

# Over All Performance Evaluation Review Of Faculties From The Perspectives Of The Senior Management

Dr. Ahmed Mahade, Dr. Abdallah Elmahi

**Abstract:** This paper is intended to investigate the faculty annual Performance evaluation methods in Sudanese universities and review people involved in the evaluation process. This paper also looked at the perspectives of the senior management on evaluation system and templates. The main instrument to obtain the results was a survey. The participants were faculty administrative and teaching faculty at public universities. In recent years, many researchers have been conducting studies on similar areas, and many have shown positive outcomes. Studies have shown increases in positive evaluation and performance relations. The analyses of the results has proved the need for the comprehensive new model of evaluation to be used at Sudanese universities, It also showed that there is agreement upon the participants on the uses, effects and the impacts of the performance evaluation on both universities and people evaluated.

**Index Terms:** Evaluation, annual performance , university ranking, Faculty performance, Performance Methodologies, Senior Management, Faculty ranking.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

THIS paper is organized as follow: Section I, investigates the international faculty performance evaluation systems, teaching and learning quality, international university ranking system. It also sheds light on the use and impact of annual faculty evaluation as well as it reviews both performance evaluation methods: traditional and modern methods. Section II is about the methods are used to obtain the results for this paper. Finally, the last section is for discussion and conclusion.

## 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The evaluation has played a prominent role in university ranking and faculty satisfaction as well as the performance improvement. The following part is about the studies conducted in and out of Sudan. Based on the Minster of higher education in Sudan (2016-2017) the number female faculties compared to male faculty numbers at the at the entry. It is also observed the absence of the Sudanese universities from the top list of the world universities ranking system. (WASC+WRS)

First, study (Jorge Trullen Fernandez, 20071) focused more on how to create better evaluation systems or how quality programs improve organizational performance. He had built on previous research on organizational change and cognition to shed light on the of quality the assessments at the public universities at general. He found that faculty identification with their program led them to rate the legitimacy and significance of evaluations more highly. In addition, faculty who belonged to the humanities

sciences. Also, (Zhivan Alach ,2016)2 carried out a study to identify the degree of maturity in performance measurement in a national group of universities in new Zealand. He stated that Performance measurement in higher education is a controversial

subject and there has been relatively little research into the basics of how, and how well, universities utilize the approach.

### 2.1 Teaching and Learning Quality

All The effect teaching is defined in three different angles: the classic definitions is provided by( Chickering and Gamson, 1991)3. Their list of principles of good teaching consists of respecting diversity, giving prompt feedback and encouraging student/faculty contact in active learning. Other definition from the perspective of behavior is to convert behaviors, or visible actions, that lead to effective learning as measured by student achievement on some test. This also known as the process/product paradigm (Shulman, 1986)4, draws on empirical findings showing that particular teaching behaviors (input) lead to certain kinds of learning (product). The cognitive perspective, on the other hand, looks at the psychological processes invoked during teaching or learning. In this context, research into effectiveness examines what it would take for students to process information at different levels and acquire complex, cognitive thinking skills such as reasoning, problem solving, and analytical thinking. With respect to teaching, effectiveness pertains to the processes involved in transforming content knowledge into instruction (Shulman, 1986). This transformation requires adapting, altering, and enriching content based on past experiences of teaching the same content. The primary goal with respect to the evaluation of teaching is to help participants develop an appreciation for its formative aspect and for ways in which information about

• Dr. Ahmed Mahade, Assistant Professor for HRM, Abudhabi University, UAE. [Ahmed.mahade@adu.ac.ae](mailto:Ahmed.mahade@adu.ac.ae)

• Dr. Abdallah Elmahi, Assistant Professor for General Education, Abudhabi University, UAE. [Abdallah.elmahi@adu.ac.ae](mailto:Abdallah.elmahi@adu.ac.ae)

and social sciences were more likely to perceive evaluations as legitimate than were faculty in the technical and natural

the quality of teaching can be gleaned from multiple sources. These include students as well as peers and the individual professor himself or herself.

