> and very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 3}$ | 101 | 171 | 330 | 685 | 352 | $3 / 64$ | $1 / 49$ | $63 / 3$ |
|  | $6 / 2$ | $10 / 4$ | $20 / 1$ | $41 / 8$ | $21 / 5$ |  |  | $57 / 7$ |
| $\mathbf{3 4}$ | 133 | 217 | 343 | 619 | 328 | $3 / 48$ | $1 / 18$ | $75 / 6$ |
|  | $8 / 1$ | $13 / 2$ | $20 / 9$ | $37 / 7$ | 20 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3 5}$ | 48 | 76 | 276 | 625 | 615 | $4 / 002$ | $0 / 995$ |  |
|  | $2 / 9$ | $4 / 6$ | $16 / 8$ | $38 / 1$ | $37 / 5$ |  |  |  |

Table 12.Frequency distribution and percentage of answer to questions related to whether in the teacher evaluation process, his evaluation skills has the most involvement role (from teachers viewpoint)

| Question | Very <br> negative | negative | No <br> comment | positive | Very <br> positive | average | Standard <br> deviation | percent of positive and <br> very positive |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 3}$ | 4 | 7 | 32 | 83 | 34 | $3 / 85$ | $0 / 891$ | $73 / 2$ |
|  | $2 / 5$ | $4 / 4$ | 20 | $51 / 9$ | $21 / 3$ |  |  | $83 / 1$ |
| $\mathbf{3 4}$ | 5 | 7 | 15 | 84 | 49 | $4 / 03$ | $0 / 927$ | $86 / 9$ |
|  | $3 / 1$ | $4 / 4$ | $9 / 4$ | $52 / 5$ | $30 / 6$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3 5}$ | 9 | 2 | 10 | 87 | 52 | $4 / 06$ | $0 / 972$ |  |
|  | $5 / 6$ | $1 / 3$ | $6 / 3$ | $54 / 4$ | $32 / 5$ |  |  |  |

Table 13.Frequency distribution and percentage of answer to questions related to whether in the teacher evaluation process, regarding instructional principles and laws by him involved most (from student viewpoint)

| Question | Very <br> negative | negative | No <br> comment | positive | Very <br> positive | average | Standard <br> deviation | percent of positive and <br> very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 9}$ | 69 | 117 | 309 | 548 | 597 | $3 / 90$ | $1 / 09$ | $69 / 8$ |
|  | $4 / 2$ | $7 / 1$ | $18 / 8$ | $33 / 4$ | $36 / 4$ |  |  | $69 / 7$ |
| $\mathbf{3 0}$ | 28 | 138 | 331 | 658 | 485 | $3 / 87$ | $0 / 986$ | $61 / 1$ |
|  | $1 / 7$ | $8 / 4$ | $20 / 2$ | $40 / 1$ | $29 / 6$ |  |  | $1 / 12$ |
| $\mathbf{3 1}$ | 84 | 191 | 363 | 592 | 410 | $3 / 64$ |  | $51 / 3$ |
|  | $5 / 1$ | $11 / 6$ | $22 / 1$ | $36 / 1$ | 25 |  | $1 / 22$ |  |
| $\mathbf{3 2}$ | 136 | 268 | 395 | 487 | 354 | $3 / 39$ |  |  |
|  | $8 / 3$ | $16 / 3$ | $24 / 1$ | $29 / 7$ | $21 / 6$ |  |  |  |

Table14. Frequency distribution and percentage of answer to questions related to whether in the teacher evaluation process, regarding instructional principles and laws by him involved most (from teachers viewpoint)

| Question | Very <br> negative | negative | No <br> comment | positive | Very <br> positive | average | Standard <br> deviation | percent of positive and <br> very positive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 9}$ | 4 | 4 | 16 | 93 | 43 | 4.04 | 0.834 | 85 |
| $\mathbf{3 0}$ | 3.5 | 2.5 | 10 | 58.1 | 26.9 |  |  | 85 |
|  | 1.9 | 3 | 18 | 87 | 49 | 4.10 | 0.810 | 82.6 |
| $\mathbf{3 1}$ | 3 | 1.9 | 11.3 | 54.4 | 30.6 |  |  | 0.890 |
| $\mathbf{3 2}$ | 1.9 | 6 | 18 | 78 | 54 | 4.08 |  | 65.7 |
|  | 3.8 | 13 | 11.3 | 48.8 | 33.8 |  | 1.01 |  |
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