

Teaching Evaluation Guide

DOCENTIA

Index

1. Teaching evaluation strategy	3
1.1. Aim of teaching evaluation and the association with teaching staff policy	3
1.2. Teaching evaluation's scope of application.....	3
1.3. Compulsory/voluntary teaching evaluation	4
1.4. Frequency.....	4
1.5. Dissemination	4
1.6. Parties involved in the evaluation process	5
2. Teaching evaluation methodology	5
2.1 Evaluation dimensions	5
2.2 Evaluation criteria	5
2.3 Sources and data collection procedures	6
3. The University's Teaching Evaluation Committee (CADU)	7
3.1 Selection criteria and structure	7
3.2 Organisation	8
3.3 Decision making.....	9
3.4 Evaluation protocol	9
3.5 Evaluation report.....	9
3.6 Failure to comply with the deadline.....	9
4. Teacher Evaluation Review Committee (CRAD)	10
4.1 Selection, structure and operation	10
4.2 Submitting objections.....	10
4.3 Communication	10
5. Teaching evaluation results and decision-making	11
5.1 Decision-making procedures following the evaluation	11
5.2 Procedures for monitoring the actions resulting from teacher evaluations..	11
5.3 Procedures for disseminating the results of the teaching evaluation	12
Annexes	13

1. Teaching evaluation strategy

The Universitat Internacional de Catalunya (UIC Barcelona) is a non-profit institution founded and advocated by the Catalan Family Foundation. UIC Barcelona's unique social objective is quality higher education, as stated in Article 35 of the Regulations on the Organisation and Operation of the University:

“The Universitat Internacional de Catalunya considers the promotion and assurance of its teaching and research quality to be an essential objective of its university policy, complying at all times with the evaluation standards required for certification and accreditation by the National Agency for the Evaluation of Quality (ANECA) and Accreditation or by the Catalan University Quality Assurance Agency (AQU Catalunya), both nationally and internationally.”

With the aim of promoting and assuring the teaching quality of its teaching staff and degree programmes, and in accordance with the Strategic Plan for the integration of UIC Barcelona into the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), approved on 6 March 2007 by the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors (hereinafter, the Board of Governors), UIC Barcelona has drawn up this *Teaching Evaluation Guide*.

On 22 September 2016, AQU Catalunya, by means of their Specific Committee for the Assessment of Individual Merits and Activities (CEMAI), favourably accredited the Guide.

1.1. Aim of teaching evaluation and the association with teaching staff policy

The aim of evaluating UIC Barcelona teaching staff's teaching activity is to continuously improve its quality. The objective underlying the design of this Guide is to ensure that teaching evaluation serves as a key instrument for improving each lecturer's/professor's teaching activity and, as a consequence, guaranteeing the quality of the degree programmes taught at UIC Barcelona.

Among the materials teaching staff have access to to improve the quality of their teaching, UIC Barcelona provides them with a teaching evaluation system, which constitutes a genuine and effective aid. This system is accompanied by a teaching training plan, described in Section 5.1 of this Guide, and considers both UIC Barcelona's strategic objectives and its teaching staff's evaluation results.

The UIC Barcelona Internal Regulations for Teaching Staff establishes their selection, promotion and financial incentive systems, depending on their academic category. In order to guarantee teaching staff's teaching quality, they must obtain a positive teaching evaluation in the most recently held call, to approve any permanent position and to recognise a five-year teaching period with the corresponding salary increase.

1.2. Teaching evaluation's scope of application

All permanent and temporary teaching staff at UIC Barcelona will be subject to an evaluation of their teaching activity.

Adjunct teaching staff will be able to opt in voluntarily.

1.3. Compulsory/voluntary teaching evaluation

All permanent and temporary teaching staff are obliged to undergo a teaching evaluation every five years. Teaching staff must have been working as a permanent lecturer/professor for at least five years in order to undergo their first teaching evaluation.

