

Seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaire of the university professor in the Faculty of Education.

Hamdan A. Alsoofi , Anisah Dohdar

Associate Professor in Education Principles, Islamic University of Gaza, Palestine.
Master of Education Principles, Islamic University of Gaza, Palestine.

Abstract: *The study aimed at finding out the degree of seriousness of postgraduate students in the Faculty of Education at the Islamic University in dealing with the evaluation questionnaire of the university professor. In addition to revealing the significance of the differences between the estimates average of the population to the degree of seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with evaluation questionnaire of the university professor due to (gender, level, and specialty). The researchers used the descriptive analytical approach based on the questionnaire as the main tool for the study. The questionnaire was applied to a random sample of (117) students, nearly(34%) of them enrolled in the postgraduate program at the Faculty of Education. The results of the study showed that the degree of seriousness of the postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaire of the university professor came largely with a relative weight (80.83%). There were no statistically significant differences at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the degree of seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with evaluation questionnaire of the university professor due to (gender, level, and specialty). Finally, the study recommended directing graduate students at the Faculty of Education to choose the appropriate time to fill in the questionnaire.*

Keywords: *seriousness of postgraduate students, evaluation of the university professor.*

Date of Submission: 22-08-2017

Date of acceptance: 08-09-2017

I. Introduction

It is well known that universities are a key pillar in the overall development process. They are the engine of the renaissance and the progress in the light of the mass knowledge and technological revolution, and huge challenges in societies and peoples, that have created a state of competition among the various community institutions.

The universities are the center of science and light, and the platform from which the views of the pioneers, research and scientific prestige are based to contribute to the enlightenment of nations and the development of humanity, and to fill the field of work through the rehabilitation of trained individuals who are capable to carry out their tasks as fully as possible. (Al-Masri, 2016, p.4).Higher Education plays a critical role through its outstanding contribution to building human capital and providing society with human resources and capabilities equipped with science and knowledge to play its role in the process of construction and development. Human development is considered the main focus of all economic, political, and social aspects. (Rubaie, 2008, p. 15).

The university professors represent the cornerstone of the university building structure, which is the most important factor of university production. At the same time, they are the most important factor in achieving the goals of university education through their academic and educational role. "(Alojaili, 2013, p. 71).If scholars represent the nation's conscious and enlightened mind, then, the university professor stands at the head of all of them. In addition, the society entrusted them with educating its youth in useful sciences and preparing them educationally, socially, and professionally. "(Muhammad and al-Fatabi, 2007, p. 99).

The tasks of university professor include lecturing, scientific research, serving the local community, and other administrative duties. Perhaps the multiple tasks entrusted to teaching member made him/her the focus of attention from several sides, as pointed out (AlFatalawi, 2008, p. 189). The responsibility of the university professor in serving the community is inseparable from his responsibilities in the service of scientific production, the students, and his/her profession. In fact, his/her service to science and students is one of the most important services provided to university and society.

University lecturing is the backbone of the professional performance for university professor as it is one of the main tasks that teachers spend most of their time in it. Lecturing at the university requires a professor with a high degree of scientific and educational competence. The efficiency of the faculty member is not only measured by his knowledge of his/her specialty, but also by his/her knowledge of the facts of this science and its

concepts. Besides, it is measured at the same time in the efficiency of his/her teaching in terms of approaches, strategies, methods, and techniques (Ali, 2005, p. 55). Lecturing is the most important universities' profession and the most effective in preparing students. It provides them with useful knowledge, positive and valuable behavioral trends, and the scientific and practical skills necessary to qualify them to become active members in serving themselves and their nation, (Saleh, 2010, p. 316). Thus, it is necessary to evaluate the professor in order to improve the performance level, raise efficiency and effectiveness, and measure the application of the system goals, outputs, and the support of the educational institution (Alsageer, 2005, P64). The concept of evaluation refers to collecting and describing data on a certain level in order to use them in decision-making. "(Nabhan, 2004, p. 40).

