

A Procedure for Managing Teacher Performance Assessment in Universities

Procedimiento para la gestión de la evaluación del desempeño de los profesores universitarios

José Antonio Aguilar Ferrer^{1*} <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1776-1602>

Maricela González Pérez¹ <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2617-5370>

Tania Vargas Fernández¹ <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4285-682x>

¹The Hermanos Saiz Montes de Oca University of Pinar del Rio, Cuba.

*Correspondence: jaguilar@upr.edu.cu

ABSTRACT

Aim: To design a procedure for assessing teacher performance at the University of Pinar del Rio, Cuba, looking for broader correspondence between the outcome of annual assessment and the fulfillment of institutional goals.

Methods: The methods used were historical-logical, modelling, and measurement, which relied on document analysis, surveys, and interview techniques, as well as procedures such as analysis-synthesis and induction-deduction for processing and analyzing empirical and bibliographic information.

Results: Some of the problems resulting from the empirical diagnostic were identified as poor engagement of actors that should be part to the process; it was a tedious assignment for assessors; the schedule set for this task was exceeded; and assessment did not correspond to the categories. A procedure was designed according to the previous information, and other information consulted; it was used to conduct annual teacher performance assessment and comprised 4 phases, 10 stages, and 19 steps, which combine self-assessment, hetero-assessment, and co-assessment.

Conclusions: Although several procedures to assess university professor performance are available, there is no consensus as to the way in which they should be implemented, so every university must manage this process through procedures that ensure proper development, considering the characteristics of an organization, and the goals set for the period.

Key words: performance assessment; university teacher assessment.

RESUMEN

Objetivo: Elaborar un procedimiento para la gestión de la evaluación del desempeño de los profesores en la Universidad de Pinar del Rio, Cuba, en el que se buscó mayor correspondencia entre los resultados de las evaluaciones anuales y el cumplimiento de objetivos institucionales.

Métodos: Se empleó el método histórico-lógico, el de modelación, así como el de medición, los que se aplicaron con ayuda de las técnicas de análisis documental, encuesta y entrevista y los procedimientos de análisis y síntesis e inducción y deducción, para el procesamiento y análisis de la información, tanto bibliográfica como empírica.

Resultados: Como resultado del diagnóstico empírico se identificaron, entre otros problemas, los siguientes: poca participación de los actores que deben involucrarse en el proceso; resulta una tarea tediosa para los evaluadores; se incumple el tiempo establecido; las evaluaciones no se corresponden con las categorías. Sobre esta base y la bibliografía consultada, se elaboró un procedimiento para efectuar la evaluación del desempeño anual de los profesores, conformado por cuatro fases, 10 etapas y 19 pasos donde se combina la autoevaluación, la hetero-evaluación y la co-evaluación.

Conclusiones: Aunque existen numerosos procedimientos para la evaluación del desempeño de los profesores universitarios, no existe consenso en la forma de evaluarlos y hacer esta, por lo que cada universidad debe gestionar este proceso a través de procedimientos que posibiliten su desarrollo adecuado, teniendo en cuenta sus características como organización y los objetivos trazados para el período.

Palabras claves: evaluación del desempeño; evaluación de docentes universitarios.

Received: 10/17/2020

Approved: 02/07/2021

INTRODUCTION

The assessment of university teacher performance cannot do without the roles that teachers must play in every area of performance, depending on the contexts. These roles will correspond to the functions and missions of universities, not just in reference to the teaching-learning process, but to scientific research and off-campus/community activities. Accordingly, the engagement and contribution of the members of the educational community is necessary, as part of a dialogic perspective that promotes professional realization, autonomy, and collaboration between teachers and their communities. "Fair and transparent assessment of teacher performance for every interested group requires, to a large extent, inclusive processes that comprise the academic community, managers, and technicians" (Pacheco, Ibarra, Iñiguez, Lee, and Sánchez, 2018, p. 6).

The objectives of teacher performance assessment are to provide feedback to teachers seeking quality improvements, and to urge them to account for their performance, though frequently, they are unmet. This double purpose suggests the need of contrasted information when interpreting the data from assessment. In other words, it consists of providing a summary to managers containing the abilities of teachers to teach, and offer information to teachers, which can help them enhance teaching by contrasting the areas of strengths and opportunities (Gómez and Valdés, 2019).

