

New Evaluation Model proposed for full time professors in FAREM-CARAZO

MSc. Raúl Alberto Medrano Chávez

Researcher Teacher

UNAN-MANAGUA, FAREM-CARAZO

raulunancarazo@gmail.com

Keywords: *model, evaluation, faculty, performance management, college extension.*

ABSTRACT

This document contains the proposal of a new evaluation model for the professorate in FAREM-Carazo, which contributes to extend the process of evaluation as a mean of reflection and improvement for the professorate in the teaching components.

For the elaboration of the diagnostic instrument, the necessity of applying two types of questionnaire with open questions was considered, this was with purpose of getting high quality information of the academic government units and the professorate.

The implementation of the spider web instrument that comprises the teaching, investigation, management and extension aspects was validated and applied to the professorate by head department directors. The professorate showed acceptance to the instrument applied, and above all, the huge necessity of strengthening the investigation aspect and the management level of the professorate and faculty authorities was evidenced.

INTRODUCTION

The educative model in UNAN-MANAGUA has been recently reformed, through the curricular transformation process, institutional self-evaluation and the considered aspects in the strategic plan of this educative institution. It also requires the transformation of training process and teaching performance evaluation (performance, plans and extension or investigation activities connected to permanent formation).

The Regional Multidisciplinary Faculty of Carazo (FAREM-CARAZO) has been implementing and monitoring the evaluation processes, but the current professorate evaluation model does not allow directing the pertinent information to all the functions, assignments and activities that are done in the teaching field and at investigation and university extension aspects.

This document introduces the initiative of a performance evaluation model that generates a

reflection frame about the work quality in and outside the classrooms by the professorate from FAREM-CARAZO. Besides updating and applying this tool to continuously improve, it also lets the teachers know about the benefits of improving the evaluation processes, which historically at UNAN-MANAGUA have been seen from other perspectives.

THE PERFORMANCE CONTEXT

The National Autonomous University of Nicaragua, Managua, with the purpose of attending the national academic demand, authorized the reopening of Centro Universitario Regional Carazo (CURC) in 1991. In that moment, it only had four full time professors. Then CURC got a notable growth and fast development, which let to increase the amount of teachers and administrative personnel. In 2000, there were seven full time professors and 10 part time professors already.

In 2005, the amount of full time professors increased to 10 and the amount of part time professors to 25. By 2010, CURC raises its category to Regional Multidisciplinary Faculty. This provoked the continuous improvement of institutional planning aspects, strengthening its structure and the relationship among the different actors of the higher education in the region. For the first semester in 2013, there were 54 full time professors, who were classified into 26 full time professors, 13 part time professors, and 14 quarter time professors.

For this study, the same evaluation will be applied to full time, part time, and a quarter time professors to get to know their performance management in FAREM-CARAZO.

It's important to highlight that, according to institutional regulations, the provost is in charge of designing the evaluation instrument and department directors are in charge of applying it.

Institutional Diagnostic

For the elaboration of the diagnostic instrument the necessity of using two types of questionnaire mainly conformed by open questions was considered, this with the purpose of getting quality information of the academic units and full time professorate.

The applied instrument to the academic units was composed for eight questions which were designed in order get to know normative aspects, competencies for the implementation of the performance evaluation activity, used instruments and its mastery, in addition to know the results.

The instrument applied to the full time professorate contains eight guidelines questions oriented to know the opinions about normative aspects, the knowledge of the evaluation instruments, evaluation objectivity and generated benefits by the evaluation; both at a particular and institutional level.

(See Table 1. Instrument Application on next page)

Among the main findings of the diagnosis, it is emphasized that at the department directors' level, aspects related to the performance evaluation of teachers are not unified.

A consensus in relation to the performance evaluation and its influence directly with the continuous teaching improvement was shown, in addition to the improvement of institutional quality, and the necessity of taking into account an instrument to evaluate professors' performance. There's a necessity to uniform the evaluation process and its instruments at the Faculties and Teaching

Department level. Another necessity at the directors' level is to show the objectivity of their subordinates' evaluation.