Due to the importance of lecturing mission, educators focused on two main inputs; the first represents the processes and outputs, which are based on their evaluation of the effectiveness of the lecturing mission to the results of the students and their achievements as a true indicator of the lecturing performance of the professor. Thus, the achievement of the students is considered the main test for judging professor's performance. The second input represents the evaluation judgments, which are based on the evaluation of colleagues, students, university administrators, and professors' self-reports (Al-Tweissi and Samara, 2014, p. 129). There are common methods to evaluate the performance of the professors in universities such as: Evaluation of the performance of the university professor by the faculties' deans, heads of departments, self-evaluation, and the evaluation of students, which is a widely used approach in evaluating the work of the university professor and his/her technical and professional skills. (Ahmed, 2012, P. 658). Universities often involve other methods to evaluate the university professor, including taking the opinion of the student in the performance of their professor in a certain course. At the same time, universities avoid using one method to eliminate any sensitivity that may arise from the traditional evaluation, and to emphasize on objectivity in the evaluation process.

Evaluation of the university professor by his/her students is considered the most accurate and stable method for evaluating the work of the university professor and his/her technical and professional skills. Evaluating the university professor by his/her students is one of the important pivotal issues that fall under the most important component in the educational system which is evaluation. Although, it is used to measure and evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the educational process in developed countries, it does not find enough attention in the Arab countries, (Al-Naqah and Issa, 2009, p. 3). If the university wants to reach a high level of excellence among other institutions, it must address weaknesses and highlight strengths as its priorities.

The importance of the evaluation of the university professor helps in improving his/her skills and his/her ideas about teaching, knowing the impact of this teaching performance in the curriculum and methodology, and providing feedback that contribute to the development of methods and shows the appropriateness of teaching methods for students, (Alshok and Alogail, P. 3). Hence, the process of evaluating the performance of the professors is considered an urgent necessity and an important priority that should not be neglected, because their efficiency and affectivity represent a model, an example, and the basic building blocks of the university. (Hadabi and Khan, 2008, p. 64). Thus, the evaluation process of the university professors is considered a key factor in the development of their teaching performance, and a driving force in the development of university education and improving its outputs.

The process of evaluating the performance of the university professor includes several aspects, including; controlling of the curriculum and presentation of the course, organization, linking it to reality as possible, using a variety of appropriate teaching methods, adopting assistive technology tools such as display devices, using computer programs such as Module and PowerPoint, the teacher's punctuality, effective management of the lecture, and prestigious treatment of students.

Therefore, a professor who seeks success in his profession must accept the evaluation from time to time in order to identify the weaknesses and strength, especially after touching the impact of successful professor over his/her students. Therefore, the student's evaluation of his/her professor is considered one of the most important determinants of the educational evaluation in democratic communities, if we are indeed aiming to achieve the overall goals of education, (Al-Naqah and Isa, 2009, p. 4). In the other hand, the student should be serious, accurate, and objective in dealing with the evaluation questionnaire of the university professor. He/she must show the highest degree of responsibility in the evaluation process.

1.1. Previous Studies

Due to the importance of the role of the professor in the educational process, the study has addressed some previous studies about evaluating the performance of university professors including the study of Al-Sanad (2012), which showed the existence of neutral attitudes of postgraduate students towards evaluating the performance of their teachers. Also, Darwish (2000) showed a receptivity to the role of students in the evaluation of teaching activities, where most of the population showed that there is a useful benefit from the evaluation of their students, and that they do not diminish their position, in which a member of the faculty at Al-Azhar University in Gaza could benefit from the evaluation to review and improve his/her methods and teaching

practices. AlHolli (2007), on the other hand, highlighted the positive attitudes of the professors at the Islamic University in Gaza towards the evaluation of their students. Al-Masriand Alostaz (2002) evaluated the academic performance of the professors at Al-Aqsa University and indicated that the total university performance did not reach the default level (60%). Finally, Abu Daf (2002) showed that the degree of evaluation of the performance of university professor in the field of supervision of theses at the Islamic University is high. Through reviewing previous studies, it is clear that there is a distinction between the previous studies. Some studies included the attitudes of postgraduate students towards evaluating the performance of the university professor as the study of (Al-Sanad, 2012). Other studies addressed the attitudes of university professors towards the students' evaluation of them as the study of (AlHolli, 2007). While some studies focused on the evaluation of the performance of the university professor in the field of supervision of theses as the study of (Abu Daf, 2002). Hence, this research is unique since it highlights the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaire of the university professor.

1.2. Statement of the problem

The evaluation of the university professor is considered an urgent necessity and an important priority. It should be given sufficient attention to the current state of faculty's academic performance. It also identifies any deviation that may directly and indirectly affect the profession in general. Thus, this study identifies the degree of seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaire of the performance of the university professor. Hence, the problem was stated in the following major questions:

1. What is the degree of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor?
2. Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the grades ratings averages of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor due to (gender, level, specialization)?

