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ABSTRACT
The study aims to evaluate performance quality evaluation of faculty members at Al-Qassim University from their and their students' perspectives and proposing a model for its development in the light of total quality standards. The researcher used analytical-descriptive method because it fits the study purposes. The sample consisted of (102) male and female faculty members who hold PhD degrees and (730) male and female students in scientific and literary majors of both samples who had been purposively selected. The results revealed to that performance quality of faculty members at Al-Qassim University was (high) from their point of view. The study revealed to in the construction of a model to develop the performance, quality of faculty members in the light of the total quality standards. The researcher recommended conducting various studies in the field of developing faculty members’ performance in accordance with total quality standards at Al-Qassim University.
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Contribution/ Originality
This study is one of very few studies which combined between evaluation performances qualities of faculty members at university in the field of: instruction, scientific research and community service in addition to propose a model for its development in the light of total quality standards.

1. INTRODUCTION
Recently, higher education institutions had reflected an increasing interest in their service quality since they work in a distinctive environment besides an increasing demand from int'l and local communities which urges for more enhancing for their services quality in order to be able to
provide the society with agile and competent graduates. So better Service quality provided by the higher education institutions will be reflected on graduates' performance, and in the light of information and globalization era, Quality is considered one of the most important competitive priorities which must be emphasized by higher educational institutions in order to achieve efficiency and excellence. Faculty members are considered the most important quality indicators. Since they elaborate plans and turn objectives of higher learning institutions into reality that is reflected in the future performance of graduate students. Upon that we realize that they are considered the development leverage in their societies. In addition, the university's reputation - and their own reputation are built on this issue (Hamdan, 2005).

Teaching quality is regarded at the top of priorities because the process of improving teaching quality is considered an urgent priority, especially in the Arab world in order to achieve the qualitative and quantitative objectives of instruction. In addition, sustainable development requires providing a distinct education in the field of educational skills and the total process, besides responding positively to the globalisation variables and facing the challenges in the labour market internationally. A situation which needs concentrating on developing faculty members capabilities, curriculum improvement, educational environment, teaching methodologies and evaluation as it is indicated in the papers published around this issue regarding the instruction quality (Al-Khatib, 2007).

1.1. The Study Questions

1. What's the degree of performance, quality of the faculty members of Al-Qassim University from their perspective?
2. What's the degree of performance, quality of the faculty members of Al-Qassim University from their students perspective?
3. Are there any significant statistical differences at (α=0.05) among the mean responses of lecturers' performance due to the following; variables: academic rank (assistant professor, associate professor, and professor) and gender?
4. Are there any significant statistical differences at (α=0.05) among the mean responses of students due to the following variables: student majors (science, literature) and gender?
5. What's the proposed model to develop the Quality of Faculty Members performance At Al-Qassim University in the light of total quality standards?

1.2. The Study Significance

The significance of this research can be reflected in the following points:

1. This study concentrates on the faculty member because he/she represents one of the most important higher learning inputs and quality indices that directly affects on the society's sustainable development.
2. This study is regarded as a response towards modern educational trends which calls for more concern for professional criteria necessary for the Faculty members.
3. It acknowledges Faculty members of the importance of their performance evaluation and how to improve it in order to achieve total quality objectives.

4. It acknowledges and informs Faculty members about the reflections of improving their performance on the higher learning quality.

5. In the context of the concluded results, the proposed mode is useful for researchers who are interested in performance development and who are responsible for performance quality at high learning institutions.

6. This study reveals pros and cons of the performance of Faculty members valuation through providing feedback after the process of performance evaluation.

1.3. The Study Definitions

- **Procedural Definition of Evaluation**
  Giving a value and estimation for performance, quality of Faculty members of AL-Qassim University in accordance with the total quality standards in the following domains: instruction, scientific research and university and community services in order to diagnose the pros and cons their performance to evaluate them.

- **Faculty Member**
  Any person whose main job is instructing or carrying out academic research or community service or university service, whether he/ she works as a part-time or a full-time instructor at AL-Qassim University, males or females , and holds a PhD degree in the following academic ranks: (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor).

- **Performance Quality**
  The ability of Faculty members at AL-Qassim University to carry out all their various assigned tasks related to instruction, scientific research, community or university service with a high degree of accuracy and preciseness in accordance with the international total quality standards.

- **Total Quality Standards**
  The quality level of characteristics and properties that should be clearly available in all the basic aspects of high learning, starting with planning, philosophy, teaching Faculty, students, administration, constructions, equipment, and professional competencies followed at AL-Qassim University.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Literature Review

Standards that have to be adopted to evaluate Faculty members’ performance, quality, they must be emerged out from their duties and tasks such as research, instruction, and society and university service (Hamdan, 2005). The Association of Arab Universities General Guide indicated that making programs and regulations available to evaluate the faculty member in all types of
performance is crucial and to include of a plan to develop their performance professionally, scientifically and with regard to research aspects (Arabic University Union, 2003).