Table 1. Source: Administrative FAREM-Carazo, 2013

Teaching Department	Full Time	¾ Time	½ Time	¼ Time	Total
Economic and Administrative Science	12	3	5	0	20
Science, Technology and Health	9	8	2	2	21
Humanity and Education Science	5	2	4	2	13
Total	26	13	11	4	54

Teaching Departments showed the necessity to create a consensus plan for the instruments used such as, operative professor's plan, semester plans, indirect supervisions, evaluation judgment of technic-scientific supervisions, qualification entering to online protocol. Also the evaluation format improvement oriented by the academic vice rector, because it's considered too general in relation to work disposition, permanence compliment, participation on investigation activities and university social projects.

The 67% of informants expressed the necessity of evaluation improvement. The same percentage said that the evaluations applied have often lack adequate objectivity due to the aspects mentioned before.

Just the 13% considers that the evaluation results are used to improve the working conditions. Most of them consider that the evaluation is done just as a transaction requirement.

The division of human resources of UNAN-Managua does not participate in the professors' evaluation, this division just evaluates the administrative personnel, so this means that evaluation instruments could be improved if the professor and the administrative components work together.

Investigation Objectives

General Objective

- To propose a new evaluation model for full time professorate that generates relevant information about functions, tasks and activities that professors from FAREM-CARAZO, UNAN-Managua perform in relation to teaching, investigation and university social projects, during the first semester 2013.

Specific Objectives

- To design an intervention plan to validate the full time professorate evaluation model in FAREM-CARAZO, UNAN-MANAGUA.
- To analyze the intervention development results of the proposed evaluation model in FAREM-CARAZO, UNAN-MANAGUA, through its validation.

INTERVENTION PLAN

The professorate evaluation is a systematic permanent process, integrated in the educational activities that help comprehends reality, inviting professors to think over about their work and the appropriate decision for it professional improvement and consecutively the institutional improvement, Clare and Aschbacher (2001), referring to the same, conclude that it is a process that can help professor to think over its action, it could be internally or by sharing opinions with their colleagues or mates, for individually or collectively search of different ways to improve the class practices.

To reach a successful professorate evaluation, the evaluative system will have to be built between the university improvement and the professorate: for this will be necessary having an account, according to Stronge (1997, in Glatthorn, 1984: Conley, 1987; Harris, 1987 and McGreat, 1988) the next priorities actions: set together objectives, total communication, evaluation climate creation, guaranteed evaluation technique and use different data source:

- a. Set of objectives mutually useful: these ones are going to build the goals to follow. They must be estimated and perceived as important for both teachers and the institution.
- b. A systematic communication: the clarity of process and the possibility of interaction is established by policies and perspectives in the evaluation of college professor competence and efficient of information. However, every key aspect of the evaluation process will have to be accompanied by the correspondent informative act that let run the information, getting quickly to all the cloister members.
- c. Creation of a propitious evaluation climate: the evaluation results absolutely efficient if it is done in the propitious environment in which confidence between the involved parts, honesty and the transperence of acting is the rule not the exception.
- d. Guarantee of the technique application of the evaluation system: every one of the aspects that conforms the technic application of the evaluative process, it is done according to the technic conditions of quality and required precision by elemental norms of educative evaluation. It cannot be an anarchical element; it must be a permanent process for the change.
- e. Use of different data source: the modern professorate evaluation systems are characterized by document the teaching activity from different information sources. It counts with different information sources that allow a global vision of the professor action with different perspectives.

A similar exposition according to what was mentioned before by Mattew and others (1996) who after analyze the different proposals and strategies of teaching evaluation, suggest that they must be respected, at least the following technic recommendations:

- a. It starts from the existence of a legal frame that regulates and norms the evaluative fact. Its existence verifies the right that assists to the society to have competent professorate to the service of the educative system and the professor to have a frame of guarantees that protect its rights.

