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Launched in 2007 by the university evaluation agencies in Spain.

**Aims**

To satisfy the university demand for a model and procedures for ensuring the quality of educational provision by university academic staff and for promoting its development and recognition.

To promote the enhancement of educational provision through teaching assessment processes conducted by the universities themselves.
1. Framework and general aims for DOCENTIA

Framework

EHEA Quality Assurance Standards and Guidelines:

“Institutions should have ways of satisfying themselves that the staff involved in teaching students is qualified and competent to do so.”

Spanish Government Royal Decree (1393/2007):

“At the spanish universities the Quality Assurance System must have teaching staff evaluation and improvement procedures in place.”

Conference of HE European Ministers (2009):

Stresses the importance of the teaching mission in universities and the need for a reform in the syllabus centred on enhancing learning outcomes.
Goals

To provide *a model and procedures* for the evaluation of teaching performance.

To support *teaching staff professional development*.

To facilitate the *decision making process* in relation to the evaluation.

To contribute towards the *change in university culture* (teaching increased recognition).

To foster a *culture of quality*.

Increased responsibility for the universities (greater decision making capacity): *each university decides on what basis they are to assess their teaching staff and on the subsequent decisions to be taken*.
2. The DOCENTIA programme

Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexto institucional</th>
<th>Institutional Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVALUACIÓN</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESARROLLO</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANIFICACIÓN</td>
<td>PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTADOS</td>
<td>OUTCOMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICACIÓN</td>
<td>COMMITMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. The DOCENTIA programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. PLANNING OF TEACHING</strong></td>
<td>1. Organisation and coordination of teaching staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination with other teaching activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Planning of teaching &amp; learning in relation to the subjects taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected learning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria &amp; methods for evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching materials &amp; resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING</strong></td>
<td>3. Development of teaching &amp; evaluation of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation procedures applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. RESULTS</strong></td>
<td>4. Results in terms of training objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Review &amp; improvement of teaching activity: training and innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 2. The DOCENTIA programme

### Information & Evidences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS TO BE EVALUATED</th>
<th>EVALUATION SOURCES AND PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation of all stakeholders: increases data reliability!
Total score: 100 points.

Favourable: ≥ 50 points.
Excellent: ≥ 80 points

### The Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division and sub-division</th>
<th>General Description</th>
<th>Points (Max.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIVISION 1. TUITION PLANNING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Participation in Academic management bodies</td>
<td>Provision of information about leadership of and participation in institutions, departments, on professional boards or committees concerned with educational related activities.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Tuition planning</td>
<td>Provision of information about the regularity and updating of course programmes/ teaching guides, their suitability, review and level of information contributing to the enhancement of teaching quality.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Coordinating activities</td>
<td>Provision of information about the coordination tasks both relating to the course and between the subjects of the qualification, or about the coordination of exchange programmes.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Model

#### DIVISION 2. DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Ordinary teaching activities</td>
<td>Formal aspects of ordinary teaching activities will be assessed: timetables, tutorials, exams, delivery of results, as well as progress in the programme, corrective measures, etc.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Complementary teaching activities</td>
<td>Activities centred on enriching the subjects, both in their content and in the teaching methods, are to be indicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Special teaching activities</td>
<td>Teaching activities not forming part of ordinary activities but which contribute towards enhancing the learning experience will be assessed. Courses: participation in Experimental Pilot Projects on the European Credit System; organisation of events such as workshops, seminars and courses; activities in relation to the transition from secondary to university education, etc.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DIVISION 3. OUTCOMES AND INNOVATION

| 3.1 Quantitative evidence | Levels of success, efficiency and abandonment will be measured, the latter two in relation to the average for the qualification. | 10 |
| 3.2 Qualitative evidence | Student satisfaction survey  
Satisfaction survey among Academic Leaders | 20 |
| 3.3 Training and innovation in teaching | Training, innovative projects, course design, etc. | 10 |
| 3.4 Others | Other teaching related merits such as prizes and academic distinctions gained, teaching experience in other prestigious institutions, etc. |
Corrective factors

To standardise the differing realities of the teaching activity among university teaching staff, both the teaching program and the teaching workload will act as correcting factors.

Corrective coefficients have been defined for indicators such as content, subject type and level and credit load of the subjects in order to add value to the score for younger teachers, a heavier workload and a greater academic diversity.

The Teacher Correcting Factor

The Subject Correcting Factor
The Teacher Correcting factor

**Teaching Level:** Three levels according to the teaching experience held by each teacher

**Teaching activity:** Compensates the diversity and load of teaching.
The Subject Correcting Factor

It is used for weighting the result of the success rates, efficiency and abandonment, to compensate to those subjects that are compulsory for first year students and have many students.

