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Abstract

Globalization has generated a high level of competition worldwide between universities. Students` mobility to study abroad and, above all, graduates` mobility to work in an international setting has forced universities to acquire a level of quality at least comparable to those of their counterparts in other countries. Thus, the culture of quality has become a basic pillar of any university. Based on the objectives of the European Union education policy and the Spanish university regulations on education, this paper proposes a model of teaching quality assessment at university level: the different functions of faculty members` teaching activities are evaluated, the sources of information needed for the implementation of the model are revised, and the weighting that those sources should have to get the final quality evaluation are assessed.
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1. Introduction

The development of a model of evaluation of the teaching quality at university levels constitutes nowadays a fundamental action for the modernization and updating of the different structures of any educational institution. The process of globalization does indeed affect the cultural and educational institutions, since these institutions are interested in knowing the level of education they provide in order to survive in todays` marketplace. For this end, the evaluation of teaching quality requires the design of a specific schedule and plan, as well as the adoption of the right strategic decisions regarding faculty members` profiles, among other aspects. This is fundamental, since the faculty members` profile will, to a great extent, depend on the criteria of evaluation applied to them by the different universities. At the same time, this will have a direct impact on the requirements established in the different degrees for students to be successful.
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In this sense, the interaction between the extant universities at an international level forces the establishment of a system that allows the teaching normalization, with the objective of adopting homogeneous methodological systems that would be recognizable between them, having a direct impact on the mechanisms of students’ evaluation.

Based on the aforementioned international normalization, those universities that opt for the implementation of homogeneous systems of evaluation of the teaching quality will broaden their possibilities, and those of their students, since the evaluation criteria applied to their faculty members would be generally standardized and approved between the different institutions, through the collaboration of the different universities, and their agreed actions for the assessment, certification and accreditation of their personnel. This would expand the expectations of both universities and students. In this regard, the general structure of the model proposed in this article has many possibilities of being implemented internationally -once specific contextual amendments have been agreed- since it has already been agreed and tried on several major Spanish universities. Furthermore, its design is based on the specifications and requirements established both in the European Union regulations regarding the Bologna system and in the European Space for Higher Education regulations. This fact guarantees the high level of normalization of the model, allowing its implementation by different universities in order to adapt to the protocols and procedures of many other European universities.

The main goal of this paper is, therefore, the presentation of a model of evaluation of the teaching quality at university level. This paper contains an action plan for the design and implementation needed in order to achieve a high level of teaching quality at higher education institutions. This action plan focuses primarily on obtaining the necessary information regarding the analysis of faculty members’ teaching quality, to come up with the proposal of a final model for this aim. Logically, the execution of the actions contained in the plan are ordered chronologically, since the first step is always to know in depth the contextual setting of application, as well as the regulations of each different country. Once these preliminary actions are achieved, the following step would be to execute the practical actions of research, data analysis, and presentation of results in order to propose a successful plan for its implementation.

On the other hand, this plan does also allow the achievement of a secondary effect, that is, the enhancement of a culture of quality in teaching education that complies with all the extent regulations, which allows different institutions to overcome their national setting and compete internationally. In this sense, it must be taken into account that the evaluation of the level of teaching quality is very important for Spain, as well as for many other countries not listed in the major worldwide university indexes, what has generated the concern of the Spanish higher education authorities.

Following Duart and Martinez (2001), a model of evaluation needs to be systematic, since it must be periodically reviewed, and it must have a non-descriptive aim. It must also be objective and impartial, hence different sources of information are required; it must be based on the different bodies of the different universities, and at the same time it must also be flexible, in order that it can be adapted to the context of every higher education organization. Thus, the model proposed in this paper complies with all these aforementioned basic features.

2. The model of teaching quality assessment

The model proposed in this paper includes the following distinct parts. Firstly, the phases or analyzable extensions of the teaching process (planning of education, development of the lessons learned, and results achieved) are determined. Secondly, it is necessary to specify which ones are the sources to get the information from. These sources should constitute the basis of the educational actions that allow evaluating the whole process: students, faculty members, and academic authorities. With regards to the sources of information used, it is obvious that students are an important source of information as a measurement mechanism to evaluate a good or bad teaching performance. However, given the possibility that the results derived from the information reported by students may not be completely objective, it is necessary to combine these sources with others. In fact, numerous authors, such as Garcia and Congosto (2000), among others, have shown the reluctance of faculty members to the elevation of the weighting of the surveys based on students’ evaluation. Thirdly, we will refer the general lines of the assessment or
evaluation procedure. Finally, it is necessary to determine the specific rules of weighting of the information collected from the various sources mentioned above, in order to be able to specify the level of quality of the teaching provided by the higher education institution. Each of these aspects will be reviewed in the following lines.