Gómez and Valdés (2019), did a review of various authors and models of assessment in the world. They found that the main feature of an assessment system in universities is that teachers should assist other educators in identifying strengths and opportunities in their pedagogic practice; have different opinions that will allow them to embrace sound knowledge, and the existence of omissions, and mistakes to improve and generate high quality education; and have clear objectives and goals to be fulfilled.

The bibliography reviewed shows several studies that document the process of performance assessment of university teachers in different universities and contexts; most

focus on what, but not how to run them. Consequently, each institution has adopted a particular way to perform assessment. Moreover, most performance assessment systems lack comprehensiveness, since they fail to consider assessment directed to all the roles of university teachers, especially full-time teachers. According to Gómez and Valdés (2019), some tend to focus on administrative issues instead of academic performance, whereas others only tackle students' opinions collected through questionnaire surveys. In that sense, Dios de, García, and Muñoz (2017) note that the models of performance assessment of university teachers:

- Assess teaching-learning, but fail to contribute to fulfilling the strategic goals of the university.
- Are focused on the results rather than on continuous improvement of learning.
- Do not engage the ones in charge of leading the organization, therefore, failing to encourage teacher commitment to the academic management.
- Only at times, they permit the identification of education and development needs.
- They do not always encourage teacher quality and excellence.

In Cuban universities, from the Ministry of Higher Education (MES), teacher performance assessment is done according to the legislation in Resolution 66/2014 from MES, which, in turn, is an adjustment of Law No. 116/2013, in reference to the characteristics of these institutions (MES, 2014). As with the decree, the resolution rules that teachers should be assessed annually, according to their functions and teaching and research categories, but it does not include the method of assessment or the procedure to implement the process, leaving it in the hands of institutions.

Moreover, an empirical diagnostic revealed that the current procedure used at the University of Pinar del Rio (UPR) to run the process does not ensure the consensus of all the staff to comply with the objectives, indicators, and goals set for continuous improvement, either individually or collective quality of all the results from the institution.

Accordingly, this research aims to design a procedure for performance assessment management of teachers at the University of Pinar del Rio, looking for greater correspondence among the results of annual assessment and the compliance with

objectives, indicators, and goals of development for the institution and their academic degrees.

DEVELOPMENT

Theoretical-methodological rationale for teacher performance assessment in universities

According to Cuesta (2010), generally, the methods of performance assessment of human resources stem from the application of objective indicators to measure or assess, as part of the performance assessment systems. Their recurrence is not excluding; for instance, the objective-assessment method can be used along with the self-assessment method. The existence of tangible and intangible indicators causes the creation of two groups:

Methods related to tangible indicators (direct indexes): these methods associate with direct, continuous or non-continuous observation offered by accounting records (volume of production, quality of production, job absenteeism).

Methods related to intangible indicators: they refer to aspects related to management, cooperation, competency, commitment, etc., that once in the system of performance assessment do not exclude the methods associated with tangible indicators. Among these methods are self-assessment, objective assessment, 360-degree assessment, and competency-based assessment.

The most commonly used methods for performance assessment of higher education teachers are the ones associated with intangible indicators, particularly the goal-based assessment, self-assessment, assessment by academic heads, and student-made assessment, only to cite a few of the actors usually asked to express opinions about teachers, Muñoz *et al* (cited por Loureiro, Míguez, and Otegui, 2017), and more recently, the competency-based assessment method.

Reis (2013) notes that the 360-degree method of assessment is a circular type involving all the elements associated with the assessee. Interestingly, in higher education, teachers, academic heads, and students are parts of this method to assess teacher performance.

Authors Wellein, Ragucci, and Lapointe (cited by Gómez and Valdés, 2019), claim that several sources of data and instruments are needed to conduct assessment, and have a

comprehensive vision of how the university is conducting education. They suggest teacher self-assessment, and hetero-assessment by specialists, students, and colleagues, because each offers information from several different perspectives, producing a more holistic vision of teaching performance.