## 2.2 International Universities Ranking standard

In the rapidly changing world of higher education, where increasing emphasis is being placed on the assessment of research and teaching quality as indicators of University Quality, the key issues that need to be considered have been debated widely in both the private and public sectors. QS, WASC and Times higher education are ranking systems. The differences between each ranking system from the fact that each one is judging universities against different criteria. In fact, productivity and quality evaluation is essential for all type of organizations since the evaluation helps organization to set short and long term goals by defining the current situations, future expectations and the roadmap to fulfill these expectations.<sup>5</sup> Rankings of Sudanese universities: The above mentioned reasons and practices resulted in a considerable deterioration in Sudan's higher education quality. One aspect of the quality decline can be clearly seen with the continuing absence of Sudanese universities in the prestigious university rankings like QS and the Times Higher Education. The extent of poor rankings of the Sudanese university can be seen from the latest Ranking Web of Universities (Webometrics).

## 2.3 The Impacts of Faculty evaluation

Every university has a system that control faculty evaluations either through recognized power or perceived power. Hind, Dornbursh, and Scott (1968)<sup>6</sup> Arreola (2000) reported, as education operated in the twenty-first century, the academic landscape has changed, thus requiring faculty evaluations to change. (Arreola, 2000)<sup>7</sup>. Growth in the number Sudanese public and private universities, required more qualified faculties to meet the demands for acquiring targeted professional and skilled faculty members.

## 2.4 The Use of Performance evaluation

Performance measurement in general has both targeted and wide scope definitions; the first type focuses on the use of qualitative and quantitative indicators to measure activities and achievements (Wang, 2002)<sup>8</sup>; the second one focuses on not only measurement, but also on the use of performance information to control and manage (Bisbe and Malagueno, 2012). This latter, broader concept is sometimes termed "performance management". While "management by numbers" probably dates back to the development of numeracy, performance measurement as a more formal concept became an increasingly important issue in the Western world through the 1980s and 1990s (Schick, 1996) often in an attempt to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the public sector. The annual evaluation is useful on multiple levels. The evaluation provides a continuous performance record for every faculty member, and it informs decisions pertaining to assessment and improvement of faculty performance. It provides substantive feedback to the person being evaluated by acknowledging and recognizing excellence, by pointing out areas for improvement, and by identifying productive uses of a

faculty member's talents. It further provides important feedback to the person conducting the evaluation in terms of their leadership, guidance, and support. It enhances faculty development by promoting self assessment, which can provide an occasion for reassessment of the role a faculty member is playing, depending on the evolution of the role throughout the faculty member's career. The evaluation can provide information for the determination of salary.

## 2.5 Types of Evaluation methods

### 1. Traditional Methods:

Traditional methods are comparatively older methods of performance appraisal. These methods were past oriented approaches which concentrated only on the past performance. The following are the topical traditional methods that were used in the past:

#### A. Ranking Method

Superior ranks his employee based on merit from best to worst [2]. However how best and why best are not elaborated in this method.

#### B. Graphic Rating Scales

In 1931 a behaviorism enhancement was introduced to graph rating scale [3]. According to [2], graphic rating scale is a scale that lists a number of traits and a range of performance for each. The employee is then graded by finding the score that best defines his or her level of performance for each trait.

#### C. Critical Incident Method

This method is concentrated on certain critical behaviors of employee that makes significant difference in the performance. According to [2], critical incident method keeps a record of unusually employee's work related behavior and revisit it with the employee at prearranged times.

#### D. Narrative Essay

In this method the administrator writes an explanation about employee's strength and weakness points for improvement at the end of evaluation time. This method primarily attempt to concentrate on behavior [4]. Some of the evaluation criterion are as follows: overall impression of performance, existing capabilities & qualifications, previous performance, and suggestions by others.