The proposed model pursues analyzing and assessing, following the pattern of Mateo et al. (1996), the faculty members’ knowledge and capabilities in the subject matter they teach, as well as their skills for the students’ assessment, their professionalism and their level of relations with the higher education institution to which they belong. In addition, this model contributes to the reduction of school failure, by eliminating the unnecessary efforts of teachers and students. Furthermore, as Nieto (1996) states, this model does also constitute a tool to improve society in general terms. In addition, we intend that this model exceeds the old conception of evaluation as an obligation of the university, and that this evaluation gets instead configured as a process of interest for the university, by encouraging the participation of all actors involved in the teaching process. Following Muñoz et al. (2002), this will in turn improve the quality of higher education institutions.

2.1 Dimensions of the teaching process subject of analysis and sources of information to evaluate the quality.

As it has been pointed out, the evaluation of teaching quality requires information from three distinct chronological and functionally aspects: teaching design, process of teaching itself and results obtained. Therefore, we are going to study the three dimensions and the sources of information in each case.

2.1.1. Teaching design

In the dimension of teaching design, three sources of information should be considered, that is, faculty members, academic leaders, and students. The faculty member contributes, through a self-report, with information concerning the decisions taken to plan the teaching methodology that is going to be provided by him. In this sense, an essential element for assessing such planning is the teaching guide. The teaching guide includes the subject syllabus, the evaluation procedure, and the materials that the student must learn. The decisions taken by the faculty members are basically the following:

A) The choice of the subject matters: the faculty member must inform about the circumstances, causes and factors that determine his choice for a specific subject matter, such as the Department criteria, schedules, degree of specialization, etc. Some factors may reduce the freedom of choice of the faculty member. For instance, the criteria of subject matter preference on the basis of the category of the teacher, or his level of specialization; the existence of predefined and fixed schedules that clash with their family circumstances; or the existence of different college campuses with long commuting distance. Thus, the information provided by the faculty member does not have a great relevance in many cases, since his election is not completely free, but it is sometimes very limited and subject to many external factors. These circumstances are beyond the faculty member’s control, which can produce a lack of variety in the chosen subject matters and in turn, give him a lower valuation or assessment of his teaching quality, given that the regulations established by the EU usually appreciate the diversity of the subject matters taught.

B) The syllabus: the faculty member must inform about the rationality or logic of the various components of the syllabus, as well as of its relevance to the subject matter objectives, since these objectives must be adapted to several criteria, such as students’ previous knowledge, the teaching resources available, or the stimuli regarding teaching innovation fostered by the University, among others. In connection with the above, it is often common to adapt the teaching syllabus to the program of the Chair. Although this practice may be positive for teachers with little experience -and it allows coordination among teachers of a same subject- however, it is a mechanism that minimizes the teacher's role and therefore, reduces the quality of his teaching assessment. We must remember that the teaching guide or syllabus includes multiple aspects: methodology, practical activities, seminars, teaching resources, bibliography and students’ evaluation criteria.
C) The teaching coordination: The faculty member also provides information on coordination actions carried out at the university, as well as information regarding the agents involved in those coordination activities. The participation of the faculty members in these matters seems minor, given that this objective is determined in the Degree Programs of each University.

On the other hand, in most cases the academic officials are the ones responsible for carrying out such actions of coordination. Accordingly, it is essential the existence of the Coordinators of Degrees, Coordinators of the subject matters -in those cases in which the same subject is taught by several faculty members in different degrees- and the report of the Director or Head of the Department. The reports of these academic leaders provide information regarding decisions taken by every faculty member, which is reflected latter in their syllabus. The academic leaders´ reports should include the following topics:

A) The choice of subject matters: regarding this issue, the report of those responsible must include the procedures and criteria adopted for the choice of the different subjects by each Department, as well as the criteria followed for the preparation of the time schedules established by the Centre. In addition, these reports should include the difficulties or inconveniences of faculty members to freely choose their subject matters. However, in many cases, the Director of the Department does not have accurate information on the criteria used or the inconveniences encountered by the faculty members when choosing their subject matters, which minimizes the value of these reports.