Under exceptional circumstances, teaching staff who undergo two consecutive evaluations with “very favourable” results, may undergo subsequent evaluations every ten years, providing that their teaching activity is deemed positive whenever it is monitored. However, teaching staff may request a voluntary evaluation after five years. The responsibility of monitoring teaching staff will fall to their respective Faculty Board.

All adjunct teaching staff who have taught an average of at least eight credits over the course of their academic years teaching, which are subject to a teaching evaluation, may voluntarily apply for the teaching evaluation.

Teaching staff who obtain a “unfavourable” evaluation, regardless of their category, are obliged to undergo a new teaching evaluation after two further academic years and after having followed a staff training plan or according to the recommendations made by the University's Teaching Evaluation Committee (hereinafter, the CADU).

In the event that a lecturer, under an obligation to apply, fails to meet the deadlines or submits the documentation incorrectly, the CADU will determine the final assessment and the actions to be taken.

All lecturers/professors who apply for the teaching evaluation must have the documentation necessary to be evaluated (student surveys and reports from the directors of the corresponding academic year).

1.4. Frequency

The UIC Barcelona Board of Governors will establish an annual teaching evaluation call at the beginning of each academic year. The merits under assessment will be those obtained by teaching staff since their last positive evaluation (or, if they have none, since joining the teaching evaluation's scope of application) until the end of the academic year immediately prior to the call.

A favourable teacher evaluation will be valid for five years.

1.5. Dissemination

The annual teaching evaluation call will be published on the intranet, specifically in the portfolios on each member of UIC Barcelona teaching staff's personal page. The Innovation and Educational Quality Service (SIQE) will personally notify all members of teaching staff who are obliged to apply to the call, and will send a general notification to all lecturers/professors so that they may apply on a voluntary basis.

Teaching staff will have permanent access to the Teaching Evaluation Guide via their portfolios, as well as the necessary forms for the evaluation process, the assessment board members and the regulations governing each call.

1.6. Parties involved in the evaluation process

The parties involved in the evaluation process have different roles: students will usually participate by filling in surveys upon completion of each subject; academic directors will complete an annual report on teaching staff who are subject to the teaching evaluation, and teaching staff members themselves will complete a self-assessment report when they apply to the evaluation call.

The CADU is responsible for issuing the assessment (it may form sub-committees, if necessary). It will receive specialist support and assistance from SIQE, who will monitor all teaching staff involved in the teaching evaluation. The Teaching Evaluation Review Committee (CRAD) will intervene in the event of disputes.

2. Teaching evaluation methodology

This Guide follows the teaching activity evaluation model proposed by ANECA and AQU Catalunya in the Docentia program, including all the guidance provided in this model for drawing up the assessment procedure that has been deemed appropriate for use by UIC Barcelona.

2.1 Evaluation dimensions

The evaluation will focus on three key dimensions of teaching activity: planning, implementation and results.

The planning dimension will focus on the classification of the subjects taught by the lecturer, the course guide, teaching coordination, the choice of content, methodological strategies and prior knowledge of the characteristics of the group of students.

The implementation dimension will focus on the teaching-learning activities carried out, with special focus on tutorial activity, and compliance with the established assessment criteria and procedures.

The results dimension will deal with the satisfaction of the stakeholders involved, students' fulfilment of the learning objectives and the review and improvement of the lecturer's/professor's teaching activity.

This last dimension also covers, as examples of excellence, research into teaching, participation in funded teaching innovation projects, presentations at congresses or conferences and publications on good teaching practices and activities as a teacher trainer, provided that the focus is on university teaching.

2.2 Evaluation criteria

There are four teaching activity evaluation criteria: adequacy, efficiency, satisfaction and focus on improving teaching, which are applied to the aforementioned dimensions. These criteria should be viewed as interrelated matters. They should be taken into consideration collectively, in order to identify areas for improvement in terms of teaching activity.

- a) Adequacy: the planning and implementation of teaching activity must respond to the learning requirements established by UIC Barcelona, the centre in question and the corresponding degree programme. Therefore, teaching activity may be considered *very inadequate* (it does

not meet the learning requirements), *not very adequate* (it partially meets the learning requirements), *adequate but could be improved* (it adequately meets the requirements but contains aspects that need to be improved), or *very adequate* (it meets and exceeds the requirements).