Faculty members need to master their tasks; also, their instruction performance must be at an advanced level through using various modern strategies including critical thinking, problem-solving approach, possessing tools of research and exploration, mastering the teaching materials that they teach, providing opportunities that make their students benefit from modern strategies and adopt a cognitive, social and personal development, possessing communication skills and efficient dialogue techniques, regular planning of the teaching material, developing the relationship with students to use it in achieving their teaching aims and applying efficient and appropriate evaluation strategies in a way that concerns diversity (Zaytoun, 1995).

The process of qualifying performance of the Faculty members at the High Learning Sector has to be comprehensive. We are not satisfied with instruction performance or research as might be the case in our Arabic universities. Instead, the focus has to be on participating in private and public community committees, various societies, different university activities including administration tasks, academic guidance and other services provided to the community and the university (Abul-Rubb and Qadadeh, 2000).

There is a close relation among the concept of quality and the principle of the continuous development of the academic institution; particularly the teaching Faculty member, and to what extent it is linked with the avowed objectives of the university. It is important to adapt untraditional through using the matrix of objectives which includes a collection of quantity standards such as instruction, scientific production, supervising dissertations, scientific activity, community service and administrative tasks (Zayed, 2003).

2.2. Total Quality Standards in Saudi Arabia

The Ministry of Higher Education (2004) has stated that it is necessary that constructing the teaching standards philosophy at the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is based on a set of main principles and concepts that form the future vision elements of education while forming at the same time the intellectual basis. Therefore, we should be familiar with the intellectual basis of the standards at the Kingdom. This is represented in being committed to the international standards of the human rights, and making an educational transformation by these standards, which promotes the community's ability to participate in instilling good citizenship elements and democracy values for the students in addition to the values of teamwork, diversity, tolerance, accepting the other, and keeping up with the modern developments within a changing world.

The National Authority for Assessment and Academic Accreditation has been established by the High Educational Council in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in order to have the responsibility to set the criteria and accredit the institutions and the educational programs of the post-secondary stage. The Quality Assurance and Accreditation agency was launched by the higher council of learning in the kingdom of Saudi Arabia (National Quality Assurance and Accreditation, 2004).
The National Authority for Assessment and Academic Accreditation in the NCAAA (2009) has set a group of criteria to ensure and accredit the High Educational Institutions' quality. These criteria relate to general eleven fields of the institutions' activities as the following:

1. The message, goals and objectives.
2. Authorities and management.
3. Management of the Quality Assurance and improvement.
4. Learning and Education.
5. Management of Student Affairs and the supporting services.
6. Learning Resources.
7. Facilities and equipment.
8. Planning and Financial Management.
9. Recruitment processes.
10. The Scientific research.
11. The educational institutions relations with the society.

Generally, these criteria were set according to the recognized good practices in the High Education Sector all over the world. They were amended to match the High Education methods in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. These criteria are applied in all universities, governmental and national colleges, or any institution relates to the High Education Ministry or any institution was established by any other different ministry or body (NQAA, 2004).

According to the recommendations of the National Authority for Assessment and Academic Accreditation and external reviewers. The Deanship of Quality Assurance and Accreditation has been established in Al-Qassim University with the High Education Council's decision in 2010/61/13 in his 61st session in 26/10/2010 A.H. The Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques, the Head of the High Education Council, has approved the session note through an honour telegram no.7807 m.b. in 12/11/2010 (NCAAA, 2009).

2.3. Previous Studies

We should point that the dearth of studies that suggested structuring a model to develop quality of the Faculty members in the light of the total quality standards. Therefore, the researcher has displayed the previous studies after dividing them into domains to make it easier for the reader to revise them. They are as follows:

Previous Studies Concerning the Evaluation of the Faculty Members Performance

- Stocking and Verlop (2003) have conducted a study that aimed to constructing an instrument used to assess teaching competencies of teachers at schools in USA and to measure their ability to conduct experimental researches. The study sample consists of (1150) male and female students. The study instrument consists of (60) items divided on the following five areas: planning, instruction, and class management, evaluation, carrying out experimental research, and taking part in student activities. The results indicate that the performance...
degree was the highest in class management and the least in carrying out experimental research.

- Barq’an and Al-Rabie (2003) have conducted a study that aims at evaluating the teaching practices of the educational textbooks from the students’ perspective, a “field study”. The questionnaire was applied on (351) male and female students. The study results showed the following results: The students’ questions were greatly welcomed by the teaching Faculty members regarding to their punctuality and treating students equally besides the clear effort made in the scientific material, but the evaluation has not covered the material’s aims and the tests’ questions were not clear. The results indicated that there are significant differences in favor of the practices degree. The researcher recommended that the objectives and the plans of the courses at the lecture should be clear to students in addition to the necessity of evaluation methods variety.