B) The syllabus: in this case, the Director or Head of the Department advises on the degree of adaptation of each subject matter to the academic, research and educational orientations of the Department, as well as on the composition of the syllabus for the different subject matters. In relation to these issues, this report can be very useful, for example, by establishing the deadline for the collection of each syllabus, the inclusion of relevant bibliography, the inclusion of the evaluation criteria or any other resources appropriate to the subject. However, the existence of very large departments, with a wide variety of subjects and contents, hinders the effectiveness of the report with regards to the appropriateness and validity of the contents.

C) The teaching coordination: the Head of Department also advises in this report on the degree of participation of faculty members in the various actions of coordination, such as meetings, for example.

Thirdly, students also provide information through a survey on the following issues:

A) The syllabus: students should inform about the accuracy of the objectives proposed in the teaching guide, the capabilities and skills to be achieved, the fulfillment of the contents with these objectives, and the level of competence of the activities, the evaluation criteria and the proposed resources. They also report on the adequacy of the time schedules, as well as on the number of credits given in the subject matter for the achievement of the final goals. In our opinion, however, students do not have the necessary information or training to answer most of those questions, especially those related to adapting the content to the course program, or the viability of formative actions.

B) The teaching coordination: students need to demonstrate the existence of possible content overlaps in the syllabus of different subject matters, as well as differences in the evaluation criteria used in these and other subjects. While for the former point it is logical to pay attention to the student's information, however, it is not for the latter one, since again we could point out a lack of students’ training in this regard.

As it can be seen, the information provided by students has a purpose of strict control over the proposal initially made by the teacher. This fact, following Rizo (1999), is a very important aspect in many models of assessment.
In addition, a series of training activities are also assessed for faculty members in the proposed model, regarding teaching skills and other issues. The valuation of such activities varies according to the institution that provides such training, that is, the University or other external agencies.

2.1.2. Teaching
The second dimension that must be evaluated refers to the act of teaching itself. The sources of information and evaluation procedures will be the same as the ones specified for the teaching design, that is, faculty members, academic leaders, and students.

The faculty members, in their self-report, must inform on the following activities:

A) Teaching and learning activities: the report provides information on the implementation of the course according to the schedule of activities proposed to the students in the teaching guide. It must also inform about other training activities offered by other faculty members and students: seminars, workshops, conferences, etc. However, the forecast on the implementation of the course is sometimes only approximate, since the teaching guide is normally made by the faculty member without knowing the specific number of students that will be in his group, which conditions the implementation and the success of these activities.

B) Evaluation procedures: the faculty member will report on compliance with the criteria and evaluation procedures established in the teaching guide, as well as on their degree of usefulness for the learning process.

Academic leaders should also elaborate a report, in which they should establish the following same topics:

A) Teaching and learning activities: academic leaders will inform on the merits achieved by the faculty members in the development of education process, as well as on the incidences identified in such teaching process.

B) Evaluation procedures: academic leaders will inform on the possible incidences regarding the teaching evaluation: students’ claims, failure to comply with the time limits, etc.

Students will also be asked in the survey about the following issues:

A) Teaching and learning activities: students will express their opinions on the implementation of the course, practical activities, tuition, etc. They will also express their view on the methodology, pedagogical resources, and their potentiality to promote learning.

B) Evaluation procedures: they will also express their opinions about the way in which the procedures of evaluation are aligned with those provided for in the course program. In addition, they will also show their opinion about the transparency in the development of the assessment process and in the implementation and good execution of the proposed criteria.

The success of the learning process and of the model itself has a direct relationship with the degree of commitment and interest of all parties involved in the entire process: teachers, students and academic authorities or leaders. That implies a constant self-critical view and a proactive attitude. Academic managers respond in the adequate functioning of the academic bodies, and must provide the means necessary for the proper performance of the teaching activity. Faculty members must fulfill their commitments. Students must make their personal effort in the process of learning. Therefore, it's a systemic scheme, so that the defects of one of the groups would have direct impact on the final results of the overall quality of the education process.
2.1.3 Results and outcomes

The third of the dimensions evaluated is the aforementioned outcomes or results derived from the act of teaching itself. The proposed model is based on the following requirements:

- Adaptation of teaching to the curriculum and goals of the institution.
- Satisfaction of students and academics for accomplished teaching.
- Degree of achievement of expected academic outcomes and results.

As well as in the previous aspects, the three sources of information include faculty members, academic leaders, and students. The faculty members, on their self-report, should inform on:

A) Achievement of the training objectives by the students: reporting about the skills in which there has been further progress by students.