- b. Deepen in the participative evaluation model direction, in which the professor is an active object of its own evaluation.
- c. Connect the professorate evaluation with the formation process, improvement and professional development oriented to the innovation process and institutional change.
- d. The evaluation policy must be clear and known and must try to enjoy a wide acceptance

Intervention plan for the new proposal of a new evaluation model of the associate professors that generate pertinent information of the functions, tasks and activities that are developed in teaching field, investigation and college extent at FAREM-CARAZO, UNAN-MANAGUA, during the first semester 2013.

(See *Intervention plan for the new proposal of a new evaluation model of the associate professors.* on next pages)

INTERVENTION PLAN FOR THE NEW PROPOSAL OF A NEW EVALUATION MODEL OF THE ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS					
OBJETIVES	SPECIFIC PERFORMANCES	TASKS TO PERFORM	RESPONSIBLES AND HUMAN RESOURCES	PERIOD	EVALUATION INDICATORS
To Analyze the evaluation instruments for full time professors that are currently used in the academic departments.	To organize meetings between academic department directors, major coordinators and full time professors.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To carry out interviews with the academic department authorities and major coordinators To obtain copies of the instruments that are currently used in every academic department. Meetings with teachers from the three academic departments to get to know their opinions in relation to the topic studied. 	<p>Responsible Raúl Medrano</p> <p>Human Resources</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Academic department directors Full time professors. <p>Resources Materials</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Interview questionnaire Evaluation formats Camera 	January 2013 2 weeks	Evaluation format copies Full time professors and directors interview results (interview questionnaire and photographs)

Table continued on next page

OBJETIVES	SPECIFIC PERFORMANCES	TASKS TO PERFORM	RESPONSIBLES AND HUMAN RESOURCES	PERIOD	EVALUATION INDICATORS
<p>To describe the legal aspects and norms that regulate the evaluation process for the full time professors' performance in FAREM-Carazo.</p>	<p>To obtain copies of the labor guidelines and copies of the proposals that curricular transformation committee is doing.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis of guidelines aspects referred to the performance evaluation for full time teachers 2. To Identify other norms that at a faculty level, are related to the evaluation performance, oriented by the facultative committee, academic dean and academic departments. 	<p>Responsible Raúl Medrano</p> <p>Human Resources</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dean 2. Department directors 3. Facultative Committee Secretary <p>Resources Materials</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professor's labor guidelines 2. Facultative committee agreements related to the performance evaluation 	<p>January 2013 2 weeks</p>	<p>Analysis summary of the normative and other officials documents that regulate the evaluation performance processes</p>

Table continued on next page

OBJETIVES	SPECIFIC PERFORMANCES	TASKS TO PERFORM	RESPONSIBLES AND HUMAN RESOURCES	PERIOD	EVALUATION INDICATORS
<p>To identify the most relevant evaluation criteria for full time professors` staff according to the professor`s profile.</p>	<p>To interview the Dean, who is a member of the review committee of professor performance guidelines.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis of the criteria used in other national and foreign universities. 2. Interview the Dean and members of the facultative committee. 3. Interviews to the Department directors. 4. Meetings with the professors representatives (professors` association) 	<p>Responsible Raúl Medrano</p> <p>Human Resources</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dean 2. Department directors 3. Facultative Committee Secretary 4. ATD representatives <p>Resources Materials</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Electronic resources 2. Copies of the evaluation formats 3. Copy of the proposal changes of teachers guidelines 	<p>February 2013</p> <p>2 weeks</p>	<p>Summary of the most relevant criteria within the performance evaluation</p>

Table continued on next page

OBJETIVES	SPECIFIC PERFORMANCES	TASKS TO PERFORM	RESPONSIBLES AND HUMAN RESOURCES	PERIOD	EVALUATION INDICATORS
<p>To design a new model that generates an appropriate data base about the full time professors performance incorporating the evaluation instruments established by UNAN-Managua and the faculty academic dean.</p>	<p>To research about the different portfolio models.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research of different models 2. Establishment of the aspects that the model will contain. 3. Obtaining input from the academic authorities and full time professors from faculty 4. Compilation of the used formats 	<p>Responsible Raúl Medrano</p> <p>Human Resources</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dean 2. Department directors 3. Teachers 4. ATD representatives <p>Resources Materials</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Electronic resources 6. Copies of the evaluation criteria 	<p>February - March 2013</p> <p>2 weeks</p>	<p>Finished and authorized portfolio instruments by the tutor in Nicaragua.</p>