- Al-Sharbini (2004) has conducted a study that aimed to evaluate the performance of university instructors in the light of high learning institutions. The researcher used the descriptive approach. The researcher designed a questionnaire consisting of (29) items. The main results the study has revealed are: 89% of the study, individuals enhance their lectures from usually while 10.9% of them are not able to do so. The study recommends the necessity of holding training courses for the Faculty members to acknowledge with their academic and advisory skills, providing them with the appropriate social and psychological atmosphere in a way that ensures carrying out their duties properly, and providing references and internet service.

- Al-Jabbouri (2008) has conducted a study aimed to evaluating Faculty members’ performance at Babylon University in the light of professionally competencies and personal characteristics from the point of view of post-graduate students. To achieve this aim, a questionnaire consisting of various domains has built and reliability and validity have tested. The questionnaire has applied on a sample of (100) male and female of post-graduate students were asked to answer the items in which were included in Two domains; occupational competencies with (30) items and including six areas, and the personal characteristic Domain consisting of (19) paragraphs. The results indicate that instructional planning, instruction methodology, human relations and evaluation areas have ranked weak levels. Nevertheless, scientific Material area has ranked a good level.

- Hamdan et al. (2010) have carried out a study to check out the level of teachers’ possession of teaching competencies which were categorized into four areas. The study sample consisted of (309) male and female teachers from primary and secondary schools at Malaysia. The results indicated that teachers possess a high level of teaching competencies in favor of female participants. Also, the study showed that the ethnic background had no relationship with possessing teaching competencies and that experience has no relation as well with possessing educational competencies.
Studies Concerning the Development of the Faculty Performance

- **Male (1999)** has conducted a study that aimed to improving teachers’ performance at the educational situations when supervisors visit them, through working on tolerating stress, which the teacher suffers because of the supervisor presence at the class. The study was conducted based on a sample consisting of (120) male and female teachers who were randomly selected. An instrument was used to observe the stress that teachers suffer from before and after the lesson which supervisors observe. The results show that teachers who suffer from a low degree of stress at the experimental lessons have improved their performance and have become better than it used to be in the past.

- **Khleif (2007)** have conducted a study with the title “A Suggested Conception to Develop the Teaching Performance of General Science Primary Teachers in Gaza Strip”. The researchers have prepared a questionnaire consisting of (72) item. The instrument’s validity and reliability have been verified. Also, the instrument is applied on a random sample of (106) male and female teachers at the UNRWA schools in Gaza Strip to identify the teachers’ perspectives towards improving the teaching performance with regard to quality standards. The results illustrate that the science teachers’ teaching performance level is low. The results also yield proposing a concept to develop the teaching performance of science teachers. The researchers recommend that international standards should be adopted and teachers be trained on them to be informed of new innovations.

Commentary on the Previous Studies and the Relation of the Current Study to Them

- Commentary on the previous studies that had addressed the Faculty performance evaluation and the place of the current study regarding them.

- All the previous studies were similar in being limited to only to performance evaluation of Faculty members in the field of teaching competencies. These studies were: (Barq’an and Al-Rabie, 2003; Al-Jabbouri, 2008; Hamdan et al., 2010).

- The current study was different in that it evaluated all aspects of Faculty performance: instruction, research, university and community service as we can see in the study of (Al-Sharbini, 2004).

- The current study agreed with the previous studies in the study approach because of using the descriptive approach. It was different from **Male (1999)** study because of using the experimental approach.

Commentary on the Studies Concerning ‘Faculty Performance Development’ and the Place of the Current Study Regarding Them

- The studies of (Male, 1999; Khleif, 2007) were similar in that all of them dealt with Faculty performance development in teaching area only.

- The current study was different from the previous studies in that it proposes constructing a model based upon the total quality standards to develop the Faculty quality in four domains: instruction, scientific research, university service and community service.
The current study agreed with the study of the Specialized National Councils (2000) in adopting total quality standards to develop performance, while it differs from the current study in the performance dimension since it was concentrated only on the instruction performance.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

The researcher has used the analytical descriptive approach based on data collection as it was compatible with the study purposes.

#### 3.1. Study Population

The study population consisted of all male and female Faculty members at Al-Qassim University. The population includes Faculty of Arts and Science at Al-Rass Governorate Faculty members who hold PhD Degree with the following Academic ranks: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor for the year 2014-2015. The total of the members were (138): 10 Professors, 12 Associate Professors and 116 Assistant Professors. In addition to, including all the male and female students at Science and Arts Faculty of Al-Qassim University at Al-Rass Governorate with a total of (9347): 3762 male students and (5585) female students.