Although researchers have looked for more referents regarding what to assess through time, the only way still used in many countries is the questionnaire survey of students. It is so because performance assessment of teachers has generally been associated with teacher roles, leaving behind other relevant aspects of academic activity, like research, management, and off-campus activities (Cancino and Márquez, 2015; Tejada and Ruiz, 2016).

Based on this conception, Tejada and Ruiz (2016) pointed out that the boundaries of university teacher competency profiles, and the establishment of the necessary education cannot be developed without the professional roles that should be assumed (research, teaching, management, and off-campus activities), or the scenario/context mentioned (classroom, institution, and general setting), as a previous step to conduct teacher performance assessment.

Therefore, this study assumes the assertion of Dios de *et al.* (2017), who said,

... in addition to assessing teaching, analyzing the planning, development, and learning evaluation or transference of scientific knowledge, it is also necessary to check the contribution of teachers to the fulfillment of the mission of the university for a particular period of time. (p. 70)

The previous analysis led to the conclusion that there is no unique system, model, or procedure for performance assessment in all the higher education institutions or even in the same country. This process can combine different methods, instruments and indicators, depending on the goals of the institution conducting it.

Results of the empirical diagnostic of the performance assessment process at the UPR

Upon the diagnostic of teacher performance assessment at UPR using secondary sources of information, such as assessment performed in recent years and their summaries contrasted to the reports of goal and requirement fulfillment at the university, as well as a

questionnaire survey of a representative sample of heads of department as the primary source, it was concluded that the main problem was that the plans of teacher results were not customized according to their teaching category, scientific category, years of experience, work objectives, and measurement criteria of the department, which was caused by shortcomings in the existing assessment procedure, the lack of engagement of every actor that should contribute with information, and little knowledge by directors and heads about the procedure required to design the expected results plans and performance assessment.

Procedure to run teacher performance assessment at the University of Pinar del Rio, Cuba

The procedure used by Fernández (2017) was included as referent; it permitted the authors to structure a proposal consisting of four general phases, each comprising 10 stages and 19 steps (Table 1).

Table 1. Phases, stages, and steps of the procedure for teacher performance assessment at the University of Pinar del Rio, Cuba

Phases	Stages	Steps
I-Preparation of performance assmt.	Definition of the objectives of performance assmt. system	
	Definition of performance assmt. process input	
II-Design of the assmt. system	Definition of performance assmt. method	
	Definition of performance assmt. instruments	
III-Implementation of the performance assmt. system	Implementation of the assmt. method	Training the staff in charge of assmt
		Communication of the assmt. procedure to assessees
		Request of form to the Human Resources Office
		Application of assmt. formats
		Redaction of the final assmt.
		Assmt. from superiors
	Communication of final assmt.	Personal interview
		Communication to staff
	Dealing with disagreements	Communication of disagreements to superiors
		Creation of commission by heads of areas
		Solution to conflicts
		Creation of a commission by the president
Submission of assmt. to the Human Resources Office	Appeal to the Base Labor Justice Body	
	Delivery to DRH	
IV-Assmt. process control	Regular controls	Creation of database
		Information to the Board of Directors
		Delivery to MES
	Proposal of improvement actions	Design of the improvement plan
		Process follow-up

Source: Made by the authors

This procedure is based on a compilation of international trends, combining diagnostic assessment with formative and summative assessment of teachers. It was conceived by the top officials of the university as a process consisting of several moments during the calendar year, and ending at the end of the year. Part of teacher self-assessment is based on their expected results plan, with the addition of opinions from students (hetero-assessment), peer-assessment, and assessment from the immediate superior (co-assessment). It also includes information compilation using different types of instruments that combine set criteria, and open to new criteria if necessary, which will determine the merits of the teacher and recommend a continuous improvement plan for development.

Below, every phase, stage, and step in Table 1, is explained.

Phase I: Preparing for performance assessment

Stage 1: Definition of objective of the performance assessment system

The general objective of teacher performance assessment system is defined as one providing the university with a guide to assess the outcome and quality of the work by full-time teachers throughout the year, so there is correspondence between the output of the process and the fulfillment of objectives, indicators and goals, both in the department and the university as a whole.

The specific objectives are,

- To determine overall performance of full-time teachers, depending of their teaching category, scientific category, functions, and responsibilities derived from their posts.
- To provide proper information to institutional management for decision-making in terms of development and teacher training improvements.
- To identify the strengths of full-time teachers to learn their skills and abilities.
- To know the weaknesses of full-time teachers to identify their training and improvement needs.

Stage 2: Preparing for performance assessment

The inputs for the performance assessment process are the following:

Legal bases: Law No.: 116/2013 Labor Code (National Assembly of the People's Power, 2013); Resolution No. No.66/2014 (Ministry of Higher Education [MES], 2014); and Collective Labor Agreement.

Actors in the process:

Assesseees: Full-time teachers at the University of Pinar del Rio.

Assessors:

- Students
- Academic peers (head teachers of the discipline, principal teachers of the academic year, heads of research projects, coordinators of Master's Degrees, Majors, Doctorates, and others related to the activities performed by the assesseees).
- Heads of teaching departments at the university.
- Presidents of Chairs.
- Directors of Municipal University Centers

Persons responsible: Heads of teaching departments at the university, presidents of chairs, faculty deans, directors of municipal university centers, Human Resources Office (DRH) of the university, president of the university.

REQUISITES

Objectivity:

- The performance criterion should be weighed regardless of likes, prejudices, and interests of assessors.
- Different sources should be identified (experience, documents) to generate information and evidence on which judgement about the assessee is based.
- To disregard subjective judgement in directed assessment.

Validity:

- The assessment must provide a faithful portrait of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the assessee.
- The assessment should be made according to the roles and responsibilities of the assessee expressed as the results expected during the year planned.

- To weigh the different criteria of assessment so that proper assessment can be determined.

Transparency:

- The staff members involved in the assessment procedure established should be known.
- The assessment must rely on qualitative and quantitative information.
- Open and reliable communication between the assessees and their superior should be established.
- The immediate superior should play a supportive role to assist the assessees through the current situation or others with higher performance.
- Encourage the assessee to adopt a positive attitude toward the recommendations arisen from the assessment.
- The same assessment criteria will be used for all the teachers.

Rationality:

A reasonable budget for proper functioning of the process should be allocated, in order to ensure the necessary material resources.

Socialization:

The procedure of performance assessment should be spread through training conducted by the DRH to the persons in charge of the assessment process, who upon proper training will inform the teachers of the corresponding areas.

Assessment period: the teacher performance assessment in universities will take place within every calendar year.

Phase II: Design of the assessment system

Stage 3: Definition of the method of performance assessment

The 360-degree method of assessment will be used, by which the various actors engaged issue their opinions, namely teachers, students, academic peers, and immediate superiors. According to this method, the assessees can produce self-assessment, and the assessors will weigh performance through a series of indicators based on observable behaviors of the person during their daily professional practice.

The opinions from academic peers can come from teachers of the same department, head teachers of the discipline, principal teachers of the academic year, heads of research projects, coordinators of Master's Degrees, Majors, Doctorates, and others related to the activities performed by the assessees. Well-thought assessment will include opinions from the highest possible number of actors.

Stage 4: Definitions of instruments for performance assessment

Two instruments were designed considering the need of knowing the opinions of every actor about teacher performance, one was used for teacher self-assessment, the assessment made by academic peers and the immediate superior (Appendix 1); the other for students to respond as a questionnaire survey (Appendix 2).

These instruments assess a group of opinions associated with the following areas:

- Undergraduate and postgraduate teaching-learning
- Political-ideological work
- Methodological work
- Science and innovation work
- Training
- Off-campus work

In each case, the desegregation of every aspect was in keeping with the Resolution 66/2014, previously cited, and the Rules for the application of teaching categories in higher education (MES, 2017).

Phase III: Implementation of the performance assessment system

Stage 5: Implementation of the method of assessment

Step 1. Training of staff responsible of assessment: The DRH will train the persons in charge of assessment about the procedure to implement, and will deliver copies of assessing formats designed to compile information.

Step 2. Communication of the assessment procedure to assessees. The immediate superiors will inform the subordinate teachers about the characteristics of the assessment procedure implemented, allowing them to become acquainted with it for satisfactory results.

Step 3. Request for the payroll at the Human Resources Office: The immediate superiors will request the department or office payroll at the DRH to work on the assessment of 100% of teachers.

Step 4. Application of assessment formats: After training, the immediate superiors will apply the assessment instruments to the assessees in every quarter, so they can express their considerations. The results must be the base for partial analyses of compliance with the plan of expected results. This allows for the implementation of corrective measures, and make adjustments to the plan, depending on the circumstances. However, every person in charge may adjust this frequency according to the characteristics of the staff. It is not advisable that the only assessment practice in terms of teacher performance takes place during the final assessment.

The head teacher of the academic year will ask students to use the assessing instrument during the last week of classes and subjects delivered by the particular teacher. Upon assessing all the indicators, students will express their considerations about the strengths and aspects to be improved. Then the immediate superior calculates the score in the assessment, endorsing the application of the instrument with the signature of both parties. The instruments for the other assessors, including the immediate superior will provide the required personal data, and the assessors will put an (X) next to the type of assessment (self-assessment, academic peers, immediate superior), and the rating they consider qualifies performance, according to all the indicators established, and following the instructions in the instruments.

The immediate superiors should consider the fulfillment of the activities planned in the results of the assessee, and the aspects to be improved resulting from previous assessment.

The resulting rating from the application of the instruments will be calculated by the immediate superior, which will sum all the scores in every indicator to later determine the score of the final assessment, considering the weight attributed to each indicator. Upon calculation, the immediate superior evaluates the strengths identified as well as the aspects to be improved. To conclude, the document is signed by the two assessors.

Step 5. Making the final assessment: The immediate superiors will make the final assessment, in which they will draft a qualitative summary of the opinions expressed by the

different assessors about the assessing indicator established. The qualification of the assessment is determined by the sum of the remaining scores of the assessment given by the different assessors multiplied by the influence factor defined for each one, where:

- Assessment from students represents 10 points.
- Self-assessment represents 20 points.
- Assessment from academic peers represents 30 points.
- Assessment from the immediate superiors represents 40 points.

Upon calculation of the final score, the immediate superior will inform the corresponding value, according to the scale suggested in Table 2.

Table 2. Qualification scale for the final assessment

C	Average (A)	Good (B)	Very Good (VG)	Excellent (E)
$0 < VT \leq 50$	$51 < VT \leq 75$	$76 < VT \leq 85$	$86 < VT \leq 95$	$96 < VT \leq 100$

Source: Made by the authors

It will define the qualification achieved, where:

Bad: when there is significant and/or repeated lack of compliance.

Average: when there is lack of compliance with the plan of expected results.

Good: when the work planned is accomplished.

Very Good: when more than the work planned is accomplished.

Excellent: when more than the work planned is accomplished, and relevant results that contribute to the objectives of the university are accomplished.

Step 6. Criteria of immediate superiors: The immediate superiors will show their assessment to their superiors (dean or president), which will assess the results, and suggest previously unconsidered grounds that can change the outcome.

Stage 6: Communication of the final assessment

Step 7. Individual interview: The immediate superiors communicate the qualification individually to every assessee, and will show the evidence of transparency of the process conducted, for which they must ensure a favorable environment.

The assessee expresses their agreement or disagreement with the opinions expressed, and both parties sign the document to conclude the process, regardless of the agreements or disagreements.

Step 8. Communication to the staff: The immediate superiors will meet with the staff and the representative from the union, and communicate the results of the assessment process. In the meeting, the fulfillment of the objectives set for the period will be discussed, including how the work of every teacher contributed to such compliance, including a special mention of teachers who have performed a relevant work during the period.

Stage 7: Dealing with disagreements:

Step 9. Communications of disagreements to the superiors: Should there be disagreements concerning the outcome of the process, the assessee will express their discrepancies in writing within the following seven (7) office days of the notification, to the dean or director, and will send a copy to the corresponding union organization.

Step 10. Creation of commissions by area superiors: The dean or director will create a commission with workers from the area that include a representative of the union in the area, in order to analyze the conflict.

Step 11. Solution of discrepancies: The dean or director solves the discrepancy in a period of twenty (20) office days. If the assessee still disagrees with the result, they may turn to the president within the next seven (7) office days past the date of the decision by the corresponding level. After hearing from the union representative, the conflict is solved in a period of twenty (20) office days, starting from the day the claim is received.

Step 12. Creation of a commission by the president: The president will create a commission that includes a representative of the union at the institution to analyze the conflict. The results of the decision are unappealable.

Step 13. Claim to the Base Labor Justice Body: In case the assessee notices violations of the rules and procedures, they may submit a written legal claim to that entity.

Stage 8: Delivery of assessment results to the Human Resources Office

Step 14. Delivery to DRH: The immediate superiors will deliver the assessments to the staff designated to do so, during the first quarter of the year following the assessment. In this process, the quality and quantity of assessment documents will be checked (only the final assessment form).

Phase IV: Control of assessment

It is important to conduct regular controls of performance assessment as a follow-up of the process. This will ensure proper monitoring, paying due attention to the deficiencies observed, and identifying the elements that improve the process.

Stage 9: Regular control

The DRH will control the development of assessment in all the areas every six months. Regarding faculties, this control is recommended according to the plan of comprehensive control visits.

Step 15. Creation of the database: The fulfillment of the indicators set for process control both at staff and institutional levels will be recorded (through the Human Resources Office), as shown in Table 3. Accordingly, a database is designed including the results of the assessment process, showing the individual data of teachers by area, and the outcome of the assessment.

Table 3. Indicators of assessment process control

Indicators	Calculation expression	Objective
Level of satisfaction with ED (SED) results	$SED = (TcED / Tte) \times 100$ Where: TcED: total teachers who agree with ED Tte: Total teachers assessed	To determine the level of teacher satisfaction with the ED results.
Level of fulfillment of the ED (CED) process	$CED = (TED / Tte) \times 100$ Where: TED: teachers assessed according to the ED process Tte: total teachers assessed	To determine the percent of fulfillment of the ED process.
Percentage of teachers assessed as Bad (Ctm)	$Ctm = (TEM / Tte) \times 100$ Where: TEM: teachers assessed as Bad Tte: total teachers assessed	To show the assessment results in percents to contrast them to the results of the analysis of fulfillment of objective, indicators, and goals.
Percentage of teachers assessed as Average (Ctr)	$Ctr = (TER / Tte) \times 100$ Where: TER: total teachers assessed as Average Tte: total teachers assessed	
Percentage of teachers assessed as Good (Ctb)	$Ctb = (TEB / Tte) \times 100$ Where: TEB: total teachers assessed as Good Tte: total teachers assessed	
Percentage of teachers assessed as Very Good (Ctmb)	$Ctmb = (TEMB / Tte) \times 100$ Where: TEMB: total teachers assessed as Very Good Tte: total teachers assessed	
Percentage of teachers assessed as Excellent (Cte)	$Cte = (TEE / Tte) \times 100$ Where: TTE: total teachers assessed as Excellent Tte: total teachers assessed	

ED: performance assessment (Spanish Acronym)

Source: Adapted from Fernández (2017).

Step 16. Information to the Board of Directors: The results of the assessment process are analyzed by the Board of Directors at the University upon concluding the process, in order to analyze the quality of the process and the correspondence of results, fulfillment of objectives, indicators, and goals of the university during that period.

Step 17: Submission to MES: Upon completing the process and following the approval of the Board of Directors, the DRH submits the results to the Ministry of Higher Education, via mail.

Stage 10: Proposal of improvement actions

Step 18. Creation of the improvement plan: The Human Resources Office, will design a plan for improvement that contributes to the improvement of the assessment process.

Step 19. Process follow-up: The Human Resources Office will follow up the results of improvement actions proposed and their impact, comparing the results of previous periods. It will permit the determination of the evolution and current state; it will offer information about new factors that might change the objectives, demands, methods, and indicators of the present performance assessment system indicators, which enables the entity to reach a higher level of human resources management.

CONCLUSIONS

The performance assessment of university teachers is a very complex process, since there is no accurate definition of a good teacher. Though several procedures have been established by several authors for performance assessment, there is lack of consensus in the way of conducting assessment. Consequently, every university must run this process through procedures that ensure proper development, considering the characteristics of the organization and the objectives set for the period.

The diagnostic of the current situation of performance assessment at the UPR revealed that the main problematic was that not always the plans of expected results are properly designed, which is caused by flaws in the procedure and the indicators of performance assessment, the absence of information provided for the process, and the absence of control of the completion of plans of expected results that hinder the fulfillment of the objectives set for the year.

The procedure designed to enhance the assessment process of teachers at UPR has four phases, ten stages, and 19 steps. It comprises the preparation of the process through to the delivery of the final reports to the Ministry of Higher Education, so it is a helpful tool for assessors and the Human Resources Office at the institution.

REFERENCES

- Asamblea Nacional del Poder Popular. (2013). Law No.: 116: Código del Trabajo de la República de Cuba. Publicado en *La Gaceta oficial del 2013*. Cuba. Retrieved from https://www.gacetaoficial.gob.cu/sites/default/files/codigotrabajoactualizado_20022020.pdf
- Cancino, V. y Márquez, T. (2015). Evaluación de desempeño de la función académica: Análisis de un sistema en el contexto universitario chileno. *Formación universitaria* 8(3), 35-46. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-50062015000300005>
- Cuesta, A. (2010). *Tecnología de gestión de recursos humanos* (3ra. ed.). La Habana, Cuba: Editorial Félix Varela y Editorial Academia.
- Dios de, T., García, J. M. y Muñoz, S. (2017). Diseño de un modelo de evaluación y desarrollo docente en una universidad privada. *Revista Complutense de Educación*, 28(1), 61-80. doi: 10.5209/rev_RCED.2017.v28.n1.4871
- Fernández, D. (2017). *Procedimiento para el sistema de evaluación del desempeño de los docentes en universidades públicas angolanas. Estudio de caso: Universidad José Eduardo Dos Santos*. (Tesis Doctoral), Universidad de La Habana, Cuba). Retrieved from <https://elibro.net/ereader/unanicaragua/90992>
- Gómez, L. F. y Valdés, M. G. (2019). La evaluación del desempeño docente en la educación superior. *Revista de Psicología Educativa*, 7(2), 479-515. doi: 10.20511/pyr2019.v7n2.255
- Loureiro, S., Míguez, M. y Otegui, X. (2016). Desempeño docente en la enseñanza universitaria: análisis de las opiniones estudiantiles. *Cuadernos de Investigación Educativa*, 1(7), 55-67. doi: 10.18861/cied.2016.7.1.2576
- Ministerio de Educación Superior. MES (2014). Resolución 66: Procedimiento para la evaluación de los profesores universitarios del sistema de la educación superior. Publicado en *La Gaceta Oficial* No. 29 del 17 de julio de 2014. Cuba. <https://www.gacetaoficial.gob.cu/es/gaceta-oficial-no-29-extraordinaria-de-2014,542-546>
- Ministerio de Educación Superior. MES (2017). Resolución 85: Reglamento para la aplicación de las categorías docentes de la educación superior. Publicado en *La*

Gaceta Oficial No. 5 ordinaria de 2017. Cuba. Retrieved from <https://www.gacetaoficial.gob.cu/es/resolucion-85-de-2016-de-ministerio-de-educacion-superior>

Pacheco, M. L., Ibarra, I., Iñiguez, M. E., Lee, H. y Sánchez, C. (2018). La evaluación del desempeño docente en la educación superior. *Revista Digital Universitaria*, 6(19), 2-18. doi: <http://doi.org/10.22201/codeic.16076079e.2018.v19n6.a2>

Reis, G. (2013). *Avaliação 360 graus. Un instrumento de desenvolvimento gerencial*. Brasília, Brasil: Editorial Atlas.

Tejada, J. y Ruiz, C. (2016). Evaluación de competencias profesionales en educación superior: Retos e implicaciones. *Educación XXI*, 19(1), 17-38. doi: <http://doi.org/10.5944/educXX1.12175>

Conflict of interest and conflict of ethics statement

The authors declare that this manuscript is original, and has not been submitted to another journal. We are responsible for the content published in this paper, and certify the existence of no plagiarism, or interest or ethical conflicts.

Authorship statement

José Antonio Aguilar Ferrer. Conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, research, validation, redaction, proofreading and editing.

Maricela González Pérez. Conceptualization, methodology, project management, supervision, visualization, redaction of the original draft.

Tania Vargas Fernández. Supervision, methodology, redaction, proofreading, editing.