# Faculty Attitudes Toward The Teaching Excellence Award At Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University: A Proposed Perspective

**Maha B. Bin Bakr**  Associate Professor, Educational Leadership & Policy Studies College of Education,  Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, P.O. Box 1982, Dammam, Saudi Arabia mbakr@iau.edu.sa

**Abstract :** The purpose of this study is to identify the attitudes of faculty who teach at Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University toward the guidelines and criteria for IAU Teaching Excellence Award (IAUTEA) to propose an updated and improved teaching award system. To this end, a fully structured questionnaire was developed by the researcher and administered to (325) faculty members. Statistical analysis of the data indicated there was a high level of agreement among respondents regarding the importance of the IAUTEA and the prizes presented to winners, otherwise, there was a moderate level of knowledge and agreement with the current IAUTEA's general conditions and criteria and with the nomination and selection processes. On the other hand, there was a high level of agreement regarding all suggested revisions and improvements of the award with an overall mean and standard deviation as follows: M=3.50 and StD=.37.

In addition, this study investigated the significant differences in responses with respect to certain demographic variables (academic rank, college cluster, years of experience, and nationality); only years of experience was determined to have a significant difference among respondents (M = 3.41, P >.05) in favor of the older group (20+).

In conclusion, this study proposed a new set of guidelines and criteria for the IAUTEA, including a submission package that could serve as a guideline in the evaluation process of each nominee. Furthermore, certain recommendations are made to ensure the success of the proposed award system.

Key Words: eligibility & judging criteria, selection procedure, submission package, teaching excellence award, Saudi faculty.

## Introduction

Higher education is in a time of immense change; facing a lot of pressures to demonstrate excellence in teaching and learning outcomes among other challenges (Courcy, 2015). Due to accountability mandates from government

entities, accreditation entities, and stakeholders, universities must establish strategies to enhance the quality of faculty and foster faculty who are life-long learners and life-long enquirers (Johnson & Agnew, 2011). Faculty must fulfill two types of learning needs to ensure a successful academic career; they should continuously update learning in their field of study while engaging in continuous professional development and implement good teaching practices (Carter & Brockerhoff-Macdonald, 2011).

"Great teachers don't just teach; they inspire, they captivate, and they motivate their students to create, investigate, solve, and continue learning long after their school years are over" (Fingal, 2012).  Universities have initiated a wide range of events and activities in an attempt to enable academic staff to be more innovative and creative in their teaching (Murphy, 2011). These activities include the following: involvement in peer consultation programs, participation in workshops and seminars regarding teaching, addressing students' feedback, attending conferences regarding teaching and learning, and identifying and honoring exemplary faculty and learning from their experiences and reflections on teaching (Carter & Brockerhoff-Macdonald, 2011).

Studies related to the field of education have explored the positive impact of Excellence in Teaching Awards (ETAs) on teaching, learning and enhancing the student learning experience; thus, providing a general uplift for the profession of teaching (Andrews, 2011). Some of the documented personal and professional outcomes of receiving ETAs include recognizing and honoring outstanding faculty, exploring exemplary faculty who may be little known outside their immediate context and utilizing their expertise once identified, providing role models for the profession and potential faculty, identifying attributes and characteristics that could be used in faculty selection and promotion procedures, facilitating reflection and professional learning, stimulating professional development and self-growth, and providing research data for theory building on successful teaching (Dinham & Scott, 2002).

Motivational theories over the years have focused on these recognition programs as a major factor that lead to highly motivated workers (Andrews, 2011). Faculty receiving recognition and rewards, and prizes have praised ETAs as being a strong source of motivation to job-satisfaction and organizational-commitment (Bin Bakr, 2015), (Bin Bakr & Ahmed, 2015).

It is important to recognize that excellence in teaching is multidimensional, difficult to measure, and has a wide range of important perspectives. There are some challenges associated with creating credible and authentic ETAs that ensure the deserved faculty is recognized, and the

powerful benefits of the awards have been fulfilled (Dinham & Scot, 2002). In order to have a valid measure of teaching excellence, criteria and measures need to be identified, agreed upon and then substantiated (Courcy, 2015).

The principal criteria for ETAs identify and honor skilled teachers who engage in new strategies and technologies and are lifelong learners who constantly solve problems and seek professional development opportunities (Crter & Brockerhoff-Macdonald, 2011). Other criteria recognize teachers' commitment to strengthen the links between their research and their teaching, thus, bridging the gap between researching, teaching and learning (Murphy & Brennan, 2011). Other distinguished award criteria includes faculty's demonstration of passion and zeal for building relationships with students to contribute to the students' success (Johnson & Agnew, 2011). Thus, teaching excellence requires an interrelated set of skills, knowledge, high technology literacy, and disposition (Dephi, 2015).

Related studies have listed the most common sources of data as a measure for excellence in teaching performance including: quantitative student rating, peer review of teaching, self- evaluation or course portfolio, department chair objective input, and peer review of the teaching reports (Courcy, 2015), (Bin Bakr, 2012), (Paulsen, 2002). Therefore, the candidate selection and evaluation process is a rigorous exercise that should be undertaken by a selected committee that represents a wide range of educational bodies.