#### 3.2. Study Sample

The study sample consisted of (102) male and female Faculty members at Al-Qassim university at Al-Rass Governorate who hold a PhD Degree, in addition to (370) male and female students from Al-Qassim university. The sample was chosen purposefully.

| Table-1. Frequency and Percentages according to the Study Variables |
|---|---|---|
| **academic rank** | **Class** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| | Professor | 8 | 7.8 |
| | Associate Professor | 9 | 8.8 |
| | Assistant Professor | 85 | 83.3 |
| Gender | Male | 74 | 72.5 |
| | Female | 28 | 27.5 |
| Total | 102 | 100.0 |

| Table-2. Frequency and Percentages according to the Study Variables |
|---|---|---|
| **Gender** | **Class** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| | Male | 197 | 53.2 |
| | Female | 173 | 46.8 |
| **Major** | Arts | 193 | 52.2 |
| | Science | 177 | 47.8 |
| Total | 370 | 100.0 |
3.3. The Study Instrument Construction

The researcher has adopted the questionnaire as an instrument to collect information and data about the performance quality of Faculty members. The questionnaire is titled “Evaluating Performance Quality of the Faculty members at Al-Qassim University from their and their Students’ perspectives”. The questionnaire construction went through several stages, which are as follows:

1. Reviewing theoretical literature and previous studies that have concerned with performance evaluation and the associated measures.
2. Discussing the aspects of the current study with some of Faculty members to benefit from their experience in determining the measurement domains of the study topic.
3. The instrument has initially prepared including the dimensions: instruction, research, community and university services.
4. The instrument has introduced to a committee of professionals for a final modification. The final version of the study instrument to evaluate the performance quality of the Faculty members from their point of view consists of (47) items divided into (3) main domains: instruction, scientific research, and university and community service. The study instrument is built to evaluate the performance quality of the faculty from the point of view of their students consist of (43) items divided into 3 domains: instruction, scientific research, and university and community service. The researcher has used 5-point Likert scale to evaluate the quality of performance. This was as the following: (1-2.33 low), (2.34 – 3.67 medium), (3.68 – 5 high)

3.4. Instrument Reliability

Internal consistency has calculated on a pilot sample outside the study sample consisting of (15) Faculty members’ canach’s alpha was calculated. The table below indicates these percentages which were considered fit for the study purposes.

| Domains                      | Internal Consistency |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Instruction                  | 0.91                 |
| Scientific Research          | 0.78                 |
| University and Community Service | 0.91              |
| Total                        | 0.94                 |

Internal consistency has been calculated based on a pilot sample taken outside the study sample consisting of (40) male and female students so Cronbach alpha was calculated.

The table below indicates these co-efficiencies. These percentages were considered suitable for the study purposes.
3.5. Instrument Validity

The researcher has confirmed the instrument validity of the following types:

- **Structure validity:**
  The researcher has calculated the correlation among each item of the questionnaire's items with the total degree of the domain.

- **Internal validity:**
  The researcher has calculated the correlation among each domain and the other domains and the total degree of the scale.

- **Content validity:**
  The questionnaire in its preliminary form was introduced to a number of professional Faculty to provide feedback and then it was modified into its final form.

3.6. Study Variables

- **The First Independent Variable:** Al Qassim University Faculty members. This variable contains both gender and rank.
- **The Second Independent Variable:** Students, This variable contains both gender and major.
- **The Dependent Variable:** Responses of Faculty members and students to the Instrument.

3.7. Statistical Treatment

The researcher has used the following statistical methods according to the previous variables and aimed:

- Pearson Correlation coefficient to demonstrate the relation among variables.
- Means and standard deviation.
- MANOVA analysis for domains, and ANOVA for the total degree.
- Computing the instrument's validity and reliability.

3.8. Procedures of Constructing the Model

The procedures of construction up the model consisted of the following stages:

- First, Theoretical Model: This stage includes literature review; previous studies related the faculty members' performance and its development besides the total quality standards adopted in different universities generally and Al-Qassim University specifically. Where this step is considered a basic element to determine the model objective, the construction philosophy, the benefits and other fundamental components.
-Second, Field stage: which is based on results that were obtained after distributing the study instrument on the two samples besides the total quality standards adopted in different universities generally and Al-Qassim University specifically and including the instrument domains into the model.

-Third, Model Validity: To confirm content validity and rational validity of the model, it is shown to professionals and a number of professors to be verified at Jordan University, and Al-Qassim University. Their remarks have been taken into consideration, and the necessary modifications have been carried out.

-Fourth, the Final Form of the Model: the proposed model has included a number of elements in the light of total quality standards according to the total quality standards adopted in different universities generally and Al-Qassim University specifically to work on Faculty performance development.

4. FINDINGS

4.1. Results Regarding Question (1)

“What is the degree of performance quality for Faculty members at Al-Qassim University from their perspectives?”

To answer this question the means and SD for the performance quality degree have calculated.

Table 5. Means and SDs of the performance quality arranged descendly according to the means

| Rank | No. | Domain                        | Mean | SD  | Degree |
|------|-----|-------------------------------|------|-----|--------|
| 1    | 1   | Instruction                   | 3.95 | .547| High   |
| 2    | 2   | Scientific Research           | 3.78 | .533| High   |
| 3    | 3   | Community and University Service | 3.34 | .747| Medium |
|      |     | Total                         | 3.70 | .548| High   |

Table (5) demonstrates that means are (3.34 - 3.95) where the instruction domain was the highest with a mean of (3.95) while university and community service is the lowest with a mean of (3.34). The mean for the instrument as a whole is (3.70).

4.2. Results Regarding Question (2)

“What is the degree of performance quality for Faculty members at Al-Qassim University from their student’s perspectives?”

To answer this question the means and SD for the performance quality degree have calculated.

Table 6. Means and SDs of the performance quality arranged descendly according to the means

| Rank | No. | Domain                        | Mean | SD  | Level |
|------|-----|-------------------------------|------|-----|-------|
| 1    | 1   | Instruction                   | 3.97 | .545| High  |
| 2    | 2   | Scientific Research           | 3.70 | .639| High  |
| 3    | 3   | Community and University Service | 2.96 | .936| Medium|
|      |     | Total                         | 3.66 | .548| Medium|
Table (6) demonstrates that means are (2.96 - 3.97) where the instruction domain is the highest with a mean of (3.97) while university and community service is the lowest with a mean of (2.96). The mean for the instrument as a whole is (3.66).

4.3. Results Regarding Question (3)

“Are there any significant differences at (a=0.05) among the means for Faculty members response to the instrument which can be attributed to the following variables: Faculty academic rank (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) and their gender?”.

To answer this question the means and SD for the performance, quality according to academic rank and gender were calculated as in the table 7.

Table (7) shows distinctive variance in the means and standard deviations of the sample performance due to the variance in variables categories of the academic rank (Professor, Associate Professor and Assistance Professor), and gender (males and females).

To illustrate the statistical significance among the means, MANOVA analysis of variance is used for the domains (table (8) and Two-way Analysis of Variance is used for the instrument as a whole.

| Table 7. Means and SD for the performance, quality according to academic rank and gender |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| academic rank | Instruction | Scientific Research | University & Community Service | Total |
| Professor | M | 3.99 | 3.85 | 2.98 | 3.61 |
| SD | .374 | .495 | .486 | .411 |
| Associate Professor | M | 3.95 | 3.97 | 3.18 | 3.69 |
| SD | .304 | .269 | .396 | .268 |
| Assistant Professor | M | 3.95 | 3.76 | 3.39 | 3.71 |
| SD | .582 | .556 | .787 | .582 |
| Gender | Male | M | 3.90 | 3.75 | 3.25 | 3.65 |
| SD | .536 | .525 | .722 | .539 |
| Female | M | 4.07 | 3.86 | 3.57 | 3.85 |
| S | .566 | .553 | .775 | .553 |

S= standard deviation  m= mean

| Table 8. MANOVA Analysis of Variance for the Impact of Rank and Gender on the Domains |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Source of Variance | Instruction | Sum of squares | Degrees of Freedom | Squares means | F value | Significance |
| Rank | 0.605 | 2 | 0.518 | 0.858 | 0.944 |
| Wilkox 900 | 0.421 | 2 | 0.211 | 0.737 | 0.481 |
| H=114 | University & Community Services | 1.277 | 2 | 0.838 | 1.180 | 0.312 |
| Gender | 0.595 | 1 | 0.596 | 1.975 | 1.63 |
| Heddle 0.39 | Scientific Research | 0.223 | 1 | 0.223 | 0.780 | 0.379 |
| H=251 | University & Community Services | 1.869 | 1 | 1.869 | 3.454 | 0.086 |
| Error | Instruction | 39.179 | 98 | 0.302 | 0.286 |
| Scientific Research | 0.008 | 98 | 0.286 |
| University & Community Services | 33.830 | 98 | 0.541 |
| Total | Instruction | 30.187 | 98 | 0.302 |
| Scientific Research | 0.008 | 98 | 0.286 |
| University & Community Services | 33.830 | 98 | 0.541 |

Table (8) indicates the following:
- There is no statistical significance at (a= 0.05) attributed to the impact of rank in all domains.
There is no statistical significance at \( a = 0.05 \) attributed to the impact of gender in all domains.