## 2. Modern Methods:

Modern Methods were formulated to enhance the conventional methods. It tried to enhance the shortcomings of the old methods such as biasness and subjectivity. The following presents the typical modern methods:

### A. Management by Objectives (MBO)

The performance is graded against the achievement of the objectives specified by the management. MBO includes three main processes; object formulation, execution process and performance feedback [5]. Wehrich [6] proposed the system approach to management by objectives. It consists of seven components; strategic planning and hierarchy of objects, setting objectives, planning for action, implementation of MBO, control and appraisal, subsystems and organizational and management development.

### B. Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales (BARS)

BARS contrast an individual's performance against specific examples of behavior that are anchored to numerical ratings. For example, a level three rating for a doctor may require them to show sympathy to patients while a level five rating may require them to show higher levels of empathy. BARS utilize behavioral statements or solid examples to explain various stages of performance for each element of performance.

### C. Humans Resource Accounting (HRA)

In this method, the performance is judged in terms of cost and contribution of the employees. Johnson [8] incorporate both HRA models and utility analysis models (UA) to form the concept of human resource costing and accounting (HRCA).

### D. Assessment Center

An assessment center is a central location where managers may come together to have their participation in job related exercises evaluated by trained observers. It is more focused on observation of behaviors across a series of select exercises or work samples. Appraisees are requested to participate in in-basket exercises, work groups, computer simulations, fact finding exercises, analysis/decision making problems, role playing and oral presentation exercises

### E. 360 Degree

It is a popular performance appraisal technique that includes evaluation inputs from a number of stakeholders like immediate supervisors, team members, customers, peers and self [4]. 360 Degree provides people with information about the influence of their action on others.

### F. 720 Degree

720 degree method concentrates on what matter most, which is the customer or investor knowledge of their work [10]. In 720 degree appraisal feedback is taken from external sources such as stakeholders, family, suppliers, and communities. 720 degree provides individuals with extremely changed view of themselves as leaders and growing individuals. It is 360 degree appraisal method practiced twice.

## 3 METHODOLOGY

In this research paper we used the quantitative methodology to obtain the results.

### 3.1 SAMPLE

Our study took place at four different universities in Sudan; the researchers studied twenty different faculties in these universities that apply some kind of annual faculty evaluation. These twenty degree programs had been evaluated at some point between November 2018 and December 2018. The twenty universities appeared in my sample appear in appendix A. The researchers chose approximately 86 senior administration faculties ranging from the full professor to assistant teacher. The respondents are holding administration positions include University Chancellors, Deans, head of departments, associated deans and other administrative positions. These faculties teach different specialization in different departments and colleges. All of the samples taken from the top ranked public universities in Sudan the researchers also looked at approximately the three parts of evaluation template as well as the procedure of the evaluation. The researchers also interviewed 5 senior management

faculties to discuss the current faculty annual evolution issues in Sudanese Universities to avoid disciplinary biases. The researchers collected archival, interview, and survey data. The survey data were obtained from the survey monkey software. To distribute the questionnaire, the researchers sent web link to respondents through email, WhatsApp and face book. The collected data was analyzed by the monkey.

### 3.2 THE SURVEY.

The Survey consists of four main parts- the effect of the evaluation results, the use of evaluation results, the perspectives of senior administrations on the evaluation system, and the background information. The first three parts contain of five questions, eight questions and six questions respectively. The total number of all sections is 27 questions. All of them were answered electronically via WhatsApp, email links and facebook. The researchers have utilized previous survey from Zhivan Alach to create their own. The draft of the questionnaire firstly developed in word document then transformed in survey monkey system after creating an account on the survey application.. In the first three parts the hexagon scale (1 – 6 indicates strongly disagree to strongly agree) is used to avoid the ambiguity or lake of certainty in the responses, and the final section is to be filled by ticking the correspondent options. The Survey is also giving a free space at the end for comments so participant can add, comment or present any point of view not included in the Survey the survey is designed in way that all responses come to the account made on the survey monkey software.

## 4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section focused on analysis and discussion of the results which we obtained from the survey. In this section we have mentioned all the details of the questions and the results in tabular format.

