Evaluative Practices Of University Professors Through Students' Estimates

Strerrahmane Naima University of setif 2 (Algeria) n.seterahmen@univ-setif2.dz

Abstract:

The current study aimed to identify the estimates of students at the Department of Psychology, Education Sciences and Speech Therapy at Mohamed Lamine Debaghine, Setif -2-, University to the evaluative practices of their professors. A descriptive analytic method was employed by the researcher to answrer the questions of the study, and a scale was developed including (38) items divided into two axes: the first axis concerned evaluative practices in lecture sessions, while the second one focused on evaluative practices in guided work sessions. After verifying its psychometric properties, the scale was applied to a sample of 230 second-year Master students. The results have indicated a moderate degree of evaluative practices for both lecture and guided work sessions. Additionally, the study has found no significant differences in average responses due to gender or academic profile, but there were differences related to the field of study, favouring students specialising in organisational work and educational psychology.

Keywords: evaluation; evaluative practices; lecture sessions; guided work sessions.

Introduction:

The higher education system worldwide is undergoing profound transformations and changes due to the increase in the number of students, the growth of institutions and university centers, and the diversification of training programs, financial resource shortages, and the economic sector's need for a skilled workforce and highly qualified staff, as well as the need for effective scientific research and the emergence of the principles of accountability and the globalisation of higher education (Van Damme, 2001). Undoubtedly, the principle of accountability entails a rigorous and effective evaluation process that diagnoses the gap between actual achievements and targeted outcomes, which must respond to the requirements and aspirations of both the local and global communities, in an era characterised by the rapid generation of knowledge and tremendous progress in technological tools and media. Thus, evaluation becomes an institutional necessity and becomes the focal point of all activities within the university educational system, including training, scientific research, and community service activities.

Evaluation, therefore, becomes a strategic and primary direction that cannot be dispensed with, as it allows for continuous improvement in quality and contributes to the effectiveness, efficiency, and fairness of higher educational system. It involves all stakeholders, including political authorities, decision-makers, educators, students, parents, socio-economic partners, and civil society as a whole. The new focus to ensure the success of the evaluation policy is on evaluating the evaluation process itself. Evaluation shifts from being a mere routine procedure tied to specific time periods to being the pulsating heart of higher education reform and its leadership, as indicated by the regulatory texts of this sector in Algeria and the necessary measures to establish viable and rigorous evaluation processes and procedures. This should begin with laying the foundations for a culture of evaluation among all educational stakeholders, providing training in evaluation, and contemplating principles and procedural mechanisms for evaluation that take into account the characteristics of the local and global context.

Improving the outcomes of higher education is undoubtedly linked to the evaluative practices of professors, which are clearly manifested in their diagnostic evaluation practices. Through this, they seek to identify the prior knowledge that prepares for the construction of new resources or learning, followed by formative evaluation accompanying the construction process. Evaluation today has become integrated into the teaching process to address learners' difficulties promptly and appropriately. Additionally, there are summative evaluation practices, which assess the extent of mastery of the competencies specified in programs or university courses. This study aims to explore these practices in the Algerian university context and the context of implementing the LMD system.

Problem study:

Since 2004, the Algerian university has adopted the LMD system in response to global and local changes. This system aims to equip students with socio-professional competencies, facilitating their integration into the workforce. The pedagogical approaches employed by university professors are essential in building and acquiring these competencies. These approaches should align with the competency-based teaching approach, which is widely adopted by higher education systems, including Algeria. This approach entails identifying and declaring the competencies that students will acquire by the end of a training program or academic path.

Therefore, pedagogical practices worldwide are shifting towards competency-based teaching approaches, distinct from content-based and objective-based approaches in their principles, processes, teaching practices, and especially their assessment practices, which will differ from previous practices. In content-based teaching approaches, assessment focuses on a sample of content representing the referential world of the taught content. In objective-based approaches, assessment targets a sample representing specific objectives and procedures, extracting a set of questions that reflect these objectives. However, in competency-based approaches, assessment focuses on proposing

complex problem situations belonging to the realm of targeted competency situations, requiring learners to mobilise a range of resources to solve them (DE Ketele, Gerard, 2005).

The researcher Bourguignon (2005) confirms the concept of assessment by delineating the shift that university professors will undergo from adopting a knowledge-based assessment towards adopting a competency-based assessment. In the former scenario, assessment focuses on monitoring the targeted knowledge of students as outlined in curricula or course materials, employing quantitative tools such as grades. Conversely, in the latter scenario of competency-based assessment, evaluation is directed towards assessing competencies, which encompass a range of knowledge, skills, abilities, and preparedness enabling students to use qualitative methodologies and standard-based indicators to achieve desired outcomes in real or simulated situations. Consequently, assessment here falls within a framework referencing the practical performance of actions grounded in pragmatic elements, facilitating adjustments to learning and control over targeted practical competencies (Kandeel, 2014).

Student competency assessment holds a significant place within the overall assessment procedures at the university level, particularly with the adoption of new reforms and curricular engineering, such as the integration of a competency-based teaching approach. The aim is to combat academic failure by emphasising the activation of diagnostic and formative assessment to assist students in constructing their learning and competencies, thereby determining their progress and guiding them towards subsequent learning, providing constructive feedback to allow students to correct their deficiencies, diversifying assessment formats (internships, personal projects, oral examinations, written examinations, portfolios, guided projects, applied works, etc.), adopting new assessment practices by faculty and administration to evaluate the effectiveness of the university system as a whole (Kaaouachi, 2001).

The aim of assessment is not limited to evaluating the learner alone, but rather to develop and enhance didactic practices of the instructor in accordance with the adopted assessment paradigm in the first place, then to renew assessment tools, and in the second place, to improve the quality of teaching. This is achieved through the instructor's practice of the diagnostic assessment process, whereby the instructor determines the threshold of success for their students by diagnosing the pre-existing fundamental or necessary competencies for building new learning. Subsequently, the instructor engages in the formative assessment process, accompanying the constructive process step by step through clarification, explanation, questioning, and providing feedback that helps the student correct their learning trajectory or resources. Finally, the instructor practises the summative assessment process to issue a judgment regarding the acquisition or lack thereof of the targeted competencies.