Table continued on next page

OBJETIVES	SPECIFIC PERFORMANCES	TASKS TO PERFORM	RESPONSIBLES AND HUMAN RESOURCES	PERIOD	EVALUATION INDICATORS
<p>To validate the proposed instruments for the full time professors' performance evaluation</p>	<p>Instruments application Piloting.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presentation of the new model to the FAREM-Carazo authorities. 2. Validation of the evaluation instruments 3. Work Correction 4. Results 	<p>Responsible Raúl Medrano</p> <p>Human Resources</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dean 2. Department directors 3. Professors 4. Tutor 	<p>March - April 2013 2 weeks</p>	<p>Presentation of the evaluation model validation results related to the full time professors' performance in FAREM-Carazo.</p>

INTERVENTION RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For the instrument application professors with availability and intention to contribute with the validation were taken into account, therefore, the sample was designed according to the selective type, getting to involve three professors from every academic department which represents 6 professors in total, in addition to that, interviews to the dean, to three department heads and to the methodology unit coordinator of the faculty were carried out, to obtain their inputs about the utility of the proposed instrument.

Characteristics of professors involved in the evaluation instruments implementation

PROFESSOR NUMBER	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6
Departament	CC EE y A		CC T y S		CC y H	
Type of contract	½ Time ECL	Complete TM	Complete TM	¾ Time ADL	Complete ADM	¾ Time ECL
Seniority	3 years	10 years	14 years	6 years	9 years	7 years
Age	23 years	42 years	41 years	32 years	42 years	37 years
Sex	F	M	M	M	F	F
Another position/post	Entrepreneurs movement coordinator	Department Extension Coordinator	Career Coordinator		Major Coordinator	Indirect Supervision
Subject	Administration II	Project Formulation	Facultative I	Programation I	Human Resources Management	Labor Laws

The model proposed, in its structure, contains general aspects of professors and evaluation criteria about teaching performance, research, management and university extension. This instrument was designed considering the new educational model requirements of UNAN- Managua and the strategic institution plan 2011-2014. The proposed model is presented below:



NATIONAL AUTONOMOUS UNIVERSITY OF NICARAGUA, MANAGUA
UNAN-MANAGUA
REGIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY FACULTY OF CARAZO
FAREM-CARAZO

SPIDER WEB EVALUATING TOOL

I. GENERAL DETAILS

Department: _____

Professor: _____

Type of Contract: _____

Teaching Category: _____

Date: _____ Time: _____

Evaluation Committee: _____

II. TEACHING

a. Teaching and lesson planning

1.	Does not use any plans in his/her teaching	
2.	Occasionally performs lesson plans executed before	
3.	Regularly evaluates some essential elements of the lesson plan	
4.	Always collaborates to lesson planning and evaluates his/her plans	

b. Interpersonal Relationships

1.	Does not contribute to establish good interpersonal relationships	
2.	Eventually establishes good interpersonal relationships	
3.	Frequently establishes good interpersonal relationships	
4.	Always contributes and promotes good interpersonal relationships	

c. Permanent professor's training

1.	Does not show interest for his/her teaching updating	
2.	Occasionally looks for constantly updating activities	
3.	Frequently participates in updating activities	
4.	Keeps constantly training and updating for scientific pedagogic improvement	

d. Professor's Attendance and Punctuality

1.	Is constantly at work	
2.	Is frequently unpunctual	
3.	Is unpunctual and does not attend work	
4.	Is punctual and daily attend work	