Demographic (table 1)

	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	63	73.3
Female	23	26.7
Age groups		
26 – 30 years	6	7.0
31 – 35 years	19	22.1
36 – 40 years	8	9.3
41- 45 years	27	31.4
46 and above	26	30.2
Job Title		
Teaching assistant	4	4.7
Instructor	19	22.1
Assistant Prof	40	46.5
Associate Prof	20	23.3
Full professor	3	3.5
Position		
Chancellor	1	1.2
Dean /associated dean	26	30.2
Head of Depart	36	41.9
Other	23	26.7

The above table shows that 61% of the participants are over 41 years old however nearly three quarters of the total of participants are ranked as assistant professor or less. This indicates that the promoting from entry positions to senior academic ranks isn't occurring frequently. It is also observed

that the number of male participants is higher than the other gender. ( Table 1)

**Table 2:**

S. No	The effects of Evaluation Results	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean ± SD
1.	The evaluation performance positively affects the research quality.	-	-	2	2	28	54	5.5 ± 0.9
2.	The evaluation performance positively affects the research quantity.	1	-	1	5	36	43	5.4 ± 0.8
3.	The evaluation performance positively affects the community service.	1	-	-	14	36	35	5.2 ± 0.9
4.	The evaluation performance positively affects the quality of teaching.	-	1	-	3	25	57	5.6 ± 0.7
5.	The evaluation performance positively affects the international ranking of the universities.	-	2	-	4	19	61	5.6 ± 0.8

Among the participants, majority of them ranked these statements somewhat agree to strongly agree that evaluation performance positively affects the research quality, quantity, and community service, quality of teaching and international ranking of the universities. The agreement ranking means score of these statements that evaluation performance positively affects Quality of teaching and international ranking of the universities was higher followed by that evaluation performance positively affects the research quality, quantity and community services. (Table 2) The agreement ranking mean scores of these statements that “I use performance information for Rewarding faculty”, “I use performance information for reviewing faculty performance” and “A lack of incentives (e.g. rewards) has hindered the use of performance information” was higher followed by question statement 3, 8, 6 and 4. (Table 2) The agreement ranking mean scores these statements that “The role of faculties fulfilled by meeting all requirements of the evaluation items”, “I am familiar with evaluation system” and “I understand the evaluation requirements and its time limits” was higher followed by question statement 4, 5 and 6.

**Table 3:**

Q. No.	The use of the Performance Evaluation Information	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean ± SD
1.	I use performance information for reviewing faculty performance.	1	4	1	22	33	25	4.8 ± 1.1
2.	I use performance information for Rewarding faculty.	3	4	4	11	28	36	4.9 ± 1.3
3.	I use performance information for Setting individual job expectations.	4	5	1	12	39	25	4.8 ± 1.3
4.	I find difficulties determining how to use performance information to improve how we operate	7	19	7	21	15	17	3.8 ± 1.6
5.	A lack of incentives (e.g. rewards) has hindered the use of performance information	2	4	10	12	23	35	4.8 ± 1.3
6.	I use performance measurement information for the Allocating resources.	2	9	8	14	30	23	4.5 ± 1.4
7.	I use performance measurement information for the Setting faculty priorities and goals.	1	5	9	12	32	27	4.7 ± 1.2
8.	I use performance measurement information for the strategic planning	3	8	2	15	23	35	4.8 ± 1.4

Q. No.	The evaluation system from the perspectives of Senior faculties.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean ± SD
1.	I am familiar with evaluation system.	1	6	7	13	32	27	4.7 ± 1.2
2.	I understand the evaluation requirements and its time limits.	3	3	7	19	24	20	4.3 ± 1.5

3.	The role of faculties fulfilled by meeting all requirements of the evaluation items.	1	2	7	20	29	27	4.8 ± 1.1
4.	The evaluation measurements cover all sides' faculties' performance (teaching , service and research)	7	8	4	28	19	20	4.2 ± 1.5
5.	The digital measurements are used in the evaluation process	6	15	9	20	21	15	3.9 ± 1.5
6.	There is a meeting after the evaluation	6	29	7	13	20	11	3.5 ± 1.6