It is noteworthy that the summative assessment conducted by professors in Algerian universities generally takes the form of knowledge monitoring rather than evaluating the

targeted competencies, which necessitates their assessment through the construction of problem-solving situations linked to the student's socio-life context, requiring the mobilisation and utilisation of appropriate or relevant resources to reach a solution rather than mere recall and retrieval.

It is noteworthy that university students complain about the evaluative practices of their professors, as they perceive them to be far from objective. For instance, in directed work sessions, there are no specific criteria outlined by the professor at the beginning of the semester or the course, and even with the presence of such criteria, their evaluation is subject to the professor's interpretation and decision. Moreover, these practices do not afford students the freedom to choose a work strategy that suits them, especially with the prevalence of the research project strategy in the College of Social Sciences. Although some students do not favour this approach because it requires more than one student's involvement, the research can be completed by one or two students only. Furthermore, professors do not employ diagnostic and formative assessment procedures during lectures, practical sessions, or directed sessions, which facilitate students' construction of targeted learning outcomes.

Not to mention the widespread phenomenon of cheating in the academic environment, especially in lecture sessions and evaluation processes conducted at the end of the semester, with the availability and proliferation of technological tools such as mobile phones and Bluetooth. This necessitates vigilance on the part of the professor when formulating and preparing questions to ensure they align with the overall objective of the assessment and require students to enlist and mobilise their knowledge rather than mere recalling it. This is supported by a study conducted by Sahad Sabah and Wasila Ben Amer (2013), which found weak proportions for the criteria of writing good test instructions and preparing test items. Similarly, Mourad Maarouf's (2016) study showed that the majority of professors use traditional tools such as various types of tests to assess their students, indicating their distance from the evaluative practices required by the adopted approach. Additionally, Khanish and Tabbah's (2021) investigation demonstrated that the degree of professors' possession of cognitive competencies for test preparation is moderate. Furthermore, a study held by Adou Aka (2014) revealed that university students exhibit significant dissatisfaction towards the evaluations conducted by their professors, which are perceived as lacking objectivity and fairness. Students also perceive their professors as authoritarian and not invested in their success.

Hence, this study aims to investigate the evaluative practices of university professors, focusing on both lecture sessions and directed work sessions, and seeks to address its inquiries within the framework of gender, demeanor, and academic specialisation variables.

Questions study:

1-To what extent do students of Master 02 in the Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences and Speech therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif – 2-, University estimate the evaluative practices of their professors?

Subsidiary Questions: (Probe Questions)

1-1- To what extent do students of Master 02 in the Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences and Speech therapy Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif – 2-, University estimate the evaluative practices of their professors in lectures?

1-2- To what extent do students of Master 02 in the Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif – 2-, University estimate the evaluative practices of their professors in guided work sessions?

2-Are there statistically significant differences at a significance level of (0.05) in the degree of estimates of second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology, Educational Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, -Setif 2 -, University for the evaluative practices of their professors attributed to the variables of gender, academic profile, and specialisation?

2-1- Are there statistically significant differences at a significance level of (0.05) in the degree of estimates of second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology, Educational Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2 , University for the evaluative practices of their professors attributed to the variable of gender ?

2-2- Are there statistically significant differences at a significance level of (0.05) in the degree of estimates of second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology, Educational Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2, University for the evaluative practices of their professors attributed to the variable of academic profile?

2-3- Are there statistically significant differences at a significance level of (0.05) in the degree of estimates of second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology, Educational Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2, University for the evaluative practices of their professors attributed to the variable of specialisation?

Aims of the Study :

This study aims to identify the assessment scores of second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology, Education Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Mohamed Lemine Dabbaghine, Setif 2, University regarding their professors' evaluative practices in two areas: lectures and guided work sessions. It also aims to determine whether there are

differences in the assessment scores attributed to particular variables: gender, academic profile and specialisation.

Significance of the Study:

The importance of this study lies in its focus on the topic of assessment, which constitutes the cornerstone of the success of the educational process in Algerian universities, especially in light of adopting a competency-based teaching approach as a pedagogical approach that facilitates the acquisition of targeted academic or professional competencies. This approach requires effective evaluative practices by the professor, both in guided practical sessions and in implementing teaching strategies that promote student independence, particularly when conducting cumulative or final evaluations that determine the targeted student competencies. Also the significance of this study lies in its findings, which, regardless of their nature, will contribute to the development of teaching practices, including assessment practices, thereby fostering the professional growth of Algerian university professors.

Study Terminology:

-A degree of estimates: It represents the culmination of the response of the study sample, namely second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology, Education Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Mohamed Lamine Dabbaghine, Setif 2, University on the scale items. It is graded on a three-point scale: high (3 points), moderate (2 points), and low (1 point).

-Evaluative Practices: These are the actions and procedures carried out by professors in the Department of Psychology, Education Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Setif 2 University, which accompany the teaching process and aim to improve university outcomes, i.e., the acquisition of targeted competencies.

-Evaluative Practices in Lecture Sessions: These encompass the total actions and procedures undertaken by the professor to impart targeted competencies to students, from activating diagnostic assessment to formative assessment, culminating in final evaluation. These are measured by items in the first axis of the study tool.

Evaluative Practices in Guided work Sessions: These encompass the total actions and procedures undertaken by the professor to enhance and support lecture outcomes through diversifying teaching and assessment strategies. These are measured by items in the second axis of the study tool.

Previous Studies:

 Sulaiman's study (2010), entitled "Faculty Members' Practices in Evaluating Their Students' Achievement in Light of Some Variables," aimed to identify faculty members' practices in evaluating their students. The researcher employed a descriptive method, and

the study tool consisted of a questionnaire comprising of 52 items covering five axes: curriculum plan evaluation axis, teachers' assessment methods axis, teachers' practices in evaluating research and reports, and teachers' practices in student evaluation. It was applied to a random sample of 517 students. The study's results revealed statistically significant differences in practices attributed to specialisation (scientific streams, literary streams) and differences in professors' assessment practices attributed to academic level (first year, second year, third and fourth years).

Saad Sabah and Waseela Ben Amer's study (2013), entitled "Assessment of the Adequacy of Constructing Achievement Tests by University Education Professors According to Good Test Standards at Mohamed Khider University, Biskra," aimed to assess the availability of good achievement test standards in the tests prepared by university professors in terms of test instructions and content. The study adopted a descriptive approach and selected a random sample consisting of (36) achievement tests for the academic year 2013, which were then applied to the study tool represented by the standard of preparing good achievement tests. The study's results indicated that the standards for writing test instructions and preparing test items were weak.

Qanoua Abdel Latif's study (2015), entitled "University Students' Responses to Achievement Tests: A Field Study at Ouargla University," aimed to determine the availability of achievement tests applied according to good test specifications from the students' perspective and their susceptibility to specific variables: gender, specialisation, academic system, and academic level. The descriptive method was used, and a questionnaire was applied to a sample of (320) male and female students at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Ouargla University. The study's results showed that students' responses to achievement tests were moderate, and there were no differences in the mean responses of students to achievement tests attributed to gender, specialisation, academic system, and academic level from their perspective.

Morad Marouf's study (2016), entitled "Evaluation Practices in the Context of Competency-Based Approach and its Constraints," aimed to uncover the reality of evaluation practices of general and technological secondary education teachers within the framework of the educational reform and adoption of the competency-based teaching approach. The researcher used a descriptive method and interview technique on a sample of 20 teachers of mathematics and Arabic language subjects. The study's results revealed that the majority of teachers used traditional tools such as tests in their assessment of students, indicating a deviation from the evaluation practices required by the adopted approach.

Amani Abdel Rahman Mekawi's study (2019), entitled "The Quality of Achievement Tests in Higher Education in Light of Comprehensive Quality Standards at the Faculty of Education, Al-Shaqraa University," aimed to determine the diversity of test items and the extent of teachers' commitment to quality standards. The descriptive method was

employed in this study, and a questionnaire was administered to a sample of 46 teachers. As for the study's findings, it revealed that teachers vary in test items and are knowledgeable about the criteria for good testing. Moreover, they adhere to these criteria to a high degree.

Youssef Khennich and Farouk Tabaa's study (2021), entitled "The Extent of University Professors' Possession of Cognitive Competencies for Preparing Achievement Tests," aimed to uncover the opinions of Education Sciences students at the University of Setif-2 regarding the extent of university professors' possession of cognitive competencies in preparing achievement tests. The descriptive method was utilised, and a questionnaire containing 27 items covering four dimensions: formulation of items, test administration, test application, and test correction, was administered to a sample of 62 second-year undergraduate students. The study's results indicated that the degree of professors' possession of cognitive competencies for test preparation was moderate.

Fatima Latifa Mardassi's 2022 study,entitled "Educational Assessment Practices in Higher Education Institutions," aimed to determine whether the assessment practices of Algerian university professors align with and approach competency-based teaching, specifically in terms of using integrative problem-situation approaches and project-based assessment, as well as whether the assessment encompasses all aspects of the student's personality. A descriptive methodology was employed, and a questionnaire was administered to a sample of 40 professors. The results indicated that the assessment practices of professors are significantly detached from the competency-based teaching approach, remaining traditional and focused on recall and memorisation of presented knowledge.

Commentary on Previous Studies:
An examination of the previous studies reveals that all of them addressed the topic of assessment practices within higher education institutions, with the exception of the study by Murad Ma'arouf (2016), which focused on this topic at the secondary education level. This study aligned with the previous studies in terms of the methodology employed, which was descriptive, and also concurred with most studies regarding the data collection tool, namely the questionnaire. However, Murad Ma'arouf (2016) utilised interviews instead, as did the study by Sa'id Sabah and Waseela Ben Amer (2013), which also used the criterion of a well-constructed test and compared it with 36 achievement tests developed by faculty members.

Regarding the sample of the study, it was consistent with the studies conducted by Suleiman (2010), Qanoua Abdel Latif (2015), and Khneish Youssef and Tabbat Farouk (2021) in selecting the research sample. In contrast, it differed from the studies held by Murad Ma'arouf (2016), Amani Abdel Rahman Mekkawi (2019), and Mardassi Fatima Latifa (2022), which selected a sample of faculty members. This study benefited from the previous studies in choosing an appropriate methodology that serves its objectives, as

well as in selecting and constructing the study tool and sample. This approach contributes significantly to the evaluation of university teaching from a didactic and assessment perspective.

The Theoretical Framework of the Current Study:

Assessment has held a significant place in all methodologies, but its role and function have evolved thanks to didactics, which has focused on exploring the relationship between the learner and knowledge, as well as the situations designed by the teacher to guide the learner in constructing the targeted knowledge. Initially, the concept of assessment was concentrated on the learner and teacher, particularly in the earlier educational stages (primary, middle, and secondary levels). However, it has now extended to include higher education, with calls for evaluating university teaching to assess its quality and effectiveness.

There are two objectives for assessing university teaching: the formative objective, which aims to improve both student development and faculty teaching practices, and the administrative objective, which seeks to recognise and enhance the quality of teaching. H. Bernard proposes three methods for assessing university teaching: the first method involves analysing the strengths and weaknesses of teaching based on survey results collected from students after lectures; the second method includes evaluating the teaching tools used by the program committee; and the third method focuses on improving the curriculum by utilising teaching assessment results during review periods or in program design.

Several approaches coexist in the field of teaching quality assessment. On one hand, there are normative approaches that establish specific standards to be met and measure alignment with these standards. On the other hand, there are constructive approaches that use assessment for development and improvement purposes, employing methods to document teaching quality, analyse strengths and weaknesses, and make necessary adjustments. Their function is to provide feedback to professors, enabling them to refine their teaching practices (Colet, p. 86). Teaching quality assessment topics vary across different levels, with each level serving distinct functions. Firstly, there is the assessment of teaching or lectures, which aims to measure teaching quality by surveying students' opinions and assessing their satisfaction with the educational experience.

Secondly, program assessment focuses on measuring the coherence and relevance of the educational program. This assessment can address the consistency of the pedagogical structure, how well the program meets the training needs identified by various stakeholders, or the effectiveness and efficiency of the program in relation to observed outcomes. Thirdly, assessment of training programs aims to measure the impact of the training on professional development or the application of acquired competencies in the workplace. Finally, pedagogical project assessment examines innovative projects and determines the added value of these innovations.

Studies (for example Bernard, Postiaux, & Celcin YEAR IS MISSING) indicate that student evaluations of teaching can contribute to the professional growth of instructors. This is true if such evaluations are considered a pathway to enhancing teaching practices and, consequently, the development of professional competencies. This process must be based on four fundamental principles: reliability, confidentiality, adaptability, and reflective thinking.

The concept of student evaluations of teaching emerged in Anglo-Saxon countries several years ago. However, it did not gain widespread acceptance for several reasons. First, teaching and higher education were traditionally viewed as personal, professional acts, with Shulman YEAR AND PAGE MISSING describing it as 'solitude pédagogique' where university professors discuss research and administrative issues but avoid discussing their teaching practices, including assessment methods. Second, some professors believe that students are unqualified to evaluate their teaching practices due to a lack of teaching experience or insufficient knowledge of the subject matter (Dejean, 2006). Third, university professors often believe in their academic freedom and thus feel unaccountable. Lastly, there is the consideration that teaching is seen as an art rather than a science, making it difficult for students to assess this art form (Berthiaume et al., 2011).

Improving teaching quality thus involves implementing a system of student evaluations that allows instructors to better understand their practices and assess the impact of their teaching processes on student learning. This system aims to enable instructors to use student feedback to enhance the quality of their pedagogical activities. Student evaluations of teaching then become a process of inquiry led by the instructors themselves, focused on achieving pedagogical effectiveness, both internal (i.e., possessing the the targeted competencies) and external (i.e., transferring these competencies to the workplace to improve organisational performance).

Evaluation has become central to the professional practices of university professors under the LMD system, which has been implemented in higher education reform in Algeria since 2004. The objective of this system is to equip university students with a range of competencies (cognitive, affective, communicative, methodological) that will support their future professional and social integration. This requires instructors to monitor the development of these competencies by tracking the construction of resources or learning outcomes and activating formative or developmental assessment processes in the first hand, followed by the activation of summative assessment procedures. Decisions are then made to confirm that students have achieved the targeted competencies, both during the undergraduate and Master phases of their education.

The four references from the 2015-2016 academic year emphasise the importance and centrality of assessment in shaping the profile of Algerian university students. The first reference is the professional reference, which outlines the current and emerging professions for which university programs are designed. The second reference is the disciplinary competencies, which encompass the fundamental cognitive resources required for each profession. The third reference is the transversal competencies, which

include the methodological resources common across all academic disciplines and serve students in both social and professional contexts. Finally, the training reference which specifies the content or resources that will shape the student profile in relation to each profession.

Evaluation has become central to the professional practices of university professors under the LMD system, as the aim of this system is to equip university students with a set of professional competencies that will contribute to their future professional and social integration. This necessitates the continuous monitoring and development of these competencies by professors through tracking the construction of resources or cognitive learning, activating formative evaluation processes initially, followed by activating the summative evaluation process and making informed decisions that confirm the university student's mastery of the targeted profile, whether during the undergraduate or Master degree program.

Field Study: Given that the aim of this study was to determine thedegree of estimates of second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology, Education Sciences, and Speech Therapy for their professors' evaluative practices in the lecture and practicum fields, the researcher deemed the descriptive method with its analytical approach to be most suitable. This approach allows for the collection of data from the field using the study tool, followed by processing, presentation, discussion and interpretation in the light of educational heritage and previous studies.

Study Boundaries: -

-Geographical Boundaries: The field study was conducted at the the Department of Psychology, Education Sciences, Speech Therapy, at the Faculty of Social Sciences, at Mohamed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2, University.

-Temporal Boundaries: The field study was conducted in January 2023.

-Human Boundaries: The study tool was applied to second-year Master students at the Department of Psychology: linguistic and clinic psychology, organisation and work, education psychology, education systems, counselling and orientation.

Study Population: The statistical population for this study comprised of all students of Master 2 at the Department of Psychology at Mohamed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2, University. The total number was 462 including male and female students.

Study Sample: As for the study sample, it was taken using a stratified random sampling method, where 50% of each specialisation was taken, constituting a sample size of 230 students. The following table illustrates the sample size of the study:

Table (01): Demonstrates the size of the study Sample

specialisation	Number of students	50%
clinic	138	69
linguistic	134	67
Organisation and Work	38	19
pedagogy	73	36
Systems	24	12
Orientation&counselling	55	27
Total	462	230

Description of the Study Sample Characteristics: The researcher deemed it necessary to examine the degree of estimates of evaluative practices among students at the Department of Psychology at Mohamed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2, University based on three variables: gender, academic profile and speciality, as illustrated in the following table.

Table (02) : illustrates the distribution of study sample individuals according to the three variables.

variables	rang	N	100%
gender	male	21	9.13
	femele	209	90.86
	total	230	100%
Academic profile	scientific	62	26.95
	literary	168	73.04
	total	230	100%
specialisation	linguistic	67	29.13
	clinic	69	30
	Organisation&work	19	8.26
	pedagogy	36	15.65
	systems	12	5.21
	Counselling&orientation	27	11.73
	total	230	100%
total		230	100%

Table (02) elucidates the distribution of the study sample consisting of (230) individuals across three variables. The gender variable reveals that females constituted the highest percentage (90.86%), whereas males were only (9.13%). Concerning the variable of academic profile, the largest percentage (73.04%) was allocated to the litteraire (literary) profile and the percentage of (26.95%) was allocated to the scientific profile. Regarding the variable of speciality, table (02) indicates that the highest percentage of (30%) is

represented by clinic psychology, followed by the percentage of (29.13%) for linguistic psychology, followed by the percentage of (15.65%) for education psychology, followed by the percentage of (11.73%) for counselling and orientation, and a percentage of (8.26) for organisation and work, and finally the percentage of (5.21%) for systems education.

Study Instrument:

The researcher employed a scale as the tool for data collection and observation from the field, following a review of the educational heritage and relevant previous studies on the subject. Two domains were identified for the scale. The first domain focused on the evaluative practices in lecture sessions, including (19) items. Further, the second domain focused on the evaluative practices in guided work sessions including also (19) items. Consequently, the final scale was commprised of a total of (38) items.

Psychometric Characteristics of the Study Tool:

Validity indicators of the study tool : To ensure that the study instrument measures what it is intented to measure, i.e., the researcher used construct validity. This is based on calculating the degree of correlation between the axes and the study instrument. The subsequent table illustrates the Pearson correlation coefficients.

Table (03): illustrates Pearson correlation coefficients

Correlation axis one with tool	0.92	Correlation axis two with tool	0.88

As we can see from the above table, there are strong positive relationships between each axis and the research tool indicating high convergent validity, hence the items or assessment tools are good at measuring what they aim to measure.

Reliability Indicators of the Study Tool: Reliability of the study instrument was assessed using the Coefficient Alpha, which indicates the internal consistency of the tool or the homogeneity among the elements of the tool items. This assessment was conducted using the SPSS version 20 software. After statistical processing of the data using this program, we obtained the coefficient alpha for internal consistency as illustrated in the following table:

Table (04): illustrates the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of study tool

Axes	Items	Alpha Cronbach
Axis 01	19	0.70
Axis 02	19	0.72
Instrument	38	0.81

Table (04) illustrates the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient for the two dimensions, namely (0.70, 0.72) consecutively, and for the entire instrument (0.81). These coefficients are deemed acceptable and high, indicating a satisfactory level of internal consistency reliability for the measurement tool.

The validity measurement employed in the study:
To determine the criterion adopted in the study, the length of the cells on the Likert Three-Point Scale was defined by calculating the range between the questionnaire scores (3-1=2). Subsequently, this range was divided by the maximum value in the tool to obtain the cell length (2/3=0.66). Afterward, this value was added to the minimum value in the tool to determine the upper limit of this cell. The cell length became as illustrated in the following table, demonstrating the degree of evaluative practices by professors.

Table (05): The validity measurement employed in the study

Scale value	Average (cell length)
Low practice	1 to 1.66
Medium practice	1.67 to 2.33
High practice	2.34 to 3

To answer the study questions, the arithmetic means and standards deviations of the students' responses to the scale items were calculated. The results of the first question, which is as follows:

1- To what extent do students of Master 02 in the Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2, University estimate the evaluative practices of their professors?

Answer of question 1-1-
- To what degree do students of Master 02 in the Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2, University estimate the evaluative practices of their professors in lectures?

Table (06): illustrates descriptive statistics for the first axis

Number of item	items	mean	deviation	Degree of practice
	The lecturer works to:			
01	Read the target competence of the teaching the module carefully.	2.20	0.609	medium

02	Set the necessary pre-requisite knowledge of the module.	2.24	0.691	medium
03	Start each lecture with a diagnostic test to gauge the pre-requisite knowledge related to building new knowledge.	1 .74	0.776	medium
04	Display the learning objectives (the specific objective and the operational objectives) at the of each lecture.	1.95	0.772	medium
05	Activate the formative evaluation to pursue the learners' development.	1.77	0.734	medium
06	Ask questions during the lecture to assess the objectives.	2.22	0.660	medium
07	Use lecturing and dictation in presenting the lecture.	2.43	0.725	higher
08	Evaluate the cognitive abilities and not the resources through the evaluation situations given.	2.01	0.693	medium
09	Diversify the teaching strategies that fit the objectives of the module.	1.89	0.725	medium
10	Diversify the teaching strategies that fit the objectives of the module. Diversify the final exam's questions by the end of the semester (questions of memorisation, understanding, analysis and evaluation)	2.23	0.734	medium
11	Make sure of the module's objectives achievement through summative assessment.	2.05	0.761	medium
12	Lure students meanwhile building their knowledge to discover their own gaps and errors.	1.93	0.754	medium
13	Give extra/ additional tasks to confirm the knowledge being acquired.	1.70	0.765	medium
14	Execute collective oral quizzes to define the strengths and weaknesses of the learners' learning.	1.78	0.757	medium
15	Build a situation of ingtegration (problem-situation) to assess the target objective of the module.	1.77	0.695	medium

16	Mix different assessing styles/ techniques when evaluating learners (quizzes, exams, projects).	2.05	0.746	medium
17	Set rating criteria that will be used in the summative assessment.	1.82	0.705	medium
18	Give immediate feedback to learners.	1.83	0.729	medium
19	Design evaluative problem-situations similar to the future job's situations.	1.85	0.729	medium
Axis's weighted mean		1.97		medium

Table (06) elucidates that the evaluative practices in the field of lecturing for professors in the Department of Psychology, Educational Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Setif 2 University, from the students' perspective, were moderately rated. The weighted mean for the first axis as a whole was (1.97). All evaluative practices were rated moderately, with a total of 18 items ranging in arithmetic means between (1.70-2.43) and standard deviations between (0.609-0.772), except for one practice which was rated significantly higher, with an arithmetic mean value of (2.43) and a standard deviation of (0.725). This practice pertained to the use of the lecture and dictation method in presenting or delivering the lecture.

These results can be interpreted as indicating that university professors still adhere to classical practices associated with a content-centered approach, diverging from the context post the 2004 reform of the university system and the adoption of the LMD system, which advocated for the implementation and activation of the competency-based teaching approach as a pedagogical approach aimed at equipping students with a set of professional competencies preparing them for practical fieldwork or integration into the job market in the future. In fact, building these competencies requires the activation of active pedagogies that make the student the main actor in constructing their learning and developing their competencies.

The role of the professor or their task would be limited to designing problem-based or didactic situations, the resolution of which would guide the student towards building the targeted resources. However, the results of this study revealed that the lecture method was the item that received a significantly higher rating, and the item addressing the diversification of teaching strategies was rated moderately. Therefore, the university professors' practices, from the students' perspective, still do not meet the standards of teaching and evaluative practices that effectively implement the competency-based teaching approach. This indicates a deviation by university professors from implementing the situational approach, or the approach of building resources and competencies. The adopted approach is theoretically grounded in cognitive theories such as Piaget's constructivism, Vygotsky's socio-constructivism, and Bruner's discovery learning theory. These theories emphasise activating the learner's role, namely the student, in constructing resources through problem-based situations designed by the professor.

These situations necessitate the application of various active strategies during lectures, such as problem-solving pedagogy, brainstorming, cooperative learning, and error pedagogy.

Furthermore, the implementation of diagnostic assessment was moderately practised despite its significance, as it involves recalling prior knowledge to aid in constructing new learning. The same applies to formative assessment and the importance of timely feedback, which guides students in effectively building their knowledge. The practice of designing integrative problem-based situations, similar to the professional problems students will face in the workplace. This also emerged at a moderate level, despite the fact that these situations are designed to reveal the targeted competencies and the associated development of scoring rubrics that include criteria for the assessment process. This was highlighted by Marad (Morad) Ma'arouf's (2016) study, which indicated that the majority of secondary school teachers still employ traditional testing methods and are distant from competency-based assessment practices. Additionally, the study held by Waseela Ben Amer and Sabah Said (2013) revealed that the standards for writing effective test instructions and preparing test items were implemented at low percentages. Such practices are expected to be highly effective to align with the adopted pedagogical approach. Moreover, the results of the study conducted by Khneish and Taba (2021) showed that university professors' possession of the cognitive competencies required for test preparation was moderate. Thus, from the perspective of second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology, Education Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Mohamed Lamine Debaghine, Sétif 2, professors' practices still fall short of effective teaching and assessment practices that implement competency-based approaches. This necessitates finding suitable methods for training university professors in new assessment practices related to modern pedagogical approaches that activate concepts such as authentic assessment, the situational approach, and scoring rubrics, among others.

Answer of question 1-2-

- To what extent do students of Master 02 in the Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2, University estimate the evaluative practices of their professors in guided work sessions?

Table (07): illustrates descriptive statistics for the second axis

Number of item	items		Mean	deviation	Degree of practice
	The tutor works to :				
01	Set the tutorials' strategies (projects or reading cards or doing activities).		2.54	0.631	higher

02	Give different evatuation tasks to allow learners show their competences).	2.08	0.629	medium
03	Set the topics of the projects.	2.35	0.682	higher
04	Let the learners free to select the topics of their projects.	2.12	0.741	medium
05	Set the methodological steps of presenting the projects.	2.10	0.761	medium
06	Set the group members in projects.	2.38	0.749	higher
07	Set the evaluation criteria of the projects.	2.29	0.721	medium
08	Evaluate the learners via the explanations they gave in their presentations only.	2.25	0.722	medium
09	Evaluate learners when presenting their works only.	1.97	0.738	medium
10	Present formative continuous feedback that is effective and functional to build the module's resources.	1.91	0.700	medium
11	Give activities and their keys.	1.78	0.751	medium
12	Allow learners to assess their peers'works (peer-assessment).	1.80	0.777	medium
13	Give field projects to develop their scientific research skills.	2.15	0.781	medium
14	Evaluate the project from the methodological perspective only.	1.67	0.630	medium
15	Specify an attendance score out of the final score of the tutorials.	2.15	0.698	medium
16	Motivate learners for self-assessment through diversifying the evaluation tools.	2.12	0.656	medium
17	Set the evaluative tasks in a clear and achievable manner to all learners.	2.15	0.702	
18	Specify a score for the participation and interaction throughout the session.	2.20	0.746	medium
19	Follow carefully the learners' presentation to supply/ help them with good remarks preventing them in the future fro	2.43	0.926	Higher
Axis's weighted mean		2.13		Medium
Instrument weighted mean		2.05		medium

Through Table (07), it appears that the evaluative practices of professors in the Department of Psychology, Educational Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Setif 2 University regarding guided work sessions were moderately rated, with the overall mean for the axis being (2.05). The degree of practice was distributed among moderate (15 items), with arithmetic means ranging between (1.67- 2.43) and standards deviations between (0.629- 0.781).

The following four items were rated as exhibiting a high degree of practice, with their means ranging between (2.35- 2.54) and standards deviations between (0.682- 0.92). Specifically, the practice related to determining research project topics had a mean of (2.35) and a standard deviation of (0.682). This indicates that university professors are not effectively achieving the goal of reforms, which is to foster student autonomy in making certain pedagogical decisions, such as selecting their research projects. Consequently, this undermines the development of initiative and motivation in students, leading to a notable deficiency in these attributes. Additionally, the practice of determining research group members had a mean of (2.38) and a standard deviation of (0.749). This suggests that professors still exert significant authority over students in choosing their project partners, focusing more on dividing the group into a set number of individuals rather than considering the coherence of group members or achieving the project's cognitive, social, and emotional objectives. Such factors are crucial for the student's personal development and preparation for their future professional life.

We also engage in rigorous monitoring of submitted research to provide students with constructive feedback that helps them avoid future errors. The average score for this practice is (2.43) with a standard deviation of (0.926). This indicates that university professors are applying formative or developmental assessment methods, which assist students in building their resources and learning effectively by identifying gaps and errors, or in pedagogical terms, unacquired knowledge. They guide students on how to address and acquire these gaps, transforming them into transversal resources necessary for other courses, both currently and in the future. Finally, the practice of defining directed work strategies (such as completing research projects, reading assignments, or applications) has an average score of (2.54) with a standard deviation of (0.631). This suggests that university professors establish the modalities for conducting directed work sessions. These may include theoretical presentations, reading assignments relevant to the course content, or practical applications if the course resources are related to such tasks, as seen in courses like statistics, measurement, methodology, and situation assessment, among others.

Regarding the items that received a moderate rating, which numbered 15, these items were expected to receive a higher rating in order to align with the reform objectives and achieve the targeted outcomes of university education. For instance, allowing students the freedom to choose research topics is crucial for training and guiding them towards independence, which is essential for their future decision-making in both professional

and social spheres. Additionally, there was an item related to defining methodological steps for presenting research projects. These steps serve as comprehensive resources for all criteria and contribute to developing students' organizational skills, preparing them for both their professional and social lives. Another item addressed the criterion for evaluating research projects. This practice, which received a moderate rating, should have been rated higher. This indicates that university professors are not fully implementing the principles of equality and fairness (l'équité) among students, nor the principle of objective evaluation through standardised and unified criteria. Furthermore, it highlights a need for addressing students' deficiencies by identifying unachieved criteria, avoiding the use of a single evaluation standard, such as awarding points solely based on presentation style or merely restating and explaining provided knowledge without analysing it or drawing appropriate conclusions.

Additionally, there is an item concerning the provision and resolution of exercises. It has been observed that, in the methodology course, some professors rely on theoretical presentations before defining the problem and hypotheses. However, this course requires practical applications where students should formulate problems and hypotheses rather than merely defining them. This issue explains the weakness observed in Master students' ability to formulate the problem statement for their final research projects, as well as the difficulties faced by supervising professors, which are often linked to the lack of field research required for students, involving well-established methodological steps within the research context. Furthermore, there are two items related to training students and encouraging them to engage in self-assessment and peer assessment. These methods are effective for developing the competencies targeted by university education and should not rely solely on the professor's evaluation. This is contingent upon establishing and defining criteria for the evaluation process to ensure it is objective, purposeful, and effective. Additionally, there is an item concerning the establishment of criteria for assessing participation and interaction during guided work sessions. This ensures that each student recognises their role in building and acquiring resources from the work of their peers.

Table (08): Test of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistique	ddl	Signification	Statistique	ddl	Signification
test	,056	223	,088	,995	223	,668

a. Correction de signification de Lilliefors

Since the calculated significance level of (0.088) is greater than the accepted significance level of (0.05), the data in the study are normally distributed. Therefore, the data will be analyzed using parametric statistical methods.

Answer of Question 2:

- Are there statistically significant differences at a significance level of (0.05) in the degree of estimates of second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology, Educational Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2, University for the evaluative practices of their professors attributed to the variables of gender, academic profile, and specialisation?

Answer of question - 2-1-

- Are there statistically significant differences at a significance level of (0.05) in the degree of estimates of second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology, Educational Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2, University for the evaluative practices of their professors attributed to the variable of gender?

Table (09): illustrates the significance of differences between the mean scores of assessment practices according to the gender variable

Variable	Male (N = 21)		Female (N = 209)		t	df	p-value
	M	**SD**	**M**	**SD**			
Evaluative practices	78.48	13.61	77.90	10.89	0.226	228	0.822

It is evident from Table (08) that the value (T = 0.226) is not significant at a degree of freedom of (228), with the p-value being (P = 0.822), which is greater than the accepted threshold. This indicates that there are no differences in the evaluation practices of second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Sétif 2, University related to the variable of gender. This result is explained by the fact that evaluation practices are consistent across both lecture sessions and directed work sessions, suggesting that there is no variation or development in these practices among university professors. This is despite the fact that assessment strategies, tools, and methods have evolved significantly with advancements in educational theories, particularly learning theories. The findings of this study align with those of Qanoon Abdellatif (2015), which showed no differences in student responses regarding achievement tests attributed to gender. However, they differ from those of Nadia Saleh Oweida (2011), which indicated differences related to gender, favouring females regarding the assessment methods used by faculty members.

Answer of question - 2-2-

-Are there statistically significant differences at a significance level of (0.05) in the degree of estimates of second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology,

Educational Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2, University for the evaluative practices of their professors attributed to the variable of academic profile?

Table (10) : illustrates the significance of differences between the mean scores of evaluative practices according to the academic profile variable.

Variable	Scientific (N = 62)		Literary (N = 168)		t	df	p-value
	M	SD	M	SD			
Evaluative practices	75.76	9.80	78.76	11.51	1.825	228	0.069

The data presented in Table (09) indicates that the value of ($T=1.825$) is not statistically significant with (228) degrees of freedom, as the value of ($P=0.069$) exceeds the accepted threshold (0.05). This suggests that there are no significant differences in the evaluative practices of professors as perceived by second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology, Education Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Mohamed Lamine Debaghine, Setif-2, University attributable to the academic profile variable.

The results demonstrate that the evaluative practices of university professors are largely uniform across students regardless of whether their academic profile is literary or scientific. Although the assessment of literary profile students in secondary education differs from the assessment of scientific profile students due to the nature of their specialised subjects—such as science, mathematics, and physics, which require problem-solving involving cognitive activities and precise answers, as opposed to literary subjects—the transition to university and the uniformity of the program and specialisation result in a standardised evaluative practice. Students must adapt to these practices, whether in lecture sessions or tutorial sessions. These findings are consistent with those of Abdul Latif Kanoua (2015), which indicated no significant differences in students' average responses attributable to the specialization variable. However, they contrast with the study by Suleiman (2010), which found statistically significant differences in professors' evaluative practices based on the specialisation variable

Answer of question 2-3-

-Are there statistically significant differences at a significance level of (0.05) in the degree of estimates of second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology, Educational Sciences, and Speech Therapy at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine, Setif 2, University for the evaluative practices of their professors attributed to the variable of specialisation?

Table (11): illustrates Results of the analysis of variance test for the significance of differences in evaluative practices by specialisation.