III. RESEARCH

a. Scientific Publications

1.	Does not develop any type of scientific publications	
2.	At least publishes an article a year	
3.	Publishes two scientific articles annually	
4.	Publishes 3 or more scientific articles a year	

b. Research training

1.	It is not interested in his/her research training	
2.	Does not participate in workshops, conferences and meetings	
3.	Keeps in constantly research training	
4.	Participates in other researchers' training	

c. Basic/Applied Research

1.	Shows a negative attitude towards the research activity	
2.	Does not work in any type of basic or applied research	
3.	Occasionally makes research that generates knowledge or solve surrounding problems	
4.	He/she is in charge of researches' staff	

e. Conferences and other events attendance

1.	Never attends conferences and other scientific events	
2.	At least attends conferences and scientific events once a year	
3.	Attends two or three conferences and scientific events	
4.	Attends three or more conferences or other scientific events a year	

IV. MANAGEMENT

a. Project management

1.	Makes a deficient management of processes	
2.	Makes a continuous management of processes	
3.	Makes a systematic management of processes	
4.	Makes an effective management of processes	

b. Execution and Control

1.	Does not develop any execution and control	
2.	Occasionally develops execution and control actions	
3.	Designs execution actions and control	
4.	Develops execution and control processes oriented to improvement	

c. Leadership

1.	Does not develop any type of leadership	
2.	Develops a transaccional leadership	
3.	Develops a participative leadership	
4.	Develops a transformational leadership oriented to improvement	

d. Resource management

1.	Does not want to participate in any type of resource management	
2.	Does not participate in resource management	
3.	Participates in resource management if he/she is invited	
4.	Collaboratively participates in resource management	

V. UNIVERSITY EXTENTION

a. Economic Agreements

1.	Does not participate in any type of economic agreement	
2.	At least participates in some economic agreement twice a year	
3.	Always participates in every economic agreement	
4.	Promotes the establishment of economic agreement collaboratively	

b. External Relationships

1.	Does not participate in any type of external relationships.	
2.	At least participates in any type of external relationship once a year	
3.	Systematically participates in external activities	
4.	Manages and participates in the establishment of external relationships	

c. Publicity

1.	Does not organize any activity to publish the achievements in a semester	
2.	Organizes at least an activity to publish semester achievements	
3.	Organizes more than one activity to publish the achievements in a semester	
4.	Constantly participates and promotes activities to publish achievements	

d. Professor's participation

1.	Does not get involved in extension activities	
2.	At least participates in extension activities four times a year	
3.	Proposes extension activities in his/her department	
4.	Always relates syllabus to extension activities	

Evaluator's Observation

Evaluated profesor's observations

 Evaluator's signature

 Evaluated professor's signature

The obtained validation results were:

I. Teaching

- a. In regards to teaching planning, it is observed that professors plan their syllabuses for a semester, and they also work together for daily lesson planning as a subject collaborative staff, which has taken a higher influence, this due to directors' direction so that professors have the opportunity to interchange experiences.
- b. Talking about interpersonal relationships mentioned before. It was found that professors frequently get involved with their colleagues, coordinators and professors from other departments.
- c. As part of constantly improvement and workshop programs it was evidenced, that professors get involved in all workshops promoted by the faculty, and also in all the activities that are organized and authorized by directors and the academic dean, which contributes to the constantly professors improvement .
- d. The evaluation shows that 95% of professors are punctual and that they teach their classes. There is one important aspect that has to be mentioned, which is that, in this faculty, indirect supervisions are done to verify and register attendance and punctuality and this action benefits to accomplish these aspects.

II. Research

- a. The research shows that full time professors do very little research work. This is evidenced in the items related to this issue. Professors involved have not developed scientific publications, showing that, this is a great weakness towards the institutional self-evaluation.
- b. Related to the research training, the professorate does not do self-investigations, just as students' research tutor or when the professorate does research as part of post graduate

studies, master or PhD.

- c. Professors do too little self-paper work.
- d. Talking about attendance to scientific congresses, the six survey teachers have participated at least once in congresses that UNAN-Managua or that our faculty promotes.

III. Management

- a. From the six professors, just one of them participates in project managements; this is a representative result in the faculty.
- b. Talking about execution and control; again, only one professor is involved, actually this professor is a specialist in projects and occasionally helps the faculty in the execution and supervision of these projects.
- c. According to the results, professors practice participative leadership, which is something positive.
- d. Referring to resources management, 100% of them participate if they are involved through the authorities' orientation; this means that no one manages resources spontaneously.