- b) Efficiency: considering the resources made available to the lecturer, teaching activities must enable students to achieve the competences laid out in the curriculum. Understood from this perspective, efficiency relates to the adequacy of the results of the UIC Barcelona learning requirements. Therefore, teaching activity may be considered *very inefficient*, (the results, given the available resources, do not meet the key objectives), *not very efficient* (the results, given the available resources, partially meet the key objectives), *efficient but could be improved* (the results, given the available resources, meet the key objectives but could be improved) or *very efficient* (the results, given the available resources, meet both the general and specific objectives).
- c) Satisfaction: teaching activity must generate positive feedback from students, academic directors and colleagues with whom the lecturer/professor must coordinate. Therefore, teaching activity can be considered *very unsatisfactory*, *unsatisfactory*, *satisfactory but could be improved*, or *very satisfactory*.
- d) Focus on improving teaching: teaching activity must be addressed on the basis of a reflection by teaching staff on their own practice, which offers them a chance to introduce appropriate changes to improve on any of the three dimensions. Therefore, the teaching activity may be considered *poorly focused on improving teaching*, (the proposed changes or actions undertaken are not geared towards improving teaching), *somewhat focused on improving teaching* (the proposed changes or actions undertaken are partially geared towards improving teaching), *focused on improving teaching* (the proposed changes or actions undertaken are geared towards improving teaching but complementary changes should also be added) or *very focused on improving teaching* (the proposed changes or actions undertaken are wholly geared towards improving teaching).

2.3 Sources and data collection procedures

The sources, data collection procedures and purpose of this data collection vary depending on the provider:

- a) Students: Upon completing each subject, students will be invited to fill out a questionnaire about the teaching provided by each of their lecturers/professors.

SIQE will coordinate the collection of this data and its subsequent processing. It can be accessed by teaching staff, academic directors of the degree programme on which the subjects are taught and the director of the department to which the is assigned. This data will also be included in each lecturer's/professor's teaching record.

If deemed necessary, SIQE may use other methods such as classroom observation, focus groups or interviews to obtain or complete information from students.

Annex 1 contains a model of this questionnaire.

- b) Academic directors: At the end of each academic year, the academic directors will write a report on all permanent teaching staff that have taught on their degree programme and who

form part of the teaching evaluation's scope of application. The director may attach any evidence they consider appropriate to the report. With regard to the degree programme director's teaching activity, the report shall be written by the dean of the faculty or the director of the school in which the degree programme is taught.

The degree programme directors will send their report to each lecturer/professor in question. They will also send it to SIQE, who will forward it on to the director of the department to which the lecturer/professor is assigned. These annual reports will also be included in each lecturer's/professor's teaching record.

Annex 2 contains a model of this report.

- c) Teaching staff: at the end of each subject, teaching staff have the chance to briefly assess their teaching activity in the subject section (for example, highlight their strengths, weaknesses and make suggestions for improvement), to which only they and the academic director will have access. These assessments can be very useful for writing the self-assessment reports on teaching activity.

This self-assessment report, necessary for applying to undergo the teaching evaluation, will cover all teaching activity completed during the period under assessment. The lecturer/professor must apply before the deadline stipulated by the teaching evaluation call to which they are subject.

Annex 3 contains both self-assessment report models recommended for use as a guide according to the seniority of the lecturer: initial version (first five years teaching at UIC Barcelona), consolidated version (more than five years teaching at UIC Barcelona). Teaching staff may include all the evidence they deem appropriate to complement their record.

When teaching staff participate in the teaching evaluation, SIQE will provide the CADU with all the information included in the lecturer's/professor's teaching record since the last positive evaluation (or, if they have none, since joining the teaching evaluation's scope of application) until the end of the academic year immediately prior to the call.

3. The University's Teaching Evaluation Committee (CADU)

3.1 Selection criteria and structure

The CADU will be responsible for the evaluation of lecturers'/professors' teaching activity when they participate in the teaching evaluation calls.