ETAs have existed around the world for many years; awards exist at the national level, institutional level, and college or departmental level. A US national stIAUy by Andrew and Erwin (2001) reported 55.7% of community colleges in the US provide an award and recognition program for their faculty, and that more colleges had added recognition programs between 1993 and 2001 studies  (Andrews & Erwin, 2001). Other examples of national level awards include the following:

- US. Professor of the Year Award, est. 1981.
- Canadian 3 M National Teaching Fellowship, est. 1986.
- Australian Awards for University Teaching Excellence, est. 1995
- UK National Teaching Fellowship, est. 2000
- New Zealand – Tertiary Excellence Awards, est. 2001

 The majority of North American and European universities and certain regional and local universities have developed programs that identify and honor faculty who engage in excellent teaching, research, and service.

After a general review of ETAs offered by national and international universities, similarities and differences were noted in regards to the

guidelines and criteria for the nomination and selection processes. For example, the nomination of a candidate was conducted solely by students at George Washington university (GW) yet students were excluded at IAU and King Saud University (KSU); the chairman's endorsement was a requirement at GW and King Fahad University of Petroleum and Minerals (KFUPM) but was not requested at IAU and KSU; and the award granting procedures including forms and file completion differed among all universities. In addition, the types of rewards given to winners varied; certain awards provided a lucrative financial reward (IAU, KSU), others distributed a financial reward as a grant for scientific and research activities (GW, University of California (UC), and KFUPM), other rewards supported academic promotion, and tenure requests.

Regardless of the similarities and differences among the ETA programs offered by the above-mentioned universities and others, the primary objectives were identical. These programs aspire to raise the profile of teaching and learning at universities by recognizing and celebrating teachers who have an outstanding impact on the student learning experience and acknowledge and reward their commitment to strengthening their teaching practices (Murphy& Brennan, 2011).

**Importance of the Study:**

IAU is dedicated to recruiting and retaining highly qualified faculty, as stated in its Strategic Goal #9. IAU has designed and implemented incentive programs and adapted several strategies to influence the faculty's commitment to excellence in teaching. One creative intervention is the Imam Abdulrahman University Teaching Excellence Award (IAUTEA) which was launched in the 2013/ 2014 academic year.

This study focused on reviewing the current form of the IAUTEA and work on improving it in order to assure its recognition of the most effective teachers in hopes that by highlighting superior faculty, others will be inspired to work harder to make IAU an exciting place to learn; thus, raising the status and standing of faculty.

**Research Questions:**
This study was designed to address the following research questions:
RQ1: What are the faculty's perceptions of the IAUTEA in its current form?
RQ2: What are the faculty's perceptions of the suggested revisions/improvements of the IAUTEA?.
RQ3: Do differences exist in the faculty's perceptions toward the IAUTEA in its current form based on college cluster, academic rank, gender, nationality, and years of work experience?.

RQ4: Do differences exist in the faculty's perceptions toward the suggested revisions/ improvements of the IAUTEA based on college cluster, academic rank, gender, nationality, and years of work experience?.

**Limitations of the study:**

This study was limited to faculty members at The Imam Abdulrahman University (IAU), affiliated with its four college clusters: (Health, Engineering, Science & Management, and Arts & Education). This study was conducted during the second semester of the 2016/ 2017 academic year.

**Methodology:**

**Population and Sample**

The target population of this study included all full- time faculty members that were employed by the Imam Abdulrahman University, excluding those on sabbatical or other study leave/vacations (N= 1,539). The sample size was calculated as (n=135) ( $n = \dfrac{\sigma^2 Z^2}{E^2} = \dfrac{1.96^2 \times 0.25}{0.084^2} = 135$ ) with a marginal error of (0.084), and a confidence level of 95%.

**Instrumentation**

A survey research design was used to meet the objectives of this study. A fully structured questionnaire was developed by this researcher after reviewing numerous teaching awards that were used by prestigious national and international universities and an in-depth review of The George Washington University's (GWU) and King Fahad University of Petroleum and Minerals' (KFUPM) experience with this topic.

This researcher visited GWU during the Fall semester of the 2016 academic year and conducted numerous face to face interviews with personnel that administered and supervised the Faculty Award Systems. Faculty recipients of past teaching awards at GWU were contacted via email and invited to attend phone interviews to document their insights regarding the award. Based on information gathered during the visit to GWU and after a thorough review of related literature, the questionnaire was designed and provided via internal electronic mail to the participants.

The first section of the questionnaire solicited information regarding demographics and the participants' professional characteristics, which included college affiliation, academic rank, gender, nationality, and years of work experience. The second and third sections consisted of 40 items that investigated the respondent's perspective of the IAUTEA using a four-point

response scale (See Appendix 1). The respondents were asked to indicate the extent that they agreed/disagreed with statements regarding the current IAUTEA and suggestions for its revision and improvement. Open-ended questions were also included to elicit a wider range of suggestions.

