



Evaluation of the Educational Scholarship Festival over the Past Seven Years from 2008 to 2014 in Iran based on the CIPP Model

Reza Ghafari, Sousan Hassanzadeh Salmasi *, Parisa Golanbar, Fariba Salek Ranjbarzadeh, Parviz Saleh

Medical Education Research Center, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran

Article info

Article Type:

Original Research

Article History:

Received: 17 Agu 2015

Accepted: 29 Nov 2015

ePublished: 1 Feb 2016

Keywords:

Educational Scholarship Festivals, Evaluation, Faculty members

Abstract

Introduction: The Educational Scholarship Festival is held every year to express appreciation for the educational Scholarship projects and elevate the promotion and development of the current educational procedures in universities both domestically and nationally. Considering the importance of the festival since its inception in 2008, we decided to conduct the present study with the aim of evaluating the Educational Scholarship Festival over the past seven years in Tabriz University of Medical Sciences.

Methods: This cross-sectional study was done among 120 faculty members who took part in the festival. The data were collected through a questionnaire based on the CIPP evaluation model designed by the National Faculty Member Secretariat. Descriptive statistics were calculated with SPSS 21.

Results: The results showed that 7.8% of participants were educational deputies of faculties, 3.1% were directors of the Medical Education Development Center (over 6 years), 1.6 % were educational experts, and 87.5% were faculty members, of whom 43.1% were members of the refereeing committee for previous festivals. Overall, 80% of participants had taken part in several festivals and 63.9% participated in providing processes. In a general overview of the festival evaluation, the results were as follows: context (mean 44.92 ± 29.25), input (mean 47.90 ± 34.12), and product (mean 42.56 ± 27.1) were evaluated as moderate and process (mean 58.36 ± 30.35) was evaluated as good. The overall satisfaction of the participants with the festival was also assessed as good (mean 71.68 ± 24.02).

Conclusion: With regard to the results, it is hoped that the quality of Educational Scholarship Festivals improves at medical sciences universities through an improvement of products and modification of the inputs and processes.

Citation: Ghafari R, Hassanzadeh Salmasi S, Golanbar P, Salek Ranjbarzadeh F, Saleh P. Evaluation of the Educational Scholarship Festival over the Past Seven Years from 2008 to 2014 in Iran based on the CIPP Model. *Res Dev Med Educ* 2015;4(2):165-169. doi:10.15171/rdme.2015.029

Introduction

The main objectives of the National Festival Secretariat located in the office for faculty affairs in the Educational Deputy of Ministry of Health and Medical Education are as follows: identification of desirable academic processes; enhancement of current educational Scholarship projects in the universities; innovation; modification of processes, facilities, equipment, and teaching aids; and attention to the conduct of educational Scholarship projects at universities and institutions of higher education in order to appreciate them. Holding this festival leads to the identification and introduction of faculty members,

promotion of desirable academic educational Scholarship projects and participation in the national educational festival. Educational Scholarship projects include all activities of learning done by faculty members to enhance the quality and product of education. Processes in various educational fields, including clinical and basic sciences, training in fields and new methods of evaluation are identified and sent to universities. Introducing the leading educational Scholarship projects without limitations in procedures and that are irrelevant to the current processes is permissible, but individuals cannot introduce more

*Corresponding author: Sousan Hassanzadeh Salmasi, Email: SALMASISH@yahoo.com



© 2015 The Authors. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, as long as the original authors and source are cited. No permission is required from the authors or the publishers.

than two educational Scholarship projects. There is no limitation for institutions producing educational tools and educational aids to introduce their leading processes.^{1,2} Based on the literature review, and considering the costs and opportunities that have been allocated to the educational Scholarship festivals annually, the lack of a comprehensive evaluation in the past seven years, and the importance of an evaluation for improvement, in this study we decided to evaluate the festivals using the CIPP model. The researchers chose this model, which was designed by Stufflebeam at Ohio University in the United States in 1970s; because this evaluation model is one of the most influential systematic models we have.³ The CIPP model is a comprehensive framework used to direct the evaluation of programs, projects, products, institutions and systems.⁴ The main reason for using this evaluation model is its comprehensiveness and further application, because some information can be obtained in terms of desirable objectives of the development plan, desirable operational programs and projects and desirable executive results of the program to help improve academic activities and obtain the university's desired efficiency.^{5,6}

Materials and Methods

This is a cross-sectional study. The data was collected through a questionnaire based on the CIPP evaluation model designed by the National Faculty Member Secretariat. This researcher-made questionnaire has been designed in two parts. The first part includes the information about the participants in the study: respondent post, role in festival, history of attending the festival, and the executor or cooperater of top process and the second part contains questions on four areas of the CIPP model including context, input, process and output. In order to determine the reliability of the questionnaire, the questionnaire draft was given to a number of educational experts and festival practitioners, and all the questions were examined in terms of transparency, simplicity, relevance and importance. The comments were applied and its validity was assessed using Cronbach's alpha ($R = 0.8$).

Purposive sampling was used in this study, so that lists of all process owners, festival scientific committee members, festival officials and practitioners, educational deputies and heads of departments participating at every festival for seven years were prepared. The number of participants enrolled in the census and given questionnaires was 155 and 120 people completed and returned the questionnaires. The researcher used purposive sampling and enrolled process owners in this study to get better benefits from the possibility of recall. It should be noted that, based on the results, the participants in this study were very interested in education and have been involved in educational Scholarship projects and festivals in recent years. Finally, the data obtained were analyzed using descriptive statistics, averages, percentages and analysis of the significant relationships between the results and the participants.

Ethical Consideration

This Study does not deal with any sensitive information

pertaining to human, invasive procedures and informed consent.

Results

The results showed that 7.8% of participants were educational deputies of the involved faculty members, 3.1% were directors of the Medical Education Development Center (over 6 years), 1.6% was educational experts and 87.5% were faculty members, of whom 43.1% were members of refereeing committees in previous festivals. In total, 80% of participants had taken part in more than two festivals and 63.9% had participated in providing processes. In a general overview of the festival evaluation, the results were as follows: context (mean 44.92 ± 29.25), input (mean 47.90 ± 34.12), and product (mean 42.56 ± 27.1) were evaluated as moderate and process (mean 58.36 ± 30.35) was evaluated as good. Overall satisfaction of the participants with the festival was also assessed as good (mean 68.71 ± 24.02).

The results of the survey in different areas are shown in Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 from the viewpoint of the participants. (The scores are between 0 and 100).

Conclusion

The results of the study show some weaknesses in various areas.

In the context area, holding an annual educational Scholarship festival to improve the allocation of resources in education has worked poorly. However, in other cases, such as creating educational motivation, enhancing research in education, promoting relationships among faculty members, creating a spirit of participation to improve education quality and encouraging the participation of faculty members in the production and implementation of educational Scholarship projects and motivation to improve the quality of education at the university, the effectiveness of the festival was moderate. Based on the results, motivation is very important in the above-mentioned categories. Because motivation is something personal, situational, permanent, timeless, variable and complex, it is not possible to issue valid and definite rules and instructions on individual motivation. However, it is desirable to plan for motivation by considering the characteristics of the individuals involved and the educational environment as well as by providing intrinsic rewards such as the enjoyment of teaching, improving the organizational climate, encouraging empowerment, providing job security and promoting responsibility among faculty members through festivals and other similar programs.⁷

In the input area, holding the annual educational Scholarship festival has performed poorly only in providing adequate funding for research in education, but in other cases, including the appropriate educational regulations, workshops, providing adequate funding and resources for the production of processes, developing a systematic evaluation program and using experts, the results were moderate.

Table 1. The frequency distribution of comments of participants – Context

Row	Holding festival in ...	The mean and standard deviation
1	Motivation in faculty members creating educational	54.16 ± 34.80
2	Creating research motivation research in education, among the faculty	54.83 ± 34.72
3	Improving relations among faculty	44.35 ± 39.57
4	Creating a spirit of collaboration among faculty members to improve the quality of education	46.03 ± 35.12
5	Improving the allocating of research resources in education	29.16 ± 34.80
6	Faculty members participation in educational products	49.23 ± 35.89
7	Faculty members participation in the implementation of the educational Scholarship projects	50.00 ± 37.46
8	Administrators acknowledgement from the participation of faculty members	48.41 ± 40.12
9	Centralizing the improvement of the education quality	52.50 ± 36.15
The overall average is moderate.		44.92 ± 29.25

Table 2. The frequency distribution of comments of participants – Input

Row	Holding festival on ...	The mean and standard deviation
1	Proper educational laws	54.31 ± 41.12
2	Holding appropriate workshops	54.02 ± 36.55
3	Providing adequate funding for research in education	33.60 ± 39.49
4	Providing facilities for the production of educational Scholarship projects	44.44 ± 38.21
5	Providing regular and continuous educational evaluation program	44.82 ± 37.09
6	The use of medical education specialist	54.16 ± 40.43
The overall average is moderate		47.90 ± 34.12