The UIC Barcelona Board of Governors will appoint the members of this committee, following the proposal of the vice-rector, according to the following **selection criteria**:

1. That they have a strong teaching reputation (academic in the case of students, professional in the case of graduates).
2. That they are involved in different disciplines or fields of knowledge taught at UIC Barcelona.
3. That they are prepared to learn about, if necessary, the evaluation processes.

This Committee will be **structured** as follows:

- President: Vice-rector for Quality
- Members:
 - 1 dean, director of faculty or department that has been working at UIC Barcelona for over five years
 - 1 lecturer/professor from a permanent teaching category who has been working at UIC Barcelona for over five years and who has obtained a favourable evaluation in a previous call
 - 1 lecturer/professor from a temporary teaching category who has been working at UIC Barcelona for over five years and who has obtained a favourable evaluation in a previous call
 - 1 bachelor's, master's or doctoral degree student
 - 1 UIC Barcelona graduate
 - 1 lecturer/professor from outside the UIC Barcelona community
- Secretary: head of SIQE (with voice but no vote)

The Board of Governors shall publish the CADU's structure for that year's annual call, for which teaching staff who are already members of the Committee will not be eligible to apply. Should it be necessary, due to the volume of teaching staff participating in the call, the CADU may establish sub-committees chaired by one of the members and with the head of SIQE as secretary, with the approval of the Board of Governors. However, the CADU's sole responsibility is to evaluate teaching activity. The Committee's president will inform the Board of Governors about the evaluation process and results.

3.2 Organisation

Before starting the evaluation process, CADU members will receive training on Docentia's objectives and the evaluation procedure to be carried out. At the end of the training period, all necessary documentation will be handed over to them, including the records of the lecturers/professors that have applied to the call: student satisfaction surveys, lecturer's/professor's self-assessment report, the report from the degree programme director and the evaluation protocols.

Each CADU member will have to sign a confidentiality agreement regarding the data to which they have access.

The CADU members will have a pre-determined period of time to submit their preliminary assessments of each of the lecturers/professors under evaluation.

With all preliminary assessments, the CADU secretary will prepare a single preliminary report for each lecturer, including quantitative and qualitative assessments and comments from the evaluating committee regarding the teaching criteria and dimensions.

Subsequently, the CADU's evaluation meeting will take place: the assessment of the lecturers'/professors' teaching will be agreed upon by a majority vote; the procedures for decision-making derived from the evaluation (overall report) will be defined; specific training courses for improving lecturers/professors with "unfavourable" evaluation results will be outlined; and recommendations for the rest of the teaching staff will be put forward.

Finally, the CADU will hold a meeting to issue their final reports, the purpose of which is to approve the overall report as well as teaching staff's individual evaluation reports.

Minutes shall be taken for each CADU meeting.

3.3 Decision making

The CADU's decision shall be made following a majority agreement, with a deciding vote by the president in the event of a tie. Both the qualitative assessment of the teaching activity of the lecturers/professors under evaluation and the training and improvement-oriented actions to be presented, will be agreed upon at the evaluation meeting to be attended by all members of the Committee.

3.4 Evaluation protocol

In order to carry out the evaluations, the evaluators must rely on the information contained in the lecturer's/professor's teaching records, which will be provided to them by SIQE. Once the information about the lecturer/professor in question has been analysed, the evaluators must make assessments of the teaching activity, considering the three dimensions described in Section 2.1 and the evaluation criteria set out in Section 2.2 of this Guide. The evaluation protocol is a tool designed to facilitate the evaluators' task.

3.5 Evaluation report

The evaluation of the lecturer's/professor's teaching activities will take the form of a report with an analytical and global approach. Firstly, an analytical assessment will be made considering the three dimensions evaluated (planning, implementation and results of the teaching activity) and the four established criteria (adequacy, efficiency, satisfaction and focus on improvement), in accordance with the parameters mentioned in Section 2.