1.3. Hypotheses of the Study

1. There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the grades ratings averages of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor due to gender (male, female.)
2. There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the grades ratings averages of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor due to level (first, second).
3. There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the grades ratings averages of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor due to specialty (Education Principles, Curricula and Methodology, Mental health).

1.4. The purpose of the Study

1. Identifying the degree of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor.
2. Finding out the significance of the differences between the estimations' average of the population to the degree of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor due to (gender, level, specialty).

1.5. Limitations of the study

1. Human and spatial limits: Postgraduate students of the Faculty of Education at the Islamic University.
2. The temporal limit: The study was applied in the second semester of 2017.

1.6. Significance of the study

1. The importance of seriousness among postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaire of the university professor.
2. The study may be useful in providing feedback to the Faculty of Education, in terms of reviewing the mechanism of the electronic evaluation program for the performance of faculty members.

II. Methodology

2.1 Research design:

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the researchers attempted the descriptive analytical approach by which to describe the phenomenon of the study, to analyze its data, to indicate the relationship between its components, to show the opinions expressed about it, to highlight the processes it contains, and to indicate the effects it causes. (Abu Hatab, 2005, p. 104).

2.1 Instrumentation

The researchers believed that the most suitable tool for achieving the purpose of the study is conducting a questionnaire which is considered the most widely used instrument for obtaining data from individuals. The questionnaire is defined as: "A tool that can be used to obtain information and ideas in response to self-examination, and to be selective in translation" (Alostaz, and Agha, 2004, p. 116). In addition to reviewing a number of researches related to educational research, the researchers conducted interviews with some lecturers, supervisors, and postgraduate students about the seriousness of the evaluation of the university professor in the Palestinian universities at the postgraduate stage. Based on these information and criteria, a questionnaire was constructed to measure the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation of the performance of the university professor. The questionnaire contains two parts; the first part deals with personal data, while the second part contains of (20) statements, to be answered according to the five-dimensional Likert scale. In order to guarantee the validity of the questionnaire, it was presented to a group of juries from faculty members of the Palestinian universities. Also to determine the validity of this tool in measuring the objectives related to this study and the number of items of the questionnaire, and to check the veracity of the vertebrae verbally and scientifically, and the adequacy of the paragraphs of the questionnaire. The validity of the internal consistency of the questionnaire was calculated by finding the correlation coefficient between each statement and the total score of the questionnaire as shown in Table (1):

Table (1): The correlation coefficient between each statement of the questionnaire and the total score.

No	The correlation coefficient	The significance level	No	The correlation coefficient	The significance level
1	0.57	0.01	11	0.69	0.01
2	0.58	0.01	12	0.83	0.01
3	0.60	0.01	13	0.77	0.01
4	0.73	0.01	14	0.81	0.01
5	0.78	0.01	15	0.70	0.01
6	0.79	0.01	16	0.77	0.01
7	0.71	0.01	17	0.80	0.01
8	0.68	0.01	18	0.81	0.01
9	0.72	0.01	19	0.72	0.01
10	0.80	0.01	20	0.53	0.01

Table (1) shows that all the statements of the questionnaire are statistically significant with the total score of the questionnaire. This indicates the internal consistency of the questionnaire.

In order to confirm the stability of the questionnaire, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated at (0.93), and split half method was calculated at (0.91). This indicates that the questionnaire is consistent with the application of the study.

2.3 The population of the study

The original population of this study represents all the students of the Faculty of Education in Postgraduate Studies at the Islamic University (345), distributed among (119) male students (34.5%), and (226) female students (65.5%).The population represents three specializations; Foundation of Education (116) students (46.67%), Methodology (161) students (46.67 %), and Mental Health (68) students (19.71%). According to the level variable, the number of students at the first level (224) students, equivalent to (64.93%), and the second level (121) students, equivalent to (35.07%), as shown in Table (2).

Table (2) Distribution of characteristics of the population's members

Variable	Gender		Section		Specialty		
	Male	Females	First	Second	Foundation of Education	Methodology	Mental Health
Classification of Variable							
Number of students	119	226	224	121	116	161	68
Percentage	34.5	65.0	64.0	35.0	33.62	46.67	19.71
Total	345						

2.4 The sample of the study

A random sample of (117) male and female students was selected by about 34% of the students who are enrolled in the postgraduate program at the Faculty of Education at the Islamic University, as shown in table (3).