**Validity and Reliability**

The survey instrument was reviewed for content validity and approved by an expert panel at King Saud University and IAU; certain adjustments were made based on the reviewers' recommendations and notes, particularly in regards to translating the survey into Arabic .

Because six constructs were assessed using a summated Likert score, it was necessary to examine the internal consistency of these scores. Cronbach's alpha (a) is a good indicator of internal consistency (Black, 1999) and is also a reasonable indicator of reliability for homogenous sections of the questionnaire. Cronbach's alpha was calculated for the results of the questionnaire. Pearson Correlation is also a reasonable indicator of the validity of an instrument. The alpha coefficients and the Pearson Correlation for the questions were calculated using SPSS and were determined to be relatively strong. Overall, the alpha coefficients ranged between 0.506 – 0.830 and the Pearson Correlation ranged between 0.648 – 0.954 and demonstrated good stability and validity of the questionnaire as illustrated in Table 1 below.

**Table 1 Cronbach's alpha and Pearson Correlation by Survey Sections**

| Sections | | N of items | Cronbach's Alpha | Pearson Analysis |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Current Award** | Current Award Practices | 6 | .684 | .689 |
| **Areas of suggested revisions/ improvements on the Award** | Nomination Process | 4 | .506 | .648 |
| | Nominees' Evaluation | 4 | .521 | 764 |
| | General Judging Criteria | 7 | .700 | .638 |
| | Award Granting Procedures | 11 | .765 | .769 |
| | Rewards given to Winners | 8 | .813 | .727 |
| | Total revisions/ improvements | 34 | .815 | .954 |
| Overall Total | | 40 | .830 | ------- |

The instrument was pre-tested on a convenience sample from this study's population. The sample selected for the pilot study was not included in the sample of the study. Participants in the pilot sample were asked to record comments, errors, and other indicators of potential problems during completion of the survey (to be used to frame follow-up questions). These participants were also asked to specifically comment on the length of the instrument and the length of time it took to complete the survey. The sample reported that the instructions and statements were clear. They were no queries from the participants.

**Data Analysis**

To analyze the data gathered from the participants, mean scores and standard deviations were computed for all responses to each item of the instrument. For interpretation purposes, the rating was segmented into four categories: high agreement, neutral agreement, low agreement, and disagreement. Faculty members who reported high agreement were those whose rating averaged at least 3.26. Averages of 2.51-3.25 indicated moderate agreement, averages of 1.76 – 2.5 indicated a low level of agreement, and averages of less than 1.76 indicated that faculty disagreed with the statements that were presented in the instrument.

**Demographic characteristics of the participants**

This section describes certain demographic characteristics of the survey respondents, including attributes such as college affiliation, academic rank, gender, nationality, and years of experience at IAU. Table 2 provides a demographic breakdown of the sample data.

**Table 2 Demographic Characteristics of the Sampled Faculty**

| College Cluster | Number | % |
|---|---|---|
| Health Professions Cluster | 72 | 22.2 |
| Engineering Colleges | 33 | 10.2 |
| Sciences & Management | 72 | 22.2 |
| Arts & Education Cluster | 148 | 45.5 |
| **Academic Rank:** | | |
| Professor | 26 | 8.0 |
| Associate Professor | 54 | 16.6 |
| Assistant Professor | 169 | 52.0 |
| Lecturer | 76 | 23.4 |
| **Gender:** | | |
| Male | 90 | 27.7 |
| Female | 235 | 72.3 |
| **Nationality:** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Saudi | 155 | 47.7 |
| Non Saudi | 170 | 52.3 |
| **Years of work experience at IAU:** | | |
| less than 10yrs | 131 | 40.3 |
| 10yrs – less than 20yrs | 101 | 31.1 |
| 20yrs + | 93 | 28.6 |
| **TOTAL** | **325** | **100** |

The participants' nationality was as follows: 47.7% were Saudi and 52.3% were expatriates. In terms of academic rank, 8% of the respondents were professors, 16.6% were associates, 52% were assistants, and 23.4% were lecturers. In regards to the duration of work experience at IAU, 40.3% were less than 10 years, 31.1% were 10 – 20 years, and 28.6% were more than 20 years. In terms of college cluster, 22.2% were from the Health Profession path, 10.2% were from the Engineering path, 22.2% represented Sciences & Management, and 45.5% were from the Arts and Education path.

**Results and Analysis:**

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data collected using various descriptive statistical calculations that included means, standard deviations, and frequencies. To determine if significant differences existed in the overall perspectives of participants based on college cluster, academic ranking, years of work experience, and nationality, t-tests and f-tests were calculated. Tables 3- 9 below provide the number of responses and levels of agreement regarding the different sections of the questionnaire.

**RQ1: What are the faculty's perceptions of the IAUTEA in its current form?.**

**Table 3 Descriptive Statistics regarding the IAUTEA in its current practice**

| STAMENTS | N | Mean | StD | % | LEVEL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The importance of IAU Teaching Excellence Award in general. | 325 | 3.70 | .57 | 15 | High |
| I know all about the award's objectives, general conditions and procedures. | 325 | 2.70 | .93 | 34 | Moderate |
| The requirements and criteria for the nomination of the award are appropriate (student assessment of the candidate, colleagues and external referees' evaluation, the completion of the candidate's course portfolio). | 325 | 3.14 | .85 | 27 | Moderate |

| | N | Mean | St. D | | Levels |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The number and the three levels of the award are suitable: (Tracks (4); Colleges (17); Departments (not yet active). | 325 | 3.08 | .84 | 27 | Moderate |
| The allocated prize for each level is suitable: Trophy +30,000 SR +certificate of appreciation for the winner of each academic track; Trophy + 15,000 SR + certificate of appreciation for the winner of each college level; Trophy + 5000 SR + a certificate of appreciation for the winner of each academic department level. | 325 | 3.32 | .82 | 25 | High |
| Procedures and criteria for winners' selection: (20% of the mark goes to one class observation by two staff members of the college committee, 20% for candidate's portfolio assessment by two staff members of the college committee, 40% for students' assessment, and 20% for the external referee evaluation. | 325 | 3.03 | .91 | 30 | Moderate |
| Overall agreement on current IAUTEA | 325 | 3.16 | .51 | 16 | Moderate |

Note: Do not Agree (1 – 1.75), Low (1.76 – 2.5), Moderate (2.51 – 3.25), and High (3.26 -4)

Table 3 provides the descriptive statistics regarding the faculty's perspectives of the IAUTEA in its current practice. Faculty's overall agreement was moderate with a mean of M=3.16 and a standard deviation of .51. Results presented in Table 3 illustrate the faculty's high level of agreement with the general importance of the IAUTEA and a high level of agreement with the current prize that is presented to winners with means of 3.7, 3.32 and standard deviations of .57, .82, respectively. Otherwise, there was a moderate level of knowledge and agreement with the current IAUTEA's general conditions and criteria and with the nomination and selection processes with means ranging 2.70 – 3.14.

**RQ2: What is the faculty's perception level regarding the suggested revisions/improvements of the IAUTEA?.**

**Table 4  Descriptive Statistics of Revisions/Improvements to the IAUTEA**

| Areas of Revision/Improvement | N | Mean | St. D | Levels |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Nomination Process | 314 | 3.35 | .57 | High |
| 2. Nominees' Evaluation | 270 | 3.33 | .52 | High |
| 3.General Judging Criteria | 270 | 3.63 | .36 | High |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.Award Granting Procedures and Conditions | 325 | 3.65 | .41 | High |
| 5.Rewards given to Award Winners | 258 | 3.60 | .47 | High |
| **Overall** | **325** | **3.50** | **.37** | **High** |

Note: Do not Agree (1 – 1.75), Low (1.76 – 2.5), Moderate (2.51 – 3.25), and High (3.26 -4)

Table 4 provides the descriptive statistics of the participants' perspectives regarding the suggested revisions and improvements of the IAUTEA. The level of agreement among the participants was high for all suggested areas of revision/improvement with an overall M=3.50 and StD=.37. The results also indicated that the need for revisions/improvements was reported highest in the following areas: the award granting procedures, the award's general judging criteria, and the rewards given to the award winners with means of 3.64, 3.63, and 3.60 and standard deviations of 41, .36, and .47, respectively.

Appendix 1 provides descriptive statistics for all statements regarding the five suggested areas of revision/improvement for the IAUTEA. The respondents' levels of agreement are presented in descending order according to each area of revision/improvement. There was a high level of agreement with all suggested statements as indicated in Appendix1 and all M> 3.26.

As illustrated in Appendix 1, the respondents' highly agreed that the nomination process should include faculty self-nomination (M = 3.52, StD =.89) and student nominations (M = 3.44, StD =.90). For the evaluation process, the highest level of agreement was for participation of students in the process (M = 4.44, StD =.78), followed by the chairman's participation (M=42, StD=.84), then external referee participation (M=3.35, StD=.86).

Furthermore, the respondents mostly agreed that the general judging criteria of the award must include the application of new pedagogical methods and effective teaching practices (M=3.78, StD=.51) and a commitment to students' learning and recognizing differing needs, strengths and differences (M=3.85, StD= 039).

In regards to award granting procedures, respondents scored highest for sending letters of appreciation to all top college candidates following an announcement of the official results (M=3.88, StD=.36); for announcing the winners via an annual forum, university website, emails, and videos of winners (M=3.80, StD=.44); and announcing the terms, procedures, and dates for nomination at the beginning of the academic year (M=3.81, StD=.52).

Other results that are provided in Appendix 1 reflect the respondents' priorities regarding the rewards given to award winners and include a financial reward (M=3.79, StD=.47), points for academic promotion (M=3.74. StD=.65), and supporting winners' decisions to extend service once they reach retirement age (M=3.73, StD=.59).

Overall, respondents reported a moderate level of agreement for only two statements; they moderately agreed with allowing any faculty member to nominate a colleague for the prize (M=3.12, StD=.977) and moderately agreed with allowing colleagues to participate in the evaluation process of the nominee through observing classes and teaching methods that were used by the nominee (M=3.11, StD=.94).