Secondly, on the basis of these analytical evaluations, an overall evaluation of the lecturers'/professors teaching activity will be made, deeming it "unfavourable", "conditionally favourable", "favourable" or "very favourable". The latter qualification may be based on excellence merits such as those mentioned in the last paragraph of section 2.1.

In the case of a "conditionally favourable" or "unfavourable" evaluation, the report must disclose a reasoned explanation of the assessments and recommendations made to the lecturer/professor to improve their teaching activity. In the case of the other two assessments, the report may also contain recommendations for improvement.

3.6 Failure to comply with the deadline

In the event that a lecturer/professor obliged to submit a self-assessment report fails to do so within the deadlines established by that call, the CADU may issue a "conditionally favourable" assessment due to lack of rigour and require the lecturer/professor to resubmit their report to the following call.

4. Teacher Evaluation Review Committee (CRAD)

In the event that a lecturer/professor disagrees with the evaluation they have received, they may request that a review be carried out by the CRAD, whose sole purpose it is to resolve all requests of this nature.

4.1 Selection, structure and operation

The CRAD members will be appointed by the Board of Governors. No member may be a member of the CADU at the same time.

The CRAD will be chaired by a senior lecturer/professor at UIC Barcelona and will have two members: another senior lecturer/professor at UIC Barcelona and an external lecturer/professor from UIC Barcelona.

All members of the CRAD will receive the teachers' records together with their reasoned request for review. Within a maximum period of three weeks, the CRAD members must reach a consensus on their assessment and issue a majority or unanimous decision on the lecturer's/professor's final evaluation, as well as ratify the assessment made by the CADU, or modify it. The CRAD can also make recommendations to the member of teaching staff and observations on how they might improve their teaching.

4.2 Submitting objections

In order to request a review of the evaluation results, lecturers/professors must submit a reasoned request regarding their objection to the CADU secretary during the week following reception of their decision. The CADU secretary will forward the application to the general secretary, who will contact the CRAD members and establish the resolution deadlines for the objections submitted.

The lecturer/professor in question will not be able to submit any additional documentation not already included in the CADU's initial record.

4.3 Communication

The CRAD president will send the final assessment reports to the general secretary as soon as a consensus has been reached.

The general secretary will be responsible for informing teaching staff of the results of their review via their personal email account in a maximum period of four weeks following notification of the teaching evaluation.

5. Teaching evaluation results and decision-making

5.1 Decision-making procedures following the evaluation

Aside from the teaching reports on each lecturer/professor who has undergone the evaluation, the CADU will also issue an overall evaluation report written during that same call. On the basis of this report, and considering the University's strategic objectives and the feedback gathered from the degree programmes, SIQE, together with the department responsible for training at the University, will draw up a teacher training plan for UIC Barcelona teaching staff, which will be submitted to the Board of Governors for approval.

This plan will consist of a series of training actions. Each training action will focus on a specific aspect of one of the evaluated dimensions (teaching planning, implementation or results), for which a significant percentage of the evaluated lecturers'/professors' demonstrate room for improvement. Once approved, this plan will be rolled out by training management and offered to all centres.

For teaching staff who receive an "unfavourable" evaluation of their teaching activity who continue at UIC Barcelona, this global training plan will be complemented by a personalised training plan for each staff member, based on the report drawn up by the CADU regarding their teaching. Training management will contact the head of the department to which the teaching staff member is ascribed in order to outline the personalised training actions. This personalised plan will be agreed upon by the lecturer/professor and the head of the department with a view to significantly improving their teaching within a period of two academic years, at which time they must apply to undergo another evaluation process. Training management will support and monitor these teaching improvement actions.

In the event of a second negative evaluation, the Board of the centre in question shall send a report to the Board of Governors regarding the lecturer's/professor's teaching ability and any proposals it deems appropriate. In light of this report, it will be up to the Board of Governors to decide whether the lecturer/professor should continue to teach at UIC Barcelona or whether they should reapply for a new call for applications.

Aside from the teaching reports on each lecturer/professor to undergo the evaluated, the CADU will also issue an overall evaluation report written in that same call. On the basis of this report, and considering the University's strategic objectives and the opinions gathered from the degree programmes, SIQE, together with training management at the University, will draw up a teaching training plan for UIC Barcelona teaching staff, which will be submitted to the Board of Governors for approval.

In addition to steering these training actions, the results of the teaching activity evaluations also have an impact on selection, promotion and financial incentive processes.

5.2 Procedures for monitoring the actions resulting from teacher evaluations

Training management will design a mechanism to monitor the training plans resulting from the teaching evaluations of teaching staff at UIC Barcelona.

In order to monitor these actions, the following elements will be needed:

- The plan's key features
- Development and application
- Stakeholder satisfaction
- The impact felt by teaching staff, students and the University

5.3 Procedures for disseminating the results of the teaching evaluation

These procedures should be followed when it comes to circulating the evaluation results:

1. To the Board of Governors: the presidents of both committees (CADU and CRAD, where relevant) will inform the Board of Governors of the CADU's overall report and of the teaching staff evaluation results alongside the final assessments of each of the lecturers/professors to undergo the evaluation. The reports will be sent to SIQE and will be archived in the lecturer's/professor's teaching record.
2. To the teaching staff under evaluation: the lecturers/professors that applied to the evaluation call will receive the final report on the results of their teaching evaluation from the CADU secretary, together with a teaching certificate in the case of "favourable" or "very favourable" evaluation reports. The report allows all lecturers/professors who are not satisfied with their evaluation to submit their objection to the CRAD. In these cases, they will have to wait for a new resolution to be issued in order to receive the definitive teaching evaluation.

Together with the report, lecturers/professors will receive a summary of the evaluation process carried out by the CADU and the evaluation results of the teaching evaluation of all teaching staff who applied to the call in terms of percentages.

3. To the academic directors and department directors: once the evaluated lecturer/professor has received the report, SIQE will send their final results to the academic directors and the directors of the departments to which the lecturers/professors are ascribed.
4. To the centre Board: once the evaluation process is complete, the CADU secretary will notify all the University's centre boards of the evaluation results in the form of percentages, as well as sending them the CADU's overall report.
5. To other UIC Barcelona teaching staff members: The CADU secretary will inform the rest of the teachers, through the personal portal, of the overall results of the evaluated teachers and will circulate the CADU's overall report.
6. To students: once the evaluation process is complete, students will be informed of the overall results of the evaluated teaching staff, via their personal portal.

Annexes

Annex 1: Student survey

Annex 2: Academic director's report

Annex 3: Lecturer's/professor's self-assessment report

Annex 1: Student survey

The survey features questions related to predetermined features that are included as recommendations within the Docentia program. They are therefore considered as tasks relating to the planning, implementation and results of the teaching activity. All questions are focused on evaluating teaching staff and not the subject they teach, which could result in the student actually evaluating the subject (e.g., level of difficulty) and not the teaching activity carried out by the teaching staff member.

With regard to the responses, a survey model has been proposed in which the ratings range from 1 to 5, the latter being students' most positive rating of the lecturer's/professor's activity. This enables students to gauge their assessment in one of two categories (agreement or disagreement), as well as giving them the chance to express a neutral opinion.

This survey has been validated by two different groups on both UIC Barcelona campuses, in order to verify the absence of linguistic errors or to identify questions that have been missed.

The surveys are completely anonymous and it is possible to complete them online or via the 'e-click' system (in person using a portable device).

With a view to the teaching evaluation of the teaching staff, only the surveys for subjects with a participation rate of more than 20% of enrolled students will be considered.

The wording of the questions has been adapted for the work placement and Final (Master's) Degree Project subjects.

Student survey

Subject

Degree programme

Academic year

Semester

Lecturer

1	Planning and organisation of teaching	1	2	3	4	5
2	Time keeping at the start and end of class	1	2	3	4	5
3	Clarity of explanations	1	2	3	4	5
4	Lecturer's/professor's motivation in the classroom	1	2	3	4	5
5	Encouragement of class participation	1	2	3	4	5
6	Teaching methodologies and activities	1	2	3	4	5
7	Clarity of the established evaluation criteria	1	2	3	4	5
8	Support outside the classroom	1	2	3	4	5
9	General satisfaction with the lecturer's/professor's teaching	1	2	3	4	5

1 - Strongly disagree

2 - Disagree

3 - Nether agree nor disagree

4 - Agree

5 - Strongly agree

Observations

Annex 2. Academic director's report

At the end of the academic year, academic directors must complete a report regarding their teaching staff's overall teaching. Another member of teaching staff from the same faculty or department board will carry out the report for the academic director.

In order to write the report, the directors have access to the *Academic directors' guide*, which will provide them with guidance on the sources of information and necessary evidence, with a view to completing all reports with the same level of objectivity and rigour.

The director will be encouraged to have a conversation with their teaching staff at the end of the academic year to discuss the aspects covered in the report, as well as to jointly establish areas for improvement.

Lecturer/professor
Degree programme

1	Planning of the teaching	1	2	3	4	5
2	Teaching coordination	1	2	3	4	5
3	Evolution of the teaching	1	2	3	4	5
4	Student assessment	1	2	3	4	5
5	Focus on improvement	1	2	3	4	5
6	Overall satisfaction with the lecturer's/professor's teaching	1	2	3	4	5

1 - Strongly disagree

2 - Disagree

3 - Nether agree nor disagree

4 - Agree

5 - Strongly agree

Observations

Annex 3. Lecturer's/professor's self-assessment report

Teaching staff who apply to undergo the teaching evaluation must submit a self-assessment report in which they express their thoughts principally regarding the three dimensions described in the Guide (planning, implementation and results), in relation to teaching at UIC Barcelona in the academic years subject to the evaluation.

The thoughts expressed by teaching staff in their self-assessment report must be clear and comprehensive and cover all subjects taught by them.

There are two types of self-assessment report, depending on how many years staff have spent teaching at UIC Barcelona:

INITIAL self-assessment report: Teaching staff who have been teaching at UIC Barcelona for between one and five years

CONSOLIDATED self-assessment report: Teaching staff who have been teaching at UIC Barcelona for more than five years

Self-assessment report: Initial version

(Teaching staff who have been teaching at UIC Barcelona for between one and five years)

LECTURER/PROFESSOR DETAILS

Name, surname(s):

Department/faculty:

Number of years teaching at university level:

Number of years teaching at UIC Barcelona:

Academic category:

PLANNING

Reflect upon your strengths and possible areas for improvement regarding your lesson planning:
Choice of content, materials and methodological and assessment strategies, teaching coordination with other lecturers/professors for the subject and degree programme, knowledge of the group's profile, etc.

Points to be assessed concerning planning the teaching activity	1	2	3	4	5
I clearly inform my students about the objectives for the subjects I teach.					
I clearly inform my students about the assessment system for the subjects I teach.					
I update and review the materials and resources, as well as the planned activities, I use to teach my subjects.					
I get involved in coordination efforts with other members of teaching staff on the degree programme I teach on.					
I take into consideration all criteria and guidelines of the degree programme I teach on.					

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TEACHING ACTIVITY

Reflect upon your strengths and possible areas for improvement regarding your implementation of the teaching activity:
Student guidance in the classroom, time management, implemented teaching methodologies, monitoring students' work, attendance and participation, students' academic results and acquisition of the planned competences, etc.

Points to be assessed concerning the implementation of the teaching activity	1	2	3	4	5
I plan and structure my classes well.					
I explain myself clearly and understandably.					
I answer questions and encourage class participation.					
I make correct use of the teaching methodologies.					
I apply innovative methodologies to my teaching practice.					
The implemented assessment system allows students to demonstrate the knowledge and competences they have acquired.					

RESULTS

Reflect upon your strengths and possible areas for improvement regarding your teaching results:
Degree to which the expected teaching objectives have been fulfilled, personal degree of satisfