

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

Marion Coderch<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Durham

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

This paper offers an overview of the DOCENTIA programme, designed to assess the quality of teaching staff in Spanish higher education, and of its implementation at Universitat Politècnica de València. While the article has its merits as a thorough description of the programme's aims and features, it does not meet the expectations of a case study as the title states. The reader is left with the impression that the paper lays out the context for a more extensive study, which would consist of the current article followed by a second part where the research outcomes would be debated. In this second part, a consistent data set should be presented, analysed and discussed: this would be the core of the case study, if the authors decided to approach it as such.

I would suggest that the authors review the title given to the paper and remove the "case study" reference, in order to manage the expectations of its audience. It may be worth considering the use of some wording that alludes to the descriptive nature of the study, as this would allow readers to gain a more accurate idea of the contents of the paper. I would also encourage the authors to follow up this article with a further study, perhaps involving interviews or focus groups with staff involved in the implementation of the programme at UPV.

I add below some more precise remarks that the authors may want to take into consideration in future versions of the paper:

- Page 2, paragraph 2: "and how digital technologies has" should read "and how digital technologies have".
- Page 3, paragraph 1: a comma is needed after "ANECA launched in 2007".
- Page 3, paragraph 3: there is a reference to "the changes in the profile of the teaching staff of the institutions". A sentence or two outlining what these changes have been would help readers contextualise the current implementation of DOCENTIA.
- Page 4, bullet point 6: the issue of balancing the different areas of academic work is one of the current challenges faced by higher education staff across different countries. This topic could be picked up and developed further at some point in the paper: how does DOCENTIA plan to facilitate the achievement of this balance?
- Page 6, paragraph 2: "the teachers who provides information" should read "the teachers who provide information".
- Page 9, paragraph 2: there is a reference to the evaluation of teaching merits in five-year terms. For clarity, it would be helpful to explain whether this evaluation schedule is linked to DOCENTIA in any way and, if so, how.
- Page 10, paragraph 1: there is a brief description of the working groups that took part in the adaptation of DOCENTIA to the UPV context. More detail would be needed on how these members were selected and on the makeup of these

groups (i.e. the professional categories of participants, their experience and expertise, etc.).

- Page 11, bullet point 7: in the reference to the need for a teacher professional development framework, a sentence could be added to specify (if possible) how this framework could be implemented, and if there are already any plans or schemes that could be taken as an example.
- Page 12, paragraph 3: I would maybe suggest a full stop after “with regional quality agencies” and start a new sentence with “It provides...”.

I shall look forward to reading the follow-up to this article on a timely and relevant (if long neglected) topic for higher education teaching and learning.