B) Review and improvement of the teaching activity: the faculty member shows the incidence in the teaching process regarding various factors, such as deficiencies encountered, degree of understanding by students, lack of teaching skills, miscalculation of the deadlines for the development of teaching activities, etc. The faculty teacher can also highlight the improvements observed with regards to the contents of the syllabus, the distribution of practical activities, and the evaluation tests.

Academic leaders’ report must provide the results of the analysis of the basic indicators of the specific subject matters: number of students enrolled, number of students that repeat the course, or the success rate of the subject matter, among other issues. Thus, students’ performance and satisfaction is assessed using indicators such as: changes in the level of academic performance taught by the teacher, evolution of the degree of success rate in the subject matters based on students’ tests, faculty member’s assessment by the students.

Students will be asked in the survey for the results obtained in the course regarding the competences proposed in the teaching guide. The results of the students affect the prestige of the University. These results are related to the faculty member’s own factors, such as his skills or training, as well as to other external factors unrelated to the faculty member, such as the prior preparation of the students and their vocation and dedication, as well as their capacity for initiative. At an institutional level, institutional outcomes also depend on the adequacy of the plans of study, the degree of competitiveness of the different degrees, and on the means or resources available, as well as on the correct design of the teaching model. Students’ questionnaires must adapt to the area of knowledge, the education cycle they belong to, and the characteristics of the studies in question. It is necessary to raise awareness of the importance of answering the survey questions with interest and objectivity.

2.2 Outlines of the teaching quality assessment procedure

2.2.1 Scope of application

The assessment may be requested on a voluntary basis, by all those teachers who are permanent faculty members of the University. In general, the assessment is based on a time span that includes the last three years of the faculty member’s teaching activity.

2.2.2 Evaluators

The Chancellor of the University shall be appointed by an evaluation Committee with the advice of a Technical Unit for Quality. Members shall be experts of recognized standing, including a representative of the Social Council of the University, and an evaluator proposed by external agencies and public authorities who regulate the accreditation process of faculty members. The final composition will be released at the same time as the publication of the corresponding call.

2.2.3 Procedures for gathering the information

The teaching activity of the faculty members will be assessed by an External Commission or agency in response to the information collected from the following agents:
- The faculty member, who must hand in a self-report indicating the merits that -in accordance with the merits that are required in the call- he deems appropriate. These merits must be proved.

- The report issued by the Center (that is, the corresponding faculty and higher education institution where the subject matters are taught).

- The report issued by the Department which is within the area of expertise in which the faculty member develops his teaching activities.

- The students, through students’ questionnaires regarding semi-annual or annual subject matters carried out by the University in the course of each academic year.

2.2.4 Process of evaluation

The phases of the evaluation process can be broken down as follows:

1st.- Publication of the call, where a maximum period shall be fixed for the filing of applications and where, as previously mentioned, the members that compose the Evaluation Commission must be stated. The forms through which the applications must be submitted will be provided in the call.

2nd.- Applications must be submitted in writing and in the forms provided to the effect, within the period established and through the registration office of the University, and they shall be accompanied by the documentation required in the call. Additionally, the submission of applications is required in electronic format to the e-mail account provided by the University in the call.

3rd.- Once the deadline for the submission of applications is closed, the Evaluation Commission will issue a provisional list regarding the accepted and rejected applications, reasoning the cause which has given rise to the rejection, and opening a deadline for any corrections, after which, the University will proceed to the publication of the final list of accepted applications.

4th.- After evaluating the documentation submitted in the applications, the Evaluation Commission will issue a report in which the faculty member’s assessment will be communicated -always in a personalized way- together with the score obtained by the candidate, and the period enabled for an appeal (as established by law). The Commission may also ask the faculty member for additional information in order to prove any of the merits which he would have claimed in the application.

It has to be taken into account that in this phase, there are models, such as the one proposed by Rizo (1999), that propose joint evaluation activities between faculty members, students and academic leaders. These models, therefore, allow some degree of dialogue between the faculty members and the academic decision-makers in order to improve the results and to generate a greater understanding of the process.

5th.- After the period for the lodging of any complaints, the Evaluation Commission -also in a personalized way- informs the faculty member about his definitive assessment and subsequent score, with the emission of a report where the teaching activity evaluation is broken down into an overall assessment (accepted or rejected), together with recommendations to strengthen or improve the weaker specific fields. There is also the possibility, if the Commission deems it appropriate, to make additional remarks in the report.