**Table 5  Proposed rating scale divisions  of participants' input for the evaluation process**

| Rating scale division choices | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| **Choice A** (Student assessment 20%, colleagues' input 20%, department head's input 20%, nominees' file evaluation 20%, external referee input 20%). | 106 | 41.2 |
| **Choice B** (Student assessment 30%, colleagues' input 10%, department head's input 10%, nominees' file evaluation 20%, external referee input 30%). | 115 | 44.7 |
| **Choice C** (Student assessment 20%, colleagues' input 20%, department head's input 10%, nominees' file evaluation 20%, external referee input 30%). | 36 | 14.0 |
| **TOTAL** | **257** | **100** |

Table 5 above provides the respondents' choice of the suggested scale divisions for the evaluation process. Choice B was the primary choice among the respondents, 44.7% preferred that the scale be divided as follows: Student assessment 30%, colleagues' input 10%, department head's input 10%, nominee's teaching file 20%, and external referee input 30%.

**RQ3: Do differences exist in the faculty's perceptions towards the IAUTEA in its current form based on college cluster, academic rank, gender, nationality, and years of work experience?**

**Table 6  F-test comparing faculty's perspective to IAUTEA in its current form according to college cluster, academic ranking, and years of work experience**

| | Variables | N | Mean | St.D | f-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **COLLEGE CLUSTERS** | Health Professions | 72 | 3.12 | .51 | | |
| | Engineering | 33 | 3.14 | .46 | | |
| | Sciences & Management | 72 | 3.12 | .50 | .82 | .49 |
| | Arts & Education | 148 | 3.211 | .53 | | |
| | TOT | 325 | 3.16 | .52 | | |
| **ACADEMIC RANK** | Professor | 26 | 3.15 | .51 | | |
| | Associate Professor | 54 | 3.20 | .43 | | |
| | Assistant Professor | 169 | 3.18 | .55 | .52 | .67 |
| | Lecturer | 76 | 3.10 | .49 | | |
| | TOT | 325 | 3.16 | .52 | | |
| **YRS OF** | less than 10yrs | 131 | 3.16 | .49 | | |
| | 10yrs – less than 20yrs | 101 | 3.14 | .52 | | |
| | 20yrs + | 93 | 3.19 | .54 | .23 | .79 |
| | TOT | 325 | 316 | .52 | | |

*p<(.05) significant  **p<(.01) highly significant

**Table 7  T-TEST comparing faculty's perspective to IAUTEA in its current form according to gender and nationality**

*p<(.05) significant       **p<(.01) highly significant

| | Variables | N | Mean | St.D | t-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **GENDER** | Female | 90 | 3.15 | .46 | -.21- | .84 |
| | Male | 235 | 3.16 | .54 | | |
| **NATIONALITY** | Saudi | 155 | 3.04 | .55 | -4.27 | .00** |
| | Non- Saudi | 170 | 3.27 | .46 | | |

Tables 6, and 7 provide the results of the analysis of variance and the t-test that compared the faculty's perspective regarding the IAUTEA in its current form based on demographic-related variables. As indicated above,

there were no significant differences in the faculty's perspectives regarding the IAUTEA in its current form based on college cluster, academic rank, years of work experience, and gender (p> 0.05). The results demonstrated that there were high statistically significant differences among respondents according to nationality (f = -4.268, p< 0.01) in favor of Non-Saudi; the level of agreement among non-Saudi regarding the IAUTEA in its current form was higher (M=3.27 and StD= .46).

**RQ4: Do differences exist in the faculty's perceptions toward the suggested revisions/ improvements of the IAUTEA based on college cluster, academic rank, gender, nationality, and years of work experience?.**

**TABLE- 8   F-TEST comparing faculty's perspective of suggested revisions/improvements to IAUTEA according to college cluster, academic ranking, and years of work experience**

| | Variables | N | Mean | St.D | f-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **COLLEGE CLUSTERS** | Health Professions | 72 | 3.53 | .35 | 213 | .89 |
| | Engineering | 33 | 3.47 | .46 | | |
| | Sciences & Management | 72 | 3.51 | .36 | | |
| | Arts & Education | 148 | 3.50 | .37 | | |
| | TOT | 325 | 3.50 | .37 | | |
| **ACADEMIC RANK** | Professor | 26 | 3.63 | .42 | 2.47 | .06 |
| | Associate Professor | 54 | 3.42 | .38 | | |
| | Assistant Professor | 169 | 3.49 | .40 | | |
| | Lecturer | 76 | 3.55 | .31 | | |
| | TOT | 325 | 3.50 | .37 | | |
| **YRS OF EXPERIENC** | less than 10yrs | 131 | 3.54 | .33 | 3.41 | *.03 |
| | 10yrs – less than 20yrs | 101 | 3.54 | .33 | | |

| | Variables | N | Mean | St.D | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 20yrs + | 93 | 3.42 | .45 | | |
| | TOT | 325 | 3.50 | .37 | | |