Table 9. Two–way analysis of Variance for the Impact of Rank and Gender on the Total Degree

| Source of Variance | Squares Total | Degrees of freedom | Squares Means | F-Value | Significance |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------|---------|--------------|
| Rank              | 0.039        | 2                  | 0.019         | 0.064   | .938         |
| Gender            | 0.818        | 1                  | 0.818         | 2.725   | .102         |
| Error             | 29.418       | 98                 | 0.300         |         |              |
| Total             | 30.310       | 101                |               |         |              |

Table (9) indicates the following:

- There is no statistical significance at \( a = 0.05 \) attributed to the impact of rank, since F value is 0.064 with a significance of 0.938.
- There is no statistical significance at \( a = 0.05 \) attributed to the impact of gender since F value is 2.725 with a significance of 0.102.

4.4. Results Regarding Question (4)

“Are there any significant differences at \( a=0.05 \) among the means for the students’ response to the instrument which can be attributed to the following variables: student major (science, arts) and their gender?”

To answer this question, the means and SD for the students’ response according to the variables of student major (Art, Science) and genders (male, female) are calculated as are shown in the table below:

Table 10. Means and SD for the students’ response according to the variables of student major (Art, Science) and Gender (male, female)

| Major | Instruction | Scientific Research | University & Community Services | Total Degree |
|-------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|
| Arts  | M           | 3.86                | 3.57                            | 2.78         | 3.53         |
|       | SD          | .569                | .652                            | .864         | .531         |
| Science | S          | 4.08                | 3.84                            | 3.15         | 3.80         |
|       | SD          | .493                | .595                            | .976         | .534         |
| Gender | Male        | M                   | 3.86                            | 2.81         | 3.54         |
|       | SD          | .547                | .628                            | .819         | .493         |
| Female | M           | 4.08                | 3.84                            | 3.13         | 3.79         |
|       | SD          | .520                | .623                            | 1.029        | .576         |

Table (10) shows distinctive variance in means and standard deviations of students’ response because of the variance in the variables categories of the student major (Arts, Science), and gender (males and females) in order to illustrate the statistical significance among the means, MANOVA.
analysis of variance is used on the domains (table 11), and Two-way Analysis of Variance is used on the instrument as whole (table 12).

Table 11. MANOVA Analysis of the Impact of Major and Gender on the Domains

| Source of Variance | Domains                  | Squares Total | Freedom Degree | Squares Mean | F value | Significance |
|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|---------|--------------|
| Major              | Instruction              | 1.696         | 1              | 1.696        | 6.016   | .015         |
|                    | Scientific Research      | 2.515         | 1              | 2.515        | 6.579   | .011         |
| H= 0.01            | Community & university Services | 5.547 | 1 | 5.547 | 6.608 | .011 |
| Gender             | Instruction              | 1.543         | 1              | 1.543        | 5.474   | .020         |
|                    | Scientific Research      | 2.529         | 1              | 2.529        | 6.563   | .011         |
| H= 0.02          | Community & university Services | 2.806 | 1 | 2.806 | 3.343 | .068 |
| Error              | Instruction              | 103.453       | 367            | 282          |         |              |
|                    | Scientific Research      | 141.440       | 367            | 385          |         |              |
|                    | Community & university Services | 308.063 | 367 | 839 | | |
| Total              | Instruction              | 109.407       | 369            |              |         |              |
|                    | Scientific Research      | 156.785       | 369            |              |         |              |
|                    | Community & university Services | 323.208 | 369 | | | |

Table (11) indicates the following:
- There is a statistical significance at (a= 0.05) attributed to the impact of major in all domains. The difference is in favor of students from scientific majors.
- There is a statistical significance at (a= 0.05) attributed to the impact of gender in the domains of instruction and scientific research. The difference is in favor of females, while there are no significant differences in the domain of community and university services.

Table 12. Two-way Variance Analysis of the Impact of Major and Gender on the Total Degree

| Source of Variance | Squares Totals | Freedom Degree | Squares Mean | F value | Significance |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------|--------------|
| Major              | 2.651          | 1              | 2.651        | 9.530   | .002         |
| Gender             | 2.073          | 1              | 2.073        | 7.451   | .007         |
| Error              | 102.101        | 367            |              | .278    |              |
| Total              | 110.797        | 369            |              |         |              |

Table (12) indicates the following:
- There is statistical significance at (a= 0.05) attributed to the impact of major, since F value is 9.530 with a significance of 0.002. The difference is in favor of students from scientific majors.
- There is no statistical significance at (a= 0.05) attributed to the impact of gender since F value is 7.450 with a significance of 0.007. The difference is in favor of females.

4.5. Results Regarding to Question (5)

"What is the proposed model to develop performance quality for Faculty members at Al-Qassim University in the light of total quality standards".

The results recommend with construction up a model to develop performance quality of the Faculty members at Al-Qassim University. After reviewing the previous studies, theoretical
literature, and the results of applying the instrument on the study sample which indicate that there is an urgent need to propose a model to develop the performance of the Faculty members especially in the domain of scientific research and university and community services. The model elements were determined in the light of the total quality standards.