Table (3) Distribution of characteristics of the population's members

Variable Classification of Variable	Gender		Section		Specialty		
	Male	Females	First	Second	Foundation of Education	Methodology	Mental Health
Sample	40	77	75	42	38	54	25
Total	117 equal to 34% of the study population						

2.5 Statistical Analysis

The data were collected and computed by using (SPSS) Statistical Package for Social Science. The following statistics were used:

Arithmetic averages, standard deviation, relative weight, and ranking were used for the first question. T Test was used to measure gender and level variables. Single variation was used to measure specialty.

In order to interpret the results, the following arithmetic averages were adopted as follows:

Weighted average 1 to 1.79 1.80 to 2.59 2.60 to 3.39 3.40 to 4.19 4.20 to 5
 Very Few Few Medium Large Very Large

III. Results and discussion of the study

The first question is: What is the degree of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor? In order to answer this question, the researchers studied which terms obtained the highest score from the population's point of view. The Arithmetic averages, standard deviation, and relative weight were found as shown in Table (4).

Table (4) Arithmetic averages, standard deviation, relative weight, and ranking of statements

No	Statement	Arithmetic average	standard deviation	relative weight	ranking
1	I avoid randomness when answering the questionnaire	4.10	0.99	82.00	12
2	I deal positively when asked to fill in the evaluation questionnaire	4.15	0.88	83.00	8
3	I choose the right time to fill out the questionnaire	3.54	1.08	70.80	19
4	I take enough time to fill out the questionnaire	4.5	0.87	81.00	14
5	I try to provide accurate answers about the ability of the professor in explaining the university course	4.21	0.83	84.20	4
6	I seek justice in my judgment on the way the teacher presents and organizes the university course	4.20	0.87	84.00	6
7	I judge objectivity on the teacher 's method in clarifying the concepts and theories, and linking them to reality	4.23	0.88	84.60	3
8	I try to be careful in evaluating the teacher's commitment to the lecture time	4.05	0.88	81.00	15
9	I provide a fair judgment on the extent to which the teacher accepts the views and suggestions of the students	4.19	0.79	83.80	7
10	I take an interest in evaluating teacher use of modern techniques in lecture	4.13	0.92	82.6	9
11	I show honesty in evaluating teacher's Effectiveness in the Management of the Lecture	4.27	0.65	85.40	1
12	I show accuracy when evaluating teacher's use of appropriate teaching methods	4.11	0.79	82.20	10
13	I take much time when evaluating the degree of teacher's use of various evaluation methods such as short tests and reports	4.07	0.88	81.40	13
14	I seek justice in evaluating the teacher 's use of various teaching methods	4.11	0.89	82.20	11
15	I show accuracy when evaluating teacher's commitment to office hours specified for course	3.90	1.04	78.00	17
16	I deal objectively when evaluating the teacher's treatment with students	4.27	0.83	85.40	2
17	I show accuracy when evaluating the teacher 's feedback for activities	4.05	0.82	81.00	16
18	I show objectivity when judging the vitality and activity of the teacher	4.21	0.76	84.20	5
19	I deal positively with the evaluation of the teacher's update of the personal page of scientific materials and research	3.88	1.01	77.60	18
20	My conviction that the university is not appreciative of my opinion of the teacher 's performance makes me provide inaccurate answer	3.11	1.27	62.20	20
	Overall grade	4.04	0.59	80.83	***

Table (4) shows that the average response rate in the sample was (4.04) and the relative weight of this field was (80.83%).

The researchers found that the two statements, which indicate that "I show honesty in evaluating teacher's Effectiveness in the Management of the Lecture, and I deal objectively when evaluating the teacher's treatment with students," ranked first with a relative weight of (85.40%). The researchers attribute this to the nature of the postgraduate stage which is characterized by a positive interactions between the professors and the students, which positively affects their seriousness in evaluating professor's performance. Besides, the nature of lectures in the Master's degree is based on flexibility, respect, and affection between students and professors more than the bachelor stage, making them more serious in evaluation.

On the other hand, the statement "My conviction that the university is not appreciative of my opinion of the teacher 's performance makes me provide inaccurate answer " got the lowest rank with a relative weight of (62.2%). The researchers attribute this to the nature of postgraduate students who trust their opinion and try to provide more serious answers in evaluating their professors.

The second question is: Are there any statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the grades ratings averages of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor due to (gender, level, specialization)?