2.2.5 Results report

With the completion of the process, the Evaluation Commission will draw up a call results report to be submitted to the competent bodies of the University for their acknowledgment and subsequent dissemination.
From a general point of view, the report of results will refer to the main results of the process, possible incidences during the same, and its resolution, as well as an analysis of the participation registered in the call, the results obtained, indicators on how to modify or improve the process in future calls and all those suggestions that help enhance the improvement of the results.

Obtaining a favorable qualification can be rewarded either economically, or with awards to scholars.

It will be necessary the adoption of a timetable including the following issues: the call, the submission of applications, the remission of documentation by the relevant agents, the proper evaluation, the communication of the results, and the opening of a complaint period for those interested, as well as the final assessment; it will also include the elaboration of a report of overall results for strategic purposes. It is advisable to perform the entire evaluation process during the academic year, in order to get reliable information.

3. Weighting indicators for the information obtained

The following tables include percentages to weigh the importance of those sources aforementioned depending on the part of the teaching process that will be evaluated and, thereby, of the source from which the information comes. However, as a specific evaluation mechanism, the information from the report of the own Faculty Member is also introduced, but with a much lower weighting. This is due to the fact that, although we understand that it is not admissible to weight such information with a high percentage -since that would eliminate the virtuality of the model- it does also seems logical to pay attention to the Faculty Member’s information, given that he knows his own work in greater depth as well as the special circumstances in which his work unfolds. Hence, it is also necessary to consider his opinions and the information provided by him.

Table 1. Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design of Teaching</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Activity</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information provided by the Faculty Member</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table provides the detailed information and specific weighting contained in the aforementioned evaluation criteria.

Table 2. Detailed assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Evaluated Factors</th>
<th>Evaluating indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighting of the criteria</th>
<th>Weighing on the overall score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Design of Teaching</td>
<td>1.1 Subject</td>
<td>1.1.1 Chosen subjects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>matter design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2 Syllabus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3 Subject</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>matter coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Teacher training</td>
<td>1.2.1 Courses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and training by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.2 Courses by</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.3 Courses by</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Educational innovation projects
- Participation in projects: 5, 5%
- Experience on innovation: 3

1.4 Activities to improve teaching
- 1.4.1 Activities: seminars, etc: 6, 5%

1.5 Adaptation of teaching to regulation
- 1.5.1 Number of activities: 4, 2%

2. Teaching Activity
- 2.1 Teaching activities
  - 2.1.1 Teaching: 10, 20%, 35%
  - 2.1.2 Supervising thesis: 3
  - 2.1.3 Seminars, conferences, etc: 3
  - 2.1.4 Diversity in teaching: 4

- 2.2 Other teaching activities: 7, 7%

- 2.3 Reports on teaching
  - 2.3.1 Information of the Faculty: 4, 8%
  - 2.3.2 Information of the Department: 4

3. Results
- 3.1 Results obtained by students
  - 3.1.1 Success rate of the subject matter: 6, 15%, 25%
  - 3.1.2 Students’ success in the subject: 4

- 3.2 Students’ questionnaire
  - 3.2.1 Result of the questionnaire: 10, 10%

4. Information provided by the Faculty Member
- 4.1 Faculty Member’s own report: 15, 15%, 10%

3.1 Explanation of the assessment criteria
The explanation of the items identified in the previous table is as follows:

1. DISIGN OF TEACHING

It is necessary to obtain a minimum of 22 points from a possible of 35 points in total in this objective or category.

1.1 Design of the subject matters
- 1.1.1 Subjects chosen by the Faculty Member in the academic courses evaluated, whose score may reach the maximum referred to in the table.
- 1.1.2. Syllabus for the chosen subject matters in such academic courses, whose score may reach the maximum referred.
- 1.1.3. Coordination of the subjects and programs, in order to avoid overlap between them and achieve a harmonized teaching of the subject by all teachers, whose score can reach the maximum referred.

1.2 Teacher training
1.2.1 Courses and training activities developed by the University. In this case, each 10 training hours received by the Faculty Member compute a point, to the maximum referred.
1.2.2 Courses organized by other educational institutions. The same score can be obtained.
1.2.3 Courses organized by evaluation authorities, up to the maximum referred to with the same computation of hours.

1.3 Educational innovation projects
1.3.1 Participation in educational innovation project. These projects can be funded by national, international entities or the University. Projects will receive between 0.5 points or 1 point, depending on the economic relevance and on the number and nature of the participants, to the maximum referred.
1.3.2 Experiences on innovation. It will be necessary to demonstrate the implementation of such experiences. They can be: texts on educational innovation, materials, methodology or specific practical experiences. Each one will be marked 0.5 points, to the maximum referred.