IV. University Extension

- a. Professors do not participate in the establishments of economic agreements.
- b. In relation to external relationships, professors participate at least once in some type of external relationship.
- c. Only one of the evaluated professors showed that annually participates in more than one divulgation activity that is carried out in their departments.
- d. As for professors' participation in extension activities, the evaluation reflects that they participate at least 4 times a year in activities promoted by the extension faculty unit being these productive, social, cultural, or sport activities.
- e. It was observed that, department directors and professors evaluated, showed acceptance to the applied instrument and above all, the great necessity of strengthening research and management aspects at the professors' staff and faculty authorities' level was evidenced. Since this perceived necessity, research coordination's and university extension activities are being strengthened.

CONCLUSIONS

Through the work context description of full time professors at FAREM-Carazo, UNAN-Managua, it is representative that a labor guideline for professors exists and in its 9th chapter refers to professors' performance evaluation, which has to be carried out at least once a year.

Article 8 mentions that, aspects to be considered in the evaluation must be:

- a. Responsibility and efficiency in the achievement of annual and semester work plan.
- b. Scientific Production

- c. Scientific Publications
- d. Work Discipline
- e. Integration to university's extension programs
- f. Social and ethical behavior

Professor's guidelines mention that, vice rector is in charge of designing the valuation format for the professorate, but currently different instruments exist. The professorate does not know in detail the content of different evaluation instruments.

An intervention plan was designed and validated for a new full time professor's evaluation model to generate information about functions, tasks and activities performed according to teaching, researching and university extension in FAREM-Carazo, UNAN-Managua, during the first semester 2013. To achieve this goal the dean staff, major directors, methodological unit and six professors' support was important, the ones who voluntarily participated in the proposed instrument validation.

The web tool that addresses the teaching aspects, research, extension and management, was validated directly by directors of the Teachers Departments. In the comments, both principals as evaluated teachers showed acceptance to the instrument, equally, was showed the great need to strengthen research and management issues at the level of teachers and school authorities.

SOME REFERENCES

- BÉCQUER, B. (2001). *Cuadro de Mando de Recursos Humanos*. Barcelona: Edipe.
- BELTRÁN, M. R. (2004). *¿Es posible evaluar la docencia en la universidad?* Mexico: Anuies.
- BUSTAMANTE, E. D. (2009). *La evaluación de los docentes en America latina*. Retrieved on september 16th, of 2011 from <http://www.monografias.com>
- BUTTERISS, M. (2001). *Reinventado Recursos Humanos*. Barcelona: Edipe.
- CANE, S. (2000). *Cómo triunfar a través de las personas*. Colombia: McGraw-Hill.
- DÍAZ, M. R. (2004). *La evaluación de la docencia en la universidad*. Mexico: Editorial UNAM.
- FERNÁNDEZ, A. (2000). *La Función de los Recursos Humanos en tiempos de cambio*. Barcelona: 2000 Management.
- GARCÍA, M. V. (2009). *Cambios en la cultura del alumno*. Retrieved on July 20th, 2011, from <http://www.epsc.upc.edu/projectes/usuarios/miguel.valero/.../docencia/.../portfolio>
- RODRÍGUEZ, L. R. (2005). *Profesionalización de la docencia universitaria: Transformación y Crisis*. México: Plaza y Valdés.
- SÁNCHEZ, M. P. (2010). *Técnicas docentes y sistemas de evaluación en la educación superior*. España: Narcea S.A.
- SANDINO, E. (2005). *La educación terciaria*. Retrieved on August 15th of 2011, from <http://www.ufg.edu.sv/ufg/theorethikos/art4.doc>
- UNAN-Managua (2008). *Plan estrategico institucional 2011-2015*. Retrieved on October 3rd, of 2011, from http://www.unan.edu.ni/images/stories/documentos/Plan_estrategico.pdf