4.6. The Basic Points for the Proposed Model

The researcher has relied on a number of basic premises, the most important of which being:
1. That teaching Faculty is an inseparable part of the instruction process. In fact they are the essential part of the instruction process.
2. Developing faculty performance is considered a real input to teaching quality at the educational institutions.
3. The teaching process success and promoting its level depends on having highly qualified teaching Faculty members, which is positively reflected on the students’ levels.
4. The qualification of the faculty members and the necessity of proposing a model to develop their performance is considered a vital topic emphasized by a lot of international and local conferences and seminars.
5. The performance of the faculty member does not stand only to instruction.

4.7. The Aim of the Model

The proposed model aims to develop the quality of the faculty members at the higher education institutions in the light of the total quality standards.

4.8. The Model’s Benefits

Hopefully, that the model provides the following benefits:
1. Develop the performance of faculty members in the higher education institutions in the domains of instruction, scientific research, and community and university services.
2. Reinforce quality culture at higher education institutions.
3. Improve educational outcomes of the higher education institutions.

4.9. Beneficiaries from the Proposed Model

In general, all the parties of the instruction process at the higher education institutions and those who are concerned with performance development. In specific, the Faculty members in particular will benefit from the proposed model

4.10. The Model Components

The proposed model consists of a collection of vocabulary as is shown in figure (1). This model has circular shape, which means that every component is influenced by the other one and influences it. Each component of them conceders greatly important. These include the following:
University Environment Quality. This includes, constructions’ quality, equipment such as appropriate light, good ventilation and others; furniture which includes good seats and offices and others; facilities such as e-libraries, resource centres, workshops and well-equipped laboratories. As far as technology is concerned, technology should be employed inside university and should be provided for Faculty members to work on improving their performance. Curricula have to be developed and updated; as well their plans have to be reconsidered with teaching Faculty participation.

- Adopting an evaluation system for teaching Faculty member performance. This system has to be efficient, objective and comprehensive at the same time to measure all the dimensions of the teaching performance, research, and university and community services. It has also to be continuous all through the academic year. Evaluation, also, has to be internal since it is carried out inside the university by the educational process parties, and external carried out by the concerned institutions.

- Proper job climate that leads to improving the level of teaching Faculty performance. This can be achieved through making a room for the Faculty members to participate in decision making, and making them feel that they are part of that decision making process. This can be achieved through having committees inside and outside departments, giving them the needed academic freedom to efficiently practice their performance, offering financial incentives, such as improving salaries, offering remunerations and morale incentives such as appreciation certificates. In addition, promotion system has to be reviewed and to be connected with the Faculty members’ performance in its various dimensions.

- Efficient social participation which can be achieved through taking part in global and local committees which concern about community and its issues in order to benefit from their experience as consultants in solving these issues.

- The university has to adopt a quality policy in planning, implementation and evaluation of any work achieved by it. Moreover, the university has to work on promoting quality culture among those working at it.

- Constant rehabilitation and training that are executed on the basis that cover Faculty training needs, and points of strength and weakness in their performance at first. Afterward, holding training seminars under the supervision of qualified leaders and cadre to improve their skills and to make them acquire new skills. These courses must not be only exclusive to teaching performance development of the Faculty member but should also include developing their research skills and other skills that may be useful in developing their teaching performance.

- Mitigating administrative, teaching and office burdens which may stand as a barrier in front of Faculty development and distracts them from continuing their research and delivering service to university and community.

- Research support for Faculty members’ research and review the scientific sabbaticals system and encourage them to carry out productive and applied research that are connected with their
community issues related to community development and achieving sustainable development in all parts of the educational process.

- Job security: refers to members’ feeling of stability and security in their job that pushes them to work more and to improve performance. This can be fulfilled through reviewing the systems of early retirement and the end of service since the university is in dire need to benefit from the Faculty experience. More care has to be given to the renewal of contracts and contracting system. It is necessary that such matters to be conducted in accordance with criteria and specifications that should be available at Faculty members in order to sign a contract with them.

- Feedback: This means that the model with its components should be in a circular form (nature) which means that each component is impacting and affecting other and by another component. Feedback is not exclusive for the internal components of the model, but it can also be executed through external elements surrounding the model which in turn contributes to the development of the Faculty member. The teaching system does not exist in vacuum.

5. DISCUSSIONS

5.1. Discussion of the Results of Question (1)

The statistical analysis results of Question (1) have represented in the means and SD of the sample subject’s response to the study instrument of all its three domains showed that the quality degree of the Faculty members of Al-Qassim university from their point of view was (high) with a mean of (3.70) for the whole instrument. The means ranged among (3.34 - 3.95). The Instruction domain was at top with the highest mean of (3.95) while the Community and University Service domain was the least with a mean of (3.34). This signifies that Faculty members are interested in the instruction process and are occupied with it. The researcher ascribed the Faculty’s being away from participating in the community services at the community level and the society level to the fact that they don’t have enough time to carry out such services since they spend their time at the study halls and the office hours in addition to the Faculty lack of awareness of the importance of such role. The researcher also ascribed this to the fact that the university’s concentration on caring about the development of the Faculty instruction skills through training courses without paying attention to other aspects such as engaging them in the community services and committees. The result of this study agreed with the study of (Barq’an and Al-Rabie, 2003; Stocking and Verlop, 2003). The result of this study disagreed with the studies of Khleif (2007).

Figure 1. Smadi model (2015) to develop the quality of the performance of a faculty member in the light of the total quality standards.
5.2. Discussion of the Results of Question (2)

The statistical analysis results of Question (2) are represented in the means and SD of the sample subjects’ response to the study instrument of all, its three domains showed that the quality degree of the Faculty members of Al-Qassim University from the point of view of their students was (low) with a mean of (3.66) for the whole instrument. This indicates a deficiency in the performance quality of the Faculty from the point of view of their students. This emphasizes the necessity of developing the Faculty performance and working on its improvement. The means ranged among (3.97- 2.96). The Instruction domain was at top with the highest mean of (3.97), while the Community and University Service domain was the least with a mean of (2.96-1.17). The researcher ascribed this to the fact that the Faculty members are busy with their teaching burdens and office hours, and to the lack of interest in the students' community services and activities because of lack of time. The study agreed with Khleif (2007).

5.3. Discussion of the Results of Question (3)

The statistical analysis results of Question 3 showed that there is no statistical differences at \((a=0.05)\) attributed to the rank impact in the instrument domain. The researcher referred that to the fact that all the Faculty members share the tasks and tasks assigned to them, and the matter of their obtaining the rank is a formality which the teaching Faculty member enjoys and it does not necessarily influence the performance quality. The fact that there is no statistical differences at the level \((a=0.05)\) could be attributed to gender variable in the instrument domains signifies that both male and female Faculty members are equal in carrying out the tasks assigned to them in the three domains. The researcher attributed that to the fact that both male and female Faculty members are occupied in teaching, in the teaching burdens, and the office hours and their lack of interest in the community services resulted from the scarcity of time left to them.

The result of this study agreed with (Stocking and Verlop, 2003) in the fact that there are no statistical differences in favor of the gender variable.

5.4. Discussion of the Results of Question (4)

The statistical analysis results show that there are statistical differences at \((a=0.05)\) attributed to major in all domains. The differences are in favor of science. The researcher attributed this to the fact that students with scientific major show more care, accuracy and perseverance than the students with literary major. This is due to the nature of the syllabuses, they study and to the difficulties they may face in understanding these subjects, especially in the workshop studies which makes them feel closer to their inspectors. This in its turn leads to making positive interaction among them reflected in their evaluation of their instructors. There are statistical differences at \((a=0.05)\) attributed to gender in the domains of Instruction and Scientific Research. Differences were in favor of female participants. The researcher attributed this to the fact that females are more affiliated to their female teachers than males in their affiliation to male teachers. This is referred to the nature of females since they are more repulsive.
and positive than males in their interests and attitudes towards education. This agreed with the results of Hamdan et al. (2010) study.

5.3. Discussion of the Results of Question (5)

The proposed model includes a number of vocabularies as illustrated in figure (1). This model is circular in its nature which means that every word is influenced by the other word and influences it. Each word of them is greatly important. These vocabularies are: quality of University environment, adopting an evaluation system for Faculty member performance, efficient social participation, adapting quality policy by the university, constant rehabilitation and training, mitigating the administrative, teaching and office burdens, research support, job security, and feedback. Some of these elements mentioned in the proposed model agreed with some of the elements proposed to develop performance, such as the model proposed in (Male, 1999; Khleif, 2007). Agreed in some elements related to the instructive aspect only. Nevertheless, the current model differs from these models in that it addresses the dimensions of research performance of the Faculty member, university and community service along with their instructive performance. Such elements were not addressed in the previous studies.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Re-designing of training courses that are held in order to develop Faculty performance to satisfy their training needs in the following domains: instruction performance, research and community performance.
- Promoting the culture of quality in all university divisions and to benefit from Faculty members experiences in this regard.
- Encouraging Higher Learning Institutions’ to adopt an objective evaluation system that is not exclusive to a particular party, but the entire teaching process parties share in carrying it out. As well, it has to be comprehensive so as to cover all professors’ tasks including instruction, scientific research and community service.
- Carrying out various studies in the field of improving Faculty members’ performance in accordance to the total quality standards.
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