

# Review of: "Quality assessment program of the teaching activity of the higher education faculty staff. A case study"

Augusto Ciuffoletti<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Pisa

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper addresses a relevant issue since teaching quality in higher school is paramount for social progress. This paper reports how this task is coped with at the University of Valencia.

The paper does not address a specific research question. The task definition refers to documents issued by national and international agencies; they are described in detail in section 2, from page 2 to page 8, more than half of the 13 pages-long paper. In section 3 authors report on the early stages of addressing the task. The article describes the mechanism with which the central agency monitors process advancement and the model used inside the institute to comply with regulations by evaluating the quality of teaching, decomposed into 14 dimensions, covering, among others, teaching organization, tutoring, and internationalization. The paper describes the expected results and conditions to proceed toward certification.

The bibliography consists of two academic papers, one document from a regional agency, and three local reports.

The article is an exhaustive report. However, it does not contribute to a different or better answer to implementing qualified teaching in higher schools. The reader is informed about an effort in that sense and that a University is engaged in fulfilling defined requirements, but the paper lacks a critical discussion, an alternative proposal, or documented results. It is not a document I see well suited to a scientific journal. I find it more adequate for a newsletter on the topic.

Also, it is just unusual for the authors of a scientific paper to qualify themselves as experts (see the end of the second paragraph on page 3), giving in such a way an implicit indication of the quality of the paper. A scientific paper should be qualified by its content, not by its authors: to this end, some journals hide the author's identities from the reviewers to avoid a potential bias in the judgment of content validity.

Summarizing the paper is well-written, organized, and exhaustive. However, its scientific contribution is too limited.