Table 3. The frequency distribution of comments of participants – Product

Row	Holding festival on ...	The mean and standard deviation
1	The selection of educational projects	65.83 ± 37.38
2	University support from production of educational projects	55.45 ± 38.09
3	Devolution more to faculty members in Educational design	53.33 ± 33.02
4	Support of university from faculty members the providers of educational scholarship projects	56.77 ± 37.66
5	Informing the faculty on the educational scholarship projects	54.09 ± 42.12
The overall average is moderate		58.36± 30.35

Since the input evaluation is related to judging resources and strategies needed to achieve major and minor goals and information gathered during this stage of evaluation, it should help decision makers to choose the best possible strategies and resources despite the specific limitations.⁸ In addition, considering that participants in this study evaluated the input area as moderate, it seems that a closer look at this area is required in order to identify strengths and weaknesses and provide possible strategies and resources as well as research on these strategies' effectiveness in achieving better and more effective outputs. In the process area, the educational Scholarship festival performed well, and the results of the majority of activities were evaluated as intermediate-high. Since the evaluation procedure involves monitoring the implementation of activities and collecting data on the decision-making during the implementation of activities,⁹ and regarding the fact that the process assessment is, in fact, deciding on the methodology and implementation of the program,¹⁰ using

the results of this study in the process area will help with restructuring plans and methods related to the process for a better and more effective festival in the coming years. In the output area, the festival activities were rated low-moderate on increasing student satisfaction with education quality improvement, increasing educational motivation of the faculty, improving faculty relations, creating an atmosphere for the commercialization of products, creating an atmosphere to attract and direct investments in science production, student satisfaction with the faculty teaching method and increasing the production of educational rules and regulations. But in other cases, this area was rated moderate, including faculty members and student satisfaction with improving the educational quality, increasing motivation, performance, improvement in teacher-student relations, creating spaces for knowledge production, improving current processes, appreciating and supporting processes, increasing educational effectiveness and improving evaluation methods.

Table 4. The frequency distribution of comments of participants – Process

Row	Holding festival led to ...	The mean and standard deviation
1	Increasing faculty members satisfaction from education quality improvement	41.93 ± 35.28
2	Increasing students satisfaction from education quality improvement	36.50 ± 36.15
3	Increasing faculty members educational motivation	38.98 ± 29.46
4	Increasing faculty members educational performance	44.35 ± 34.00
5	Improving relations among faculty members	36.6 ± 35.50
6	Improving faculty members relationship with students,	43.54 ± 37.85
7	Increasing spirit of participation among faculty members to improve the educational quality	50.00 ± 36.51
8	Producing of new training methods	62.50 ± 34.50
9	Creating the right environment of knowledge production for the faculty members	49.16 ± 37.38
10	creating an atmosphere for commercialization of educational products	26.19 ± 34.61
11	Creating an environment for investing on knowledge production	18.33 ± 27.56
12	Innovation, modifying processes, facilities and equipment and educational aids	40.47 ± 38.99
13	Enhancing current educational scholarship projects in university	46.77 ± 33.71
14	Promoting scientific level of faculty members	40.76 ± 36.22
15	Promoting educational level of faculty members	40.83 ± 32.53
16	Increasing students satisfaction with Faculty members teaching methods	38.70 ± 35.55
17	Appreciating and supporting running educational scholarship projects at the university	47.58 ± 38.86
18	enhancing the educational procedure	45.31 ± 34.17
19	Continuous use of leading educational scholarship projects	50.80 ± 37.86
20	Increasing the production of educational rules and principles	32.53 ± 32.57
21	enhancing the educational effectiveness	44.26 ± 31.57
22	Improving evaluation methods	65.47 ± 34.99
The overall average is moderate.		42.56 ± 27.01

Table 5. The frequency distribution of comments of participants – Overall level of satisfaction

Row	Satisfaction with	The mean and standard deviation
1	Holding the previous festivals	71.25 ± 27.16
2	Festival secretariat performance	75.79 ± 27.30
3	Refereeing of scholarship projects and production at the university	68.65 ± 29.77
4	Refereeing of scholarship projects and production in the country	61.29 ± 28.51
5	Festival quantitative progress during the previous years	66.10 ± 28.52
6	Festival qualitative progress over time	66.25 ± 26.68
The overall average is good		68.71 ± 24.02

Managers can use the output evaluation in deciding to continue or modify the program, and it aims to measure, interpret and judge the results obtained from the program. This study showed that the educational Scholarship festival failed to achieve some of the key objectives of the festival such as increasing education quality improvement and educational motivation of the faculty, investments in education and science production and educational rules and regulations. If these goals are accomplished, there can be substantial and long-term developments in the field of medical education. Therefore, it is necessary to study the areas of context, input and process of the festival to achieve the cited objectives.