1.4. Participation in activities for the improvement of the teaching performance.
1.4.1 Activities: teaching in other languages, coordination of studies, invitation of other universities as a teacher; etc. Each activity will compute 1 point, up to the maximum referred to in the table.

1.5 Activities for the adaptation of teaching to the University regulations
1.5.1 Number of activities: teaching provided in accordance with the criteria established by the University regulations, collaboration in the elaboration of plans of study, participation in evaluation bodies. Each activity will compute 1 point, up to the maximum referred to in the table.

2. TEACHING ACTIVITY
In this objective, the Faculty Member must obtain a minimum of 18 points from a possible total of 30.

Evaluated factors
2.1 Teaching activity
2.1.1 Teaching designed and taught in the various cycles of university education (measured in credits). Each 6 credits taught receive 1 point to the maximum referred to in the table.
2.1.2 Supervising thesis and PhD. Each dissertation gets 1 point, if the Faculty Member is a co-supervisor he would get 0.5 points, to the maximum referred in this category.
2.1.3. Unpaid teaching, such as seminars, courses, etc. Every 20 hours award 1 point, up to the maximum referred.
2.1.4. Diversity of teaching. Each different subject in a course receives 1 point, two 1.5, up to the maximum referred.

2.2 Other teaching activities
2.2.1 Other activities: committees and coordination of studies, projects, department director, etc. 1 point per each participation, to the maximum referred.

2.3 Reports on teaching
2.3.1. Information of the Faculty/school. For this objective, the Faculty Member must the available information such as assistance lists, claims of students, the deadlines and requirements of his class evaluation, transparency of his teaching activities; involvement in institutional educational activities; etc. The assessment may be very positive, positive, negative, and very negative, being the 8 maximum and 0 the minimum.
2.3.2. Information of the Department/area. This report will assess similar aspects which information and valuation correspond to this institutional body. The score achieved is identical to the previous one.

3 RESULTS
3.1 Results obtained by the students
In this section, the Faculty Member must obtain a minimum of 10 points of all possible.
3.1.1 Success of the subject matter in relation with the success of the degree: the total number of passed students for that subject is assessed with respect to the total number of students enrolled in that subject matter. Thus, a comparison with other lectureships of that subject in other degrees by other Faculty Members can be made. The computation would be 2.5 points if the relationship is up to 25%, 5 points if it is up to 50%, 7.5 if it is up to 75% and 10 if it is up to 100%. Up to the maximum score referred.

3.1.2 Number of students who pass the subject as compared to those who enrolled on it. Scoring is similar to the previous one, up to a maximum of 5 points.

3.2. Students’ questionnaire regarding the Faculty Member’s performance.
A high score is given to this section, that is, 10 points.

4. INFORMATION GIVEN BY THE FACULTY MEMBER

4.1 Faculty Member’s report. In this report, the Faculty Member shall prove the merits on teaching, and related tasks and activities, such as those on innovation and teaching performance improvement activities, or activities related to the goals set by the University regulations. The Faculty Member must also add a personal assessment of all activities, the required documentation and his contribution to the improvement of his teaching.

In order to be evaluated the following criteria must be met: Faculty Member with full dedication. The period for the assessment should cover the last 3 years. The minimum final score to get a positive assessment is 50 points. Between 50 and 100 the Faculty Teacher can get a rating of: “Accepted” (50-70), “excellent” (70-90) and “outstanding” (90-100). If the Faculty Member’s application is accepted (more than 50 points), he can be rewarded either economically, or with other awards systems.

4. Conclusion

The main goal of this paper is the presentation of a model of evaluation of the teaching quality at university level. The development of a model of teaching quality assessment at university levels is a fundamental tool for updating and standardizing the different structures of an educational institution, regardless of the country in which the different institutions operate. Using the same model for the teaching quality assessment can provide higher education institutions with the key to compete and survive in todays’ marketplace, thus allowing them to adopt the right strategic decisions. This would expand the expectations of both universities and students. In this regard, the general structure of the model proposed in this article has many possibilities of being implemented internationally, once contextual modifications have been applied to it, since it has already been agreed and tried on several major Spanish universities and will shortly be tried on Jordan Universities. Furthermore, its design is based following the specifications and requirements established in the European Union regulations regarding the Bologna system and the European Space for Higher Education regulations. This fact guarantees the high level of normalization of the model, allowing its implementation by different universities in order to adapt to the protocols and procedures of many other European universities.
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