*p<(.05) significant     **p<(.01) highly significant


**TABLE- 9   T-TEST comparing faculty's perspective   of suggested revisions/improvements to IAUTEA according to gender and nationality**

| Variables | | N | Mean | St.D | t-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **GENDER** | Female | 90 | 3.47 | .37 | -1.05- | .29 |
| | Male | 235 | 3.52 | .37 | | |
| **NATIONALITY** | Saudi | 100 | 3.47 | .34 | -1.67- | .10 |
| | Non- Saudi | 170 | 3.54 | .34 | | |

*p<(.05) significant     **p<(.01) highly significant

Tables 8,9 provides the results of the analysis of variance and t-test that compared the faculty's perspectives regarding the IAUTEA in its revised/improved form based on demographic-related variables. As indicated above, there were significant differences in the faculty's perspectives based on years of work experience (M= 3.41, p< 0.05) in favor of the older group (20 yrs+); the respondents had a lower level of agreement with the suggested revisions/improvements regarding the IAUTEA.

Furthermore, Table 8 indicates that there were no significant differences among respondents according to college cluster (f = 213, p> 0.05) or academic rank (f=2.45, p > 0.05). The results of the T-test that are provided in Table 9 indicate no significant difference between Saudi nationals and

expatriates regarding their perspectives on the suggested revisions/improvement for the IAUTEA (f=-1.666, p> 0.05).

**Summary of main results:**
- There was a high level of agreement among respondents regarding the importance of the IAUTEA and the prizes presented to winners with means of 3.7 and 3.32, respectively.

- There was a moderate level of knowledge and agreement with the current IAUTEA's general conditions and criteria and with the nomination and selection processes with means ranging M=( 2.70 – 3.14).

- There was a high level of agreement regarding all suggested revisions and improvements of the award with an overall mean and standard deviation as follows: M=3.50 and StD=.37.
- The changes/revisions that scored the highest included the following: the department chair must participate in the nomination and evaluation processes (M=3.29, M=3.42); students should be invited to participate in the nomination and evaluation process (M=3.44, M=3.44); and an allocation of only five award winners at the university level (M=3.44).

- A variety of lucrative incentives should be tied to the IAUTEA including financial rewards, special scientific grants, support of conference attendance, sabbatical leave and academic promotion requests (M = 3.79 – 3.33).

**Conclusions and Recommendations:**

This study was designed to review the current IAUTEA system to suggest improvements in accordance with the faculty's perspectives. After reviewing the related literature, studying excellent teaching awards provided by other prestigious national and international universities, and analyzing the data and information gathered in this study, suggestions that were highly accepted among faculty are provided to improve the current award and include the following:

1. Nomination to the award must be tied to peer-recognition and popularity among students.

2. Department chair input is crucial to the nomination process; they should choose who is endorsed and help candidates complete the file.

3. The general judging criteria should be applicable to all disciplines and support the nomination of faculty that impact the broader aspects of teaching and learning, the teaching process, and students and peers.

4. All endorsed nominees should be formally acknowledged by sending letters to thank them for participating and request their future participation.

   In conclusion, the following Guidelines and Criteria for the IAUTEA Proposal is recommended for implementation at the Imam Abdulrahman University and a new IAUTEA Submission Package is also recommended for the evaluation process of all candidates as provided below.

   Furthermore, the following are recommendations that will ensure success in implementing the proposed IAUTEA system.

1. Incentives must be awarded to committees that work with different aspects of IAUTEA.
2. The IAUTEA booklet must be revised according to this study's suggestions and should include the following: General guidelines & eligibility criteria, judging criteria, nomination and selection procedures, evaluation criteria & scale division, types of rewards provided to winners, the IAUTEA submission package requirements and guidelines, and all updated forms and rubrics produced by the TAC.
3. University leadership must demonstrate its support to the award through meetings and formal letters to all deans that emphasize the importance of the award and its relationship to fulfilling the university mission and strategic goals.
4. Establishing an **Academy of Distinguished Leaders** under the Dean of Educational Development responsible for developing the teaching and learning experience at IAU; among which is reviewing the award process and rethinking the award criteria and final selection process. The membership of this new group must include previous winners of the award, as well as faculty and students from different disciplines.
5. There must be a significant recognition of award winners at the university level, which should include the following: A library of "best practices" video interviews with winners describing their contributions to the teaching and learning world, announcements of winners on the university website and a public event attended by all university personnel (leaders, faculty, and student).
6. Create an Endowment fund for the university that can be used to generate financial support for the IAUTEA in a secure and continuing manner.

**GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA FOR IAU TEACHING EXCELLENCE AWARD (A Proposed Perspective)**

**1. Introduction:**

**1847 | Maha B. Bin Bakr          Faculty Attitudes Toward The Teaching Excellence Award At Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University: A Proposed Perspective**

IAU is dedicated to increasing the human resource capacity to accomplish IAU's teaching, research, and service missions more effectively through designing and implementing appropriate incentive programs as stated in its Strategic Goal #9. To recognize the best of the best, the IAUTEA program is designed and implemented in hopes that by highlighting superior faculty, others will be inspired to work harder to make Dammam University an exciting place to learn and thereby influencing the faculty's commitment to excellence in teaching.