In addition, the following areas were all rated good: the total average satisfaction with the festival, secretariat performance, refereeing the processes and products domestically and nationally, and festival qualitative and quantitative progress.

Some factors, such as promoting information on new missions of faculty members, departments, schools and universities; lack of competent management in

departments; and lack of attention to intellectual rights of faculty members and their teaching oversight are of great importance in the participation of faculty members in the educational Scholarship festival and new educational Scholarship products and processes. As it turns out, it is necessary for university administration to provide support to strengthen decision-making in departments and schools so that a sense of responsibility and accountability can be fostered. In addition, evaluations to improve the quality of educational activities should be distributed among all, thus creating a common sense of purpose and values among faculty members. University administrators can utilize the festival to create a consulting system so that faculty members are employed for this purpose in different ways either within or outside the university in order to increase the faculty member participation in getting the festival to reach its desired level.¹¹ Attention should be paid to emphasizing the main tasks of educational authorities to create areas to increase vitality in educational settings and enhance positive beliefs related to education improvement for a sense of responsibility and awareness through various

educational workshops in the field of providing educational Scholarship projects. It is hoped that some positive steps can be taken to improve the quality of the festival with the guidance and support of university authorities in the coming years.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no financial or personal conflict of interests.

Acknowledgements

The researchers would like to render their thanks to all university authorities in the past seven years, especially Dr. Abolgasem Amini, Dr. Mahasti Alizadeh, Dr. Manoocher Khoshbaten, Dr. Moosa Mirinejad, Dr. Saeed Aslanabadi, Dr. Hassan Salami, Mr. Alireza Vahedpour, Mr. Mirsaleh Heydarian and all staff in Tabriz Medical Education and Development Center.

References

1. National Regulations of Shahid Motahari Educational Festival, 2013 [Online]. [Cited 2014 Feb 15]. Available from: <http://jsm.tbzmed.ac.ir/Uploads/100/cms/user/File/333/93/aeendaneshghah.pdf>. [In Persian].
2. Shahid Motahari Educational Festival Manuals, from 2008-2014 [Online]. [Cited 2014 Feb 15]. Available from: <http://jsm.tbzmed.ac.ir/?PageID=7>. [In Persian].
3. Eseryel D. Approaches to Evaluation of Training: Theory & Practice. *Educational Technology & Society* 2002;5(2):93-8.
4. Stufflebeam DL. CIPP Evaluation Model Checklist [Online]. 2007. [cited 2007 Mar 17]. Available from: http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/archive_checklists/cippchecklist_mar07.pdf/
5. Singh MD. Evaluation framework for nursing education programs: application of the CIPP model. *Int J Nurs Educ Scholarsh.* 2004;1:Article13.
6. Fathabadi J, Mohammadi Arya A, Kakaie Y, Nozari M. Evaluation of Azad University of Gorgan Based on Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) Approach in Academic Year of 2006-2007. *Journal of Gorgan Bouyeh Faculty of Nursing & Midwifery Faculty* 2012;8(2):58-68. [In Persian].
7. Faizy T, Geramipour M, Shahabi B. Identifying Faculty members Motivation Factors in Tehran Payam-e-noor University. *Journal of Public Administration* 2013;4(12):73-88. [In Persian].
8. Meredith G, Walter B, Joyce G. Quantitative and qualitative research methods in Education and Psychology, Vol. II. translator Nasr AR, et al. Tehran:Shahid Beheshti University, Samt Press;2004.1229. [In Persian].
9. Bazarghan A. Educational Evaluation. Tehran:Samt Press;2004.106. [In Persian].
10. Bolla HS. Educational Proposals and curriculums evaluation for development 1990. Translated by Abili kh. Unknown: International Institute of Adult Education;1996.
11. Sepacy H, Omidian F, Mehralizadeh Y. A Study of Relationship between Organizational Climate and Faculty Members Participation in University Decision Making. *Quarterly Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education* 2005;11(1):1-36. (Persian) [In Persian].