To answer this question, three hypotheses were formulated:

The first hypotheses: There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the grades ratings averages of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor due to gender (male, female.)

To validate this hypothesis, "T" test was used to detect the significance of the differences, and Table 5 shows this.

Table (5) Results of using the T test to detect the difference between the average responses of students due to gender

Statement	Gender	Number	Arithmetic Average	Standard Deviation	"T" Value	Level of significance
Total degree	Male	40	4.0763	0.52842	0.455	Not sig at 0.05
	Female	77	4.0234	0.62904		

The table above shows that there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the grades ratings averages of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor due to gender (male, female.). The researchers attribute this to the fact that male and female postgraduate students study the same courses, are taught by the same professors, and are subjected to the instructions of the College of Graduate Studies where there is no difference between male and female. Therefore, there is no difference between the seriousness of males and females in dealing with the evaluation questionnaire of the university professor.

The second hypotheses: There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the grades ratings averages of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor due to level (first, second).

To validate this hypothesis, "T" test was used to detect the significance of the differences, and Table (6) illustrates this.

Table (6) Results of using T test to detect the difference between the average responses of students due to level

Statement	Level	Number	Arithmetic Average	Standard Deviation	"T" Value	Level of significance
Total degree	First	75	4.0053	0.61861	0.877	Not sig at 0.05
	Second	42	4.1060	.55096		

The table above shows that there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the grades ratings averages of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor due to level (first, second).The researchers attribute this to the fact that postgraduate students are more experienced and mature than any other stage in the Faculty of Education, especially since the vast majority of students are teachers, which makes them deal more seriously with the evaluation questionnaire regardless the level of study .The third hypotheses: There are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the grades ratings averages of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor due to specialty ((Education Principles, Curricula and Methodology, Mental health) In order to verify the validity of this hypothesis, one way Anova analysis was used, as shown in Table (7).

Table (7) The source of the variance, the sum of the squares, the degrees of freedom, the average of squares, the value of F, and the level of significance due to the specialty

Statement	source of variance	Sum of scores	degrees of freedom	Average of squares	F level	Level of significance
Degree of seriousness due to specialty (Principles of education, curricula and methodology, mental health)	Between groups.	.391	2	0.195	0.548	Not sig at 0.05
	Within groups	40.646	114	0.357		
	Total	41.036	116			

The table shows that there are no statistically significant differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the grades ratings averages of the seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaires of the performance of the university professor due to specialty ((Education Principles, Curricula and Methodology, Mental health).

The researchers attribute this to the recognition of postgraduate students that the evaluation questionnaire should be given some kind of interest, especially since the population of the study is mostly of teachers in which evaluation is considered a fundamental pillar in their work, regardless of specialty.

IV. Recommendations

Based on the results of the study, the following recommendations were suggested:

- Increasing the awareness of postgraduate students in the Faculty of Education about the importance of their role in evaluating the university professor, and taking their opinions in providing feedback to their professors.
- Stimulating postgraduate students towards taking much time when dealing with the evaluation questionnaire of the university professor, which makes the evaluation more credibility and accuracy.
- Guiding postgraduate students to the necessity of commitment to seriousness and giving them more attention to evaluate the performance of the university professor outside the classroom, such as updating the personal page of scientific materials, and commitment to office hours.
- Conducting meetings between the students and the Faculty of Education for each course individually, taking their views on the performance of the university professor directly, and directing them towards commitment to seriousness and objectivity in dealing with the Evaluation questionnaire.

V. Conclusion

In conclusion, the researchers note that the accuracy of the evaluation of postgraduate students of their professors is related to the degree of seriousness in dealing with the evaluation questionnaire of the university professor. This study shows that the degree of seriousness of graduate students in dealing with the evaluation of the university professor was high. This means that students' evaluation of their professors can be regarded as a very accurate criterion for evaluating the university professor, although this criterion is not the only one that can be judged. - through him - the performance of the university professor. It is possible that this study is a pavement to other studies concerned with the degree of objectivity of students in the evaluation of the university professor and the degree to which the university professor considers the results of the student evaluations for his/her performance, especially since the performance of the university professor is one of the most important pillars of advancing the educational process and linking it to development aspects.