It is the average of three indicators:

Number of students per group
Type of subject
Number of first-year courses
Participants in the Assessment Process

*Teaching staff.* Self-evaluation report & supporting evidence.

*Academic Leaders:* Deans: report with overall teaching assessment.

*Students:* Surveys on their degree of satisfaction.

*Assessment Panel:* Indirect, second order assessment report based on the supporting evidence supplied by the lecturer, the relevant academic representative and the students.

*Assessment and Quality Enhancement Unit:* Technical support and assistance to all various bodies involved.

*Analysis and Planning Board:* Supplies info from data bases at the ULL.

*Deputy Vice-Chancellor for Teaching Staff and Teaching Quality:* General coordination of the process.

*Guarantee Committee:* Resolves appeals against the decisions of the Assessment Panel.
4. Comparative model assessment

1. Faculty: 1385

2. Faculty: 1523

3. Faculty: 2192

4. Faculty: 1793
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Comparison focused on tree dimensions

1. Strategic
   Aims of the assessment
   Scope
   Agents involved

2. Methodology
   Sources and data collection procedures
   Assessment procedure
   Appeals and claims procedures
   Reports

3. Evaluation Results
   Ratings
   Decision-making procedure and consequences
   Results dissemination
1. Strategic dimension

**Goal**  
*Same in all cases*  
Continuous teaching improvement; Professional development  
Training and Recognition of Faculty excellence

**Scope**  
*Significant differences*  
ULL & USC: mandatory for all faculty after a minimum number of teaching years  
UDC & UVI: voluntary, but mandatory annual surveys of student opinion

**Evaluation bodies**  
*Significant differences*  
Galicia universities: A General Evaluation Committee plus five Commissions  
Assessment (knowledge branch) with 2 external reviewers (from the ACSUG).  
Students participation allowed.

ULL: A single Evaluation Committee (one member from the ACECAU) plus a  
Guarantee Commission (teachers claims and appeals).
4. Comparative model assessment

2. Methodology

Sources and data collection  
Same in all cases

The self-report has an unique format in ULL and USC
In UDC and UVI, three self-report versions (initiation, 5 years teaching experience; consolidation, 6 to 15 years teaching experience; senior)

Self-reports are qualitative at the UDC; qualitative and quantitative at the USC and ICU and more specific in quantitative terms a the ULL.

Assessment procedure  
No significant differences

Compliance in the administrative requirements (call for evaluation; claim period; final decision and dissemination of results and compliance with the provisions of the Spanish Data Protection Act).
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2. Methodology

Claims procedures

Significant differences

Differences arising from the differences in the evaluation bodies.

First instance reviews are made by the Evaluation Committees (all cases)

Subsequent appeals processed by:

University Board of Government at the UDC
University Rector at the USC and UVI
Committee of Guarantees (Rector and 5 faculties elected by the University Board of Government) at the ULL.

Reports

Same in all cases

Individual report and institutional reports of the overall results evaluation.
3. Evaluation Results

**Decision-making procedure and consequences**  
*Significant differences*

**Galician universities**: Defined decision-making procedures and tracking system for the actions. Specific negative consequences at Department or Centre levels (non-participation in calls for aid to teaching, UDC; failure to obtain individual benefits, USC).

**ULL**: When an unfavorable report, the Committee will make proposals to the faculty to improve teaching; he/her may propose actions which, if approved, will be monitored by the Unit and Evaluation and Quality Improvement.

**Rating types**  
*No significant differences*

Excellent, Favorable or Unfavorable.  
USC includes a fourth level: "Violation of teaching duties”

**Results dissemination**  
*Same in all cases*

Dissemination at institutional level.  
Galician universities: An individualized certification results to the ACSUG
There are more commonalities than differences among the designs analyzed: fully implantation of the General DOCENTIA Model.

DOCENTIA only includes the students participation through the assessment surveys. Some universities have student representatives at the Evaluation Commission (beyond the Quality Assurance Standards and Guidelines by ENQA).

Decision making in the case of unfavorable evaluations is the most controversial issue and there are different degrees of development of the models analyzed.

Universities begin to perceive the importance of teaching quality for a competitive university, but in Spain still the professor prestige is mainly based in research merits.
DOCENTIA at the University of La Laguna: A program for teaching performance evaluation, promotion and development. Model comparison and assessment with the Galicia universities

Thank you for your attention

Dr. Néstor V. Torres Darias Isabel Belmonte Otero
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