Variable	Speciality	N	M	SD	F	df	P- value
Evaluative practices	Linguistics	67	79.39	10.25	5.996	5 ; 224	<0.001
	clinical	69	72.49	10.97			
	organisation	19	81.68	11.86			
	pedagogy	36	82.81	9.06			
	systems	12	79.67	11.32			
	Counseling	27	78.48	10.90			

It is evident from Table (10) that the F-value of (5.996) with (5 and 224) degrees of freedom is statistically significant, as the p-value of (0.001) is less than the accepted level of significance of (0.05). This indicates that there are differences in the means of students' responses regarding the assessment practices of their instructors. To ascertain the significance of these differences, pairwise comparisons of group means were conducted to provide a detailed analysis of variance results. Post hoc testing was employed using the Tukey test to perform all possible pairwise comparisons.

Table (12): illustrates the significance of differences between the mean scores of the study sample in the evaluation of assessment practices, distributed according to the variable of specialisation, as determined by the Tukey test.

Specialisation		MD	SE	p-value
Linguistics	clinical	.690	1.81	0.003
	organisation	-2.30	2.75	0.961
	pedagogy	-3.42	2.18	0.623
	systems	-0.28	3.3	1.00
	Counseling	0.91	2.41	0.99
Clinical	organisation	-9.19	2.74	0.01
	pedagogy	-10.31	2.17	0.00
	systems	-7.17	3.31	0.25
	Counseling	3.20	3.17	0.91
Organisation	pedagogy	-1.12	3.00	0.99
	systems	2.02	3.90	0.99
	Counseling	3.20	3.17	0.91
pedagogy	systems	3.14	3.52	0.94
	Counseling	4.32	2.69	0.59
systemes	Counseling	1.19	3.67	1.00

Considering the data presented in Table (12) and the results revealed by the Tukey HSD test, there are significant differences in the mean scores of evaluations provided by second-year Master students in the Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences,

with a focus on their professors' assessment practices. These differences are first observed between the fields of psycholinguistics and clinical psychology, with the differences being substantial and statistically significant at a level of (0.04). The mean score difference between these two groups favours clinical psychology. Additionally, Table (12) shows differences between clinical psychology and organisational psychology, which are both substantial and statistically significant at a level of (0.01). The mean score difference in this comparison favours organisational psychology. Thirdly, Table (12) also indicates differences between clinical psychology and educational psychology, which are significant and statistically valid at a level of (0.00). In this case, the mean score difference favours educational psychology.

The differences between psycholinguistics and clinical psychology, with clinical psychology being favoured, can be explained by the fact that clinical psychology involves real pathological cases or situations during both lectures and practical sessions, where students are required to diagnose these cases and understand their causes in order to propose appropriate treatments. Thus, the assessment practices in clinical psychology are based on what is known as authentic assessment. Similarly, the differences observed between clinical psychology and organisational psychology can be attributed to the fact that organisational psychology also deals with real-world situations involving organisations or institutions, whether they are healthcare, social, economic, or educational, resulting in different assessment practices compared to those in other fields. Furthermore, the differences educational psychology can be attributed to the fact that from the third year of undergraduate studies, courses in this field (such as educational assessment, curriculum development, educational administration, etc.) prepare students for teaching. It is well recognised that assessment has become an integral part of the teaching process, making professors and students in this field more familiar with and practised in its concepts and methods. The results of this study are consistent with the findings of Suleiman (2010), which demonstrated statistically significant differences in practices attributable to the variable of specialisation (scientific streams versus literary streams). However, these findings contrast with the results of Qanoon Abdul Latif (2015), which indicated no differences between the mean responses of students regarding achievement tests attributable to the specialisation variable.

Conclusion :
In contemporary pedagogical approaches, assessment has become integral to the learning-teaching process and serves as a strategic tool utilised by professors to achieve the objectives outlined in university training programs. This necessitates that university instructors master this tool to effectively implement it within the classroom, guiding the development of targeted competencies. Such competencies significantly contribute to students' professional adaptation upon entering the workforce and support the organisation's developmental goals. A lack of proficiency with this strategic tool will render university training ineffective and inefficient, leading to substantial waste of human, financial, and material resources. Based on the findings, the researcher presents

a set of recommendations to enhance and improve the assessment practices of university professors, aiming to advance the Algerian higher education institution.

Study Recommendations:

-Organise training courses for all professors across various disciplines, focusing on pure pedagogical training.

-Provide specialised training for university professors in assessment, particularly from the perspective that aligns with competency-based teaching approaches.

-Encourage professors to develop their assessment practices and adopt modern methods, especially authentic assessment.

-Equip professors with tools for analysing evaluations based on the relationship between targeted competencies and the adopted or approved assessments.

-Provide professors with tools from the field of docimology to address how grades or measurement stages are determined, thereby avoiding common pitfalls and classical assessment errors.

References list :

1. Adou, A. (2014). Assessment of learning at the university: Students' perceptions and expectations. Université des Sciences de l'Éducation Review, No. 1.
2. Berthiaume, D., Lanares, J., & Jacqmot, C. H. (2011). Student evaluations of teaching: A strategy for supporting the pedagogical development of educators? In Recherche et Formation, Vol. [Issue], Training University Educators in Pedagogy.
3. De Ketele, J.-M., & Gerard, F.-M. (2005). Validation of assessment tools according to a competency-based approach. Measurement and Evaluation in Education Review, [Volume], pp. 50.
4. Gérard, F.-M. (2005). Assessment of student achievements within the framework of educational reform in Algeria. In Revamping Pedagogy in Algeria, ONPS.
5. Kandeel, R. (2014). ICT in the practices of French as a Foreign Language (FLE) teachers for DELF preparation. Frantice.net, No. 09.
6. Kaaouachi, A. (2001). Assessment in the higher education system in Morocco: Achievements, limitations, and main challenges.
7. Paquay, L., & Coupremanne, M. (n.d.). Active methods in support of the professionalization of higher education students: Analysis of frameworks that promote the development of competencies and professional identity.
8. Rege Colet, N. (2002). Assessment of teaching and university management. Education in Debate: Comparative Analysis Review, Vol. 3.