The IAUTEA is based on competition. The application of the award is made to the Dean of Academic Development and the final selection and recommendation to  H. E. the Rector is made by the Supreme Award Committee (SAC) headed by the Vice Rector of Academic Affairs.

## 2. Eligibility Criteria:

-The applicant has served as a full-time faculty member at IAU for a minimum of 3 years.
-The applicant has regularly taught undergraduate students for the last four continuous academic semesters.
-The latest three years average of the students' evaluations and departmental chairman input of the applicant should place him/her among the top faculty in his/her department.

## 3. General Guidelines:

-The SCA is responsible for reviewing the requirements and procedures for the nomination and updating required forms.

-The announcement of terms, procedures and dates for nomination will occur at the beginning of the academic year.
-A maximum of five awards are granted university-wide every year to full-time faculty members who have scored the highest among all nominees; winners of the award should be from different departments. (Colleges are responsible for awards given at the college and department level).
-Eligible faculty members may nominate themselves for the award or be nominated either by a department chair, students (over 10 students), or colleagues (at least two members).
-The candidates' submission package must be completed by the nominee as outlined below.

## 4.  Judging Criteria:
- Application of new pedagogical methods and effective teaching practices.

**1848 | Maha B. Bin Bakr           Faculty Attitudes Toward The Teaching Excellence Award At Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University: A Proposed Perspective**

- Commitment to students' learning and recognizing differing needs, strengths, and differences.
- Availability to students outside of regularly scheduled class time.
- Developing new courses and programs related to field of study.
- student evaluations must reflect high academic standards and achievements.
- Fostering academic leadership and actively participation in the peer review of teaching
- Engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

**5. Rating Division:** Overall scale division of evaluators' input:
- 30% for students' input; 10% for colleagues' input; 10% for chairman's' input; 50% for candidates' submission package which includes supporting material for fulfilling the judging criteria (SAC members 30%, external referee input 20%).

**Note:** General principles of the rating scale for the judging criteria: (Specific rubric for indicators of each criterion should be prepared by the SCA)

- (0) rating is suggested if no evidence is provided regarding the criterion.
- (1) rating is suggested if practices reflect those generally used in the discipline or area.
- (2-3) ratings are suggested for increasingly exemplary and/or innovative practices.
- (4) rating is suggested for practices adopted by others and/or contributing to the field.

**6. Nomination and Selection Procedures:**

- Nominations are sent directly to the Dean of Academic Development for eligibility review.

- Names of all eligible nominees are sent to department chairs to endorse and help the candidates to review and complete the nomination package.
- The top five packages are sent to the SAC with a list of excluded applicants.
- Members of the SAC should follow up with the external referee evaluation of the package.
- Scores are averaged and a cut-off point is determined.
- Packages that make the cut are then reviewed and discussed by the entire SAC and the Vice Rector of Academic Affairs for final selection.
- Final selection of the UATEA winners is presented to H.E. the Rector of the university.

- Announcement of the award winners via the annual forum, University website, e-mails, and video about the winners.

- Letters of appreciation are sent to all top department candidates.
- The SAC head accepts aggrieved candidates' complaints.

**6. Rewards Provided to Winners:**

**-**A financial reward; its amount to be determined by the SAC.

-Granting special pensions for a year after receiving the award for scientific and research activities.
-The nomination to higher prestigious committees at the college and university level.
-Priority to attend scientific conferences and the granting of sabbatical leave, scholarships and scientific channels.
-Support decisions to extend service when the winner of the award reached the age of retirement.
- Receive points when applying for academic promotion.
-Be assigned a research assistant (hiring a postdoctoral student/unloading a college lecturer).

**IAUTEA Submission Package (Proposed Perspective)**
Name: (Contact information):

Department/College:

Department Chair: (contact information)

Colleagues participating in the nomination process: (contact information)

Students' input: contact information)

**For each of the following criteria, please identify where the item is located in the submission package:**

| Criteria | Location of supporting materials in package by page# |
|---|---|
| 1. Application of new pedagogical methods and effective teaching practices. | |
| 2. Commitment to students' learning and recognizing differing needs, strengths, and differences. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. Availability to students outside of regularly scheduled class time. | |
| 4. Developing new courses and programs related to field of study. | |
| 5. Student evaluation must reflect high academic standards and achievements. | |
| 6. Fostering academic leadership and active participation in the peer review of teaching | |
| 7. Engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning | |

**Package Submission Guidelines:**

- Please attach above page to the front of nominees' submission package.

- Nomination materials must be submitted electronically as a single PDF document.

- The submission package should be a maximum of 40 pages; materials beyond the 40-page limit will not be considered.

- Letters need not be on letterhead nor signed by hand; typed signatures are acceptable but must be accompanied with complete contact information in the letter.

- Each package is divided into **4 sections** and should be submitted in the following order (all pages should be numbered):

**1.Nominee's documentation of his/her Teaching and Learning efforts 50%:**

- Evidence of all indicators for each criterion as practiced by the nominee using the forms and template prepared by the SAC.

- Summary of teaching experience and approach as it relates to the material in the package (1 page).
- Evidence of (2) teaching materials used in the courses during the last two semesters (maximum 10 pages).
- Two examples of teaching materials used in the course(s)(maximum of 15 pages total). Each example should be labeled to which criteria or criterion it supports; These can include Syllabi, Course assignments or projects descriptions/prompts, Presentation slides, Active learning techniques, Classroom or laboratory activities, and Sample of completed student work with grading/feedback.

**2. Chairman input (10%)**
- One letter from the department chair stating the departmental support of the nominee and addressing the judging criteria (1-2 pages).

**3. Colleagues' input (10%)**

- Two letters from departmental colleagues who have observed the teaching practices of the nominee addressing some or all the criteria (1-2 pages).

**4. Students' input (30%)**

- Letters (2-5) from student/alumni who have completed a course with the nominee during the two most recent semesters addressing some or all the criteria (1-2 pages).
- Summaries of students' evaluations of all courses taught by the nominee during two recent semesters (all quantitative scores and student comments should be summarized into a table).

Please note that nomination packages and materials will not be returned.

**References**

Andrews, H.A. (2011). Supporting quality teachers with recognition. Australian Journal of Teacher Education. 46(12), pp59-70.

Andrews, H.A. &Erwin, J. (2011). Nationwide Study Examines faculty recognition programs. Community College Journal. 73(2), pp36-39.

Bin Bakr, M. & Ahmed, E. (2015). An empirical investigation of Faculty members' organizational commitment in the kingdom of Saudi Arabia. American Journal of Educational Research. 3 (8), pp1020-1026. http://pubs.sciepub.com/education/3/8/12/

Bin Bakr, M. (2015). Level of job satisfaction among faculty members at the College of Arts, Imam Abdulrahman University – faculty members' perspective-. The College of Education Scientific Journal, University of Ain Shams, 2(39), pp275-354.

Bin Bakr, M. (2012). A proposed faculty performance evaluation system at the College of Art, Imam Abdulrahman University from -their Perspective-. The College of Education Scientific Journal, University of Ain Shams, 2(36), pp9-59.

Black, R., (1999). Doing quantitative research in the social sciences. London: Sage.

Böckerman, A., & Ilmakunnas, P. (2012). Does high involvement management improve worker wellbeing?, Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization. 8(4), pp 660-680.

Carter, L., & Brockerhoff- Macdonald, (2011). The Continuing Education of Faculty as Teachers at a Mid-size Ontario University. The Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. 2 (1), pp1-12.

Clemente, M. & Ferrandiz-Vindel, I., (2012). Self-Assessment of the University Teaching Staff Functions. Contemporary Issues in Education Research. 5 (5), pp367–372.

Courcy, E. D. (2015). Defining and measuring teaching excellence in higher education in the 21st century. College Quarterly. 18(1), pp1-4.

Delphi, M. (2015). Identifying characteristics of technology and engineering teachers striving for excellence using modified Delphi. Journal of Technology Education. 26(2), pp2-21.

Dinham, S. & Scot, C. (2002). Awards for teaching excellence: intentions and realities. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education.
http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED471574.pdf

Fingal, D. (2012). Excellent Educ, ISTE's Awards Winners Inspire, Captivate, and Motivate. International Society for Technology in Education, pp12-16.
http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ991231.pdf

Gentry, G. & Stokes, D. (2015). Strategies for professors who service the university to earn tenure and promotion. Research in Higher Education Journal, 29 (1), pp1-13.

Guidelines & Criteria for Distinguished University Professorship Award, King Fahad University of Petroleum & Minerals, http://faculty.kfupm.edu.sa/ME/bsyilbas/Awards.html

Guidelines & Criteria for Distinguished Professorship Award: King SaIAU University.
https://dsrs.ksu.edu.sa/ar/node/

Kauhanen, A. (2009). The Incidence of High-Performance Work Systems: Evidence from a Nationally Representative Employee Survey. Economic and Industrial Democracy 30(3), pp454-480.

Kizilos, M., Cummings, C., & Cummings, T. G. (2013). How high-involvement work processes increase organization performance: The role of organizational citizenship behavior, Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 49 (4), pp 413–436.

Moynihan, D., & Pandey, S. (2007). Finding workable levers over work motivation: Comparing job satisfaction,job involvement, and organizational commitment. Administration & Society, 39 (7), pp803-832.

Murphy, J, Brennan, A. (2011). NAIRTL Grants Initiative: Evaluation of Impact. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED538010.pdf

Paulsen, M. (2002). Evaluating teaching performance. New Direction for Institutional Research. 114, pp557-571.

Teaching Excellence Awards at the University of George Washington, http://tlc.provost.gwu.edu/awards

Imam Abdulrahman University Strategic Plan, http://www.uod.edu.sa/en