References

- [1] Ahmed, Ibrahim. (2012). Evaluation of the performance of the university professor and the teaching material from the perspective of the university student. The Second Arab International Conference for Quality Assurance of Higher Education 4 - 5 April 2012.
- [2] Alostaz, Mahmoud, and Agha, Ihsan (2004). Introduction to the design of educational research. Gaza: Islamic University.
- [3] Abu Hatab, Fouad, and Amal, Sadiq. (2005). Methodology and Statistical Analysis in Psychological, Educational and Social Sciences. Cairo: The Anglo Library.
- [4] Hadabi, Dawood, and Khan, Khalid. (2008). Evaluation of students for the performance of faculty members at the Yemeni University of Science and Technology in the light of some teaching competencies. Arab Journal for Quality Assurance of University Education, 1 (2), 63-74.
- [5] AlHollei, Alian. (2007). Attitudes of faculty members at the Islamic University towards students' evaluation. Najah University Research Journal, 2 (3), 805-836.
- [6] Darwish, Atta (2000). The extent to which faculty members at Al-Azhar University in Gaza accepted the role of students in evaluating the effectiveness of teaching. Journal of Studies in Curricula and Teaching Methods, Faculty of Education Ain Shams University, 84 (63) 161-184.
- [7] Abu Daf, Mahmoud (2000). Evaluation of the performance of the university professor in the field of supervision of scientific messages from postgraduate students' point of view of, Journal of Reading and Knowledge Egypt, 17 (1) 15-54.

- [8] Rubaie, Saed. (2008). Higher education in the era of knowledge changes, challenges, and future prospects. Palestine: Dar Al Shorouk.
- [9] Al-Sanad, Jalal (2012). Postgraduate students' attitudes toward their teachers (field study at the Faculty of Education, University of Damascus). *University of Damascus Journal*, 28 (3 + 4), 323-348.
- [10] Alshok, Baleegh, and Alogail, Raja. (2010). Evaluating the performance of the university professor in light of the overall quality standards. Arab Conference on Higher Education and the Labor Market, April 14-15.
- [11] Saleh, Youssef. (2010). Improving the performance of the university professor and evaluating it in the overall quality of higher education. Conference on the application of regional and global indicators of quality and academic accreditation in the universities of the Islamic world towards excellence, a mean, not an end, Naif University for Security Sciences 20-22 December.
- [12] Alsageer, Ahmed Hussein. (2005). Higher education in the Arab world challenges reality and visions of the future. Cairo: The World of Books.
- [13] Al-Tweissi, Ahmed, and Samara, Nawaf. (2014). The attitudes of faculty members at Mu'tah University towards evaluating their teaching performance by students and the degree of satisfaction with their results. *Najah National University Journal*, 28 (1) 127-156.
- [14] Alojaili, Mohammed. (2013). Higher education in the Arab world, reality and future strategies. Amman: Safa Publishing House.
- [15] Allam, Saladin. (2010). Measurement and evaluation of educational in the teaching process. Amman: House of the march.
- [16] Ali, Nadia. (2005). Evaluation of the performance of the university professor in the light of quality standards. Egypt: *Journal of Studies in University Education, Faculty of Education Zagazig University*, No. 8, pp. 28-87.
- [17] AlFatahawi, Suhaila. (2008). Quality in education. Palestine: Dar Al Shorouk.
- [18] Mohammed, Shehta, and AlSabbati, Ibrahim. (2007). Studying the effect of some variables in the assessment of university students for the performance of faculty member. *Scientific Journal of King Faisal University*, 8 (1) 97-176.
- [19] Al-Masri, Rafik, and Alostaz, Mahmoud (2001). The academic performance of the faculty members at the Faculty of Governmental Education in Gaza from the perspective of their students, *Al-Aqsa University Journal of Humanities*, 6 (1) 94-143.
- [20] Almasri, Walid. (6 201). A proposed Notion for activating the role of Palestinian universities in achieving intellectual security and promoting societal values among university youth. International Youth Conference November 28.
- [21] Al-Naqah, Salah, and Issa, Hazem (2009). Evaluating the professional competencies that the faculty members in the Faculty of Education in the Islamic University have from the point of view of their students according to the quality standards. Gaza: Second Educational Conference "The Role of Higher Education in Comprehensive Development" 18-19 November.
- [22] Nabhan, Mosa. (2004). The basics of measurement in behavioral sciences. Amman: Dar Al Shorouk.

Hamdan A. Alsoofi . "Seriousness of postgraduate students in dealing with the evaluation questionnaire of the university professor in the Faculty of Education." *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)* , vol. 7, no. 5, 2017, pp. 18–25.