I am familiar with evaluation system	Male	4.78	1.18	0.6
	Female	4.65	1.43	82
I understand the evaluation requirements and its time limits.	Male	4.22	1.44	0.7
	Female	4.35	1.58	29
The role of faculties fulfilled by meeting all requirements of the evaluation items.	Male	4.83	1.07	0.7
	Female	4.74	1.25	53
The evaluation measurements cover all sides' faculties' performance (teaching , service and research)	Male	4.14	1.62	0.5
	Female	4.39	1.20	03
The digital measurements are used in the evaluation process.	Male	3.71	1.55	0.0
	Female	4.52	1.41	31*
There is a meeting after the evaluation	Male	3.51	1.64	0.8
	Female	3.57	1.56	85

Spearman Rank correlation was used to determine the correlation between effect of evaluation results score, use of the performance evaluation information score and evaluation system from the perspectives of senior faculties score. Results indicates that there are moderate correlation among the effect of evaluation results score, use of the performance evaluation information score and evaluation system from the perspectives of senior faculties score. Correlation between effect, use and perspective of senior faculty score of evaluation system

Significant difference was observed in mean score of this statement “I use performance measurement information for the Setting faculty priorities and goals” full professor and associate professor have lower mean score as compared to remaining job titles. Major difference was observed in mean score of this statement “The evaluation measurements cover all sides' faculties' performance (teaching , service and research)” full profession have higher score as compared to remaining job titles. Significant difference was observed in mean score of this statement “The digital measurements are used in the evaluation process”. Professor has higher score as compared to remaining job titles. Least score given by teaching assistant. Significant difference was also observed in mean score of this statement “There is a meeting after the evaluation”. Teaching assistant and associate profession have lower score as compare to remaining job titles.

**Comparison between genders:**

The effects of Evaluation Results	Gender	Mean	SD	p-value	Job Title	Mean	SD	p-value	
The evaluation performance positively affects the research quality.	Male	5.44	0.96	0.42	Teaching assistant	5.75	0.50	0.699	
	Female	5.70	0.56		Instructor	5.32	1.20		
The evaluation performance positively affects the research quantity.	Male	5.29	0.87	0.103	Assistant Prof	5.55	0.88		
	Female	5.61	0.58		Associate Prof	5.50	0.61		
The evaluation performance positively affects the community service.	Male	5.16	0.92	0.486	Full professor	6.00	0.00		
	Female	5.30	0.63		0.469	Teaching assistant	5.25	0.50	
The evaluation performance positively affectsthe international ranking of the universities.	Male	5.56	0.86	0.69		Instructor	5.37	0.68	0.675
	Female	5.70	0.56		Assistant Prof	5.40	0.98		
<b>The use of the performance Evaluation Information</b>					The evaluation performance positively affects the research quantity.	Associate Prof	5.25	0.64	
I use performance information for reviewing faculty performance.	Male	4.83	1.17	0.998		Full professor	6.00	0.00	
	Female	4.83	0.83		0.336	Teaching assistant	5.00	0.82	
I use performance information for Rewarding faculty.	Male	4.94	1.20	0.922		Instructor	5.32	0.75	0.466
	Female	4.87	1.60		Assistant Prof	5.15	0.95		
I use performance information for Setting individual job expectations	Male	4.68	1.33	0.322	Associate Prof	5.10	0.79		
	Female	5.00	1.24		Full professor	6.00	0.00		
I find difficulties determining how to use performance information to improve how we operate.	Male	3.71	1.61	0.410	Teaching assistant	5.00	0.82		
	Female	4.04	1.69		0.335	Instructor	5.32	0.75	
A lack of incentives (e.g. rewards) has hindered the use of performance information	Male	4.70	1.40	0.93		Assistant Prof	5.15	0.95	0.466
	Female	5.09	1.12		Associate Prof	5.10	0.79		
I use performance measurement information for the Allocating resources	Male	4.52	1.35	0.982	Full professor	6.00	0.00		
	Female	4.48	1.47		0.654	Teaching assistant	5.00	0.82	
I use performance measurement information for the Setting faculty priorities and goals	Male	4.75	1.14	0.982		Instructor	5.32	0.75	
	Female	4.74	1.51		Assistant Prof	5.15	0.95		
I use performance measurement information for the strategic planning	Male	4.81	1.39	0.654	Associate Prof	5.10	0.79		
	Female	4.65	1.56		Full professor	6.00	0.00		
<b>The evaluation system from the perspectives of Senior faculties.</b>									

The evaluation performance positively affects the quality of teaching.	Teaching assistant	5.25	0.50	0.376
	Instructor	5.79	0.54	
	Assistant Prof	5.55	0.78	
	Associate Prof	5.50	0.61	
	Full professor	6.00	0.00	
The evaluation performance positively affects the international ranking of the universities.	Teaching assistant	5.75	0.50	0.786
	Instructor	5.68	0.58	
	Assistant Prof	5.50	0.96	
	Associate Prof	5.60	0.68	
	Full professor	6.00	0.00	
<b>The use of the performance Evaluation Information</b>				
I use performance information for reviewing faculty performance.	Teaching assistant	4.25	0.50	0.569
	Instructor	5.11	0.74	
	Assistant Prof	4.85	1.17	
	Associate Prof	4.65	1.09	
	Full professor	4.67	2.31	
I use performance information for Rewarding faculty.	Teaching assistant	4.25	1.50	0.129
	Instructor	5.21	0.71	
	Assistant Prof	5.15	1.08	
	Associate Prof	4.35	1.81	
	Full professor	4.67	2.31	
I use performance information for Setting individual job expectations	Teaching assistant	4.50	0.58	0.989
	Instructor	4.84	1.26	
	Assistant Prof	4.80	1.34	
	Associate Prof	4.70	1.34	
	Full professor	4.67	2.31	
I find difficulties determining how to use performance information to improve how we operate.	Teaching assistant	4.00	0.00	0.338
	Instructor	3.58	1.64	
	Assistant Prof	3.95	1.66	
	Associate Prof	3.95	1.70	
	Full professor	2.00	1.00	

A lack of incentives (e.g. rewards) has hindered the use of performance information	Teaching assistant	5.00	1.15	0.543
	Instructor	4.63	1.26	
	Assistant Prof	5.00	1.30	
	Associate Prof	4.45	1.54	
	Full professor	5.33	1.15	
I use performance measurement information for the Allocating resources	Teaching assistant	3.75	0.96	0.240
	Instructor	4.68	1.38	
	Assistant Prof	4.75	1.21	
	Associate Prof	4.00	1.56	
	Full professor	4.67	2.31	
I use performance measurement information for the Setting faculty priorities and goals	Teaching assistant	5.25	0.50	0.022*
	Instructor	4.95	0.91	
	Assistant Prof	5.00	1.13	
	Associate Prof	3.95	1.39	
	Full professor	4.67	2.31	
I use performance measurement information for the strategic planning	Teaching assistant	3.75	2.06	0.259
	Instructor	5.11	1.10	
	Assistant Prof	4.93	1.23	
	Associate Prof	4.35	1.76	
	Full professor	4.67	2.31	
<b>The evaluation system from the perspectives of Senior faculties.</b>				
I am familiar with evaluation system	Teaching assistant	3.75	0.96	0.389
	Instructor	4.63	1.54	
	Assistant Prof	4.95	1.18	
	Associate Prof	4.60	1.19	
	Full professor	5.00	0.00	
I understand the evaluation requirements and its time limits.	Teaching assistant	3.75	2.06	0.482
	Instructor	4.53	1.43	
	Assistant Prof	4.38	1.35	
	Associate Prof	3.80	1.54	
	Full professor	4.67	2.31	

The role of faculties fulfilled by meeting all requirements of the evaluation items.	Teaching assistant	4.25	1.26	0.162
	Instructor	5.05	0.97	
	Assistant Prof	4.88	1.09	
	Associate Prof	4.40	1.23	
	Full professor	5.67	0.58	
The evaluation measurements cover all sides' faculties' performance (teaching , service and research)	Teaching assistant	4.00	0.00	0.013*
	Instructor	4.32	1.45	
	Assistant Prof	4.58	1.24	
	Associate Prof	3.25	1.86	
	Full professor	5.33	1.15	
The digital measurements are used in the evaluation process.	Teaching assistant	2.50	1.00	0.001*
	Instructor	4.26	1.41	
	Assistant Prof	4.23	1.33	
	Associate Prof	3.00	1.65	
	Full professor	6.00	0.00	
There is a meeting after the evaluation	Teaching assistant	2.75	0.96	0.029*
	Instructor	4.11	1.49	
	Assistant Prof	3.70	1.54	
	Associate Prof	2.65	1.63	
	Full professor	4.33	2.08	

The evaluation performance positively affects the community service.	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.681
	Dean /associated dean	5.12	0.71	
	Head of Depart	5.17	0.97	
	Other	5.30	0.82	
The evaluation performance positively affects the quality of teaching.	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.662
	Dean /associated dean	5.69	0.47	
	Head of Depart	5.50	0.81	
	Other	5.61	0.66	
The evaluation performance positively affects the international ranking of the universities.	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.839
	Dean /associated dean	5.54	0.95	
	Head of Depart	5.56	0.81	
	Other	5.70	0.56	
<b>The use of the performance Evaluation Information</b>				
I use performance information for reviewing faculty performance.	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.236
	Dean /associated dean	4.50	1.10	
	Head of Depart	4.94	1.07	
	Other	4.96	1.07	
I use performance information for Rewarding faculty.	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.649
	Dean /associated dean	4.96	1.28	
	Head of Depart	4.75	1.32	
	Other	5.09	1.38	
I use performance information for Setting individual job expectations	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.719
	Dean /associated dean	4.69	1.23	
	Head of Depart	4.69	1.45	
	Other	4.91	1.20	
I find difficulties determining how to use performance information to improve how we operate.	Chancellor	3.00	0.00	0.814
	Dean /associated dean	3.65	1.60	
	Head of Depart	3.78	1.59	
	Other	4.04	1.80	

### Comparing mean differences scores among different job positions

The effects of Evaluation Results	Job Position	Mean	SD	p-value
The evaluation performance positively affects the research quality.	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.904
	Dean /associated dean	5.50	0.58	
	Head of Depart	5.56	0.91	
	Other	5.43	1.12	
The evaluation performance positively affects the research quantity.	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.297
	Dean /associated dean	5.42	0.58	
	Head of Depart	5.19	1.04	
	Other	5.57	0.59	

A lack of incentives (e.g. rewards) has hindered the use of performance information	Chancellor	4.00	0.00	0.868	The evaluation measurements cover all sides' faculties' performance (teaching , service and research)	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.396
	Dean /associated dean	4.77	1.50			Dean /associated dean	3.88	1.68	
	Head of Depart	4.75	1.20			Head of Depart	4.28	1.50	
	Other	4.96	1.40			Other	4.39	1.31	
I use performance measurement information for the Allocating resources	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.730	The digital measurements are used in the evaluation process.	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.068
	Dean /associated dean	4.58	1.33			Dean /associated dean	3.42	1.60	
	Head of Depart	4.44	1.44			Head of Depart	3.92	1.34	
	Other	4.48	1.38			Other	4.43	1.65	
I use performance measurement information for the Setting faculty priorities and goals	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.681	There is a meeting after the evaluation	Chancellor	5.00	0.00	0.164
	Dean /associated dean	4.69	1.09			Dean /associated dean	2.96	1.54	
	Head of Depart	4.83	1.23			Head of Depart	3.75	1.54	
	Other	4.61	1.44			Other	3.74	1.74	
I use performance measurement information for the strategic planning	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.736	Significant difference was observed in mean score of this statement "I understand the evaluation requirements and its time limits", Head of department have less score as compared to other job position.				
	Dean /associated dean	4.92	1.16						
	Head of Depart	4.69	1.51						
	Other	4.65	1.61						
The evaluation system from the perspectives of Senior faculties.									
I am familiar with evaluation system	Chancellor	5.00	0.00	0.309	5. CONCLUSION				
	Dean /associated dean	4.92	0.89						
	Head of Depart	4.44	1.48						
	Other	5.00	1.17						
I understand the evaluation requirements and its time limits.	Chancellor	6.00	0.00	0.048*	5.1 FINDINGS.				
	Dean /associated dean	4.15	1.43						
	Head of Depart	3.89	1.49						
	Other	4.87	1.32						
The role of faculties fulfilled by meeting all requirements of the evaluation items.	Chancellor	5.00	0.00	0.984	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One of the major findings derived from the demographic of participants is that: the promoting from entry positions to senior academic ranks isn't occurring frequently.</li> <li>The result showed the evaluation performance positively affects Quality of teaching and international ranking of the Sudanese public universities.</li> <li>there are moderate correlation among the effect of evaluation results score, use of the performance evaluation information score and evaluation system from the perspectives of senior faculties score.</li> <li>there is agreement upon the participants on the uses, effects and the impacts of the performance evaluation on both universities and people evaluated.</li> </ol>				
	Dean /associated dean	4.85	1.08						
	Head of Depart	4.75	1.11						
	Other	4.83	1.23						
5.2 RECOMMENDATION									
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connecting the promotion system policy to the annual performance evaluation for the sake of enabling faculties achieve the promotion requirements.</li> <li>Propose a comprehensive new model of evaluation to be used at Sudanese universities.</li> </ol>									
ACKNOWLEDGMENT									
We thank our colleagues from Sudanese universities who provided insight and expertise that greatly assisted the research, although they may not agree with all of the interpretations of this paper. WE ALSO THANK OUR COLLEAGUES THAT WHO ASSISTED US WITH COMMENTS THAT GREATLY IMPROVED THE MANUSCRIPT. WE WOULD									

ALSO LIKE TO SHOW OUR GRATITUDE TO THE DR. ALAA AMIN, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR , KHARTOUM UNIVERSITY FOR SHARING THEIR PEARLS OF WISDOM WITH US DURING THE COURSE OF THIS RESEARCH.

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. Eason, B. Noble, and I. N. Sneddon, "On certain integrals of Lipschitz-Hankel type involving products of Bessel functions," *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London*, vol. A247, pp. 529–551, April 1955. (references)
- [2] Arreola, R. *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*. (2nd ed.) Bolton, Mass.: Anker, 2000.
- [3] Finkelstein, M. J., Seal, R. K., and Schuster, J. H. *The New Academic Generation: A Profession in Transformation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- [4] J. Clerk Maxwell, *A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism*, 3rd ed., vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1892, pp.68–73.
- [5] I. S. Jacobs and C. P. Bean, "Fine particles, thin films and exchange anisotropy," in *Magnetism*, vol. III, G. T. Rado and H. Suhl, Eds. New York: Academic, 1963, pp. 271–350.
- [6] K. Elissa, "Title of paper if known," unpublished.
- [7] R. Nicole, "Title of paper with only first word capitalized," *J. Name Stand. Abbrev.*, in press.
- [8] Y. Yorozu, M. Hirano, K. Oka, and Y. Tagawa, "Electron spectroscopy studies on magneto-optical media and plastic substrate interface," *IEEE Transl. J. Magn. Japan*, vol. 2, pp. 740–741, August 1987 [Digests 9th Annual Conf. Magnetism Japan, p. 301, 1982].
- [9] M. Young, *The Technical Writer's Handbook*. Mill Valley, CA: University Science, 1989.
- [10] Worcester, P. I. (1993). *Faculty and administrator perceptions of faculty evaluation in a technical college* (Order No. 9319419). Available from ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (304059219). Retrieved from <http://adezproxy.adu.ac.ae/docview/304059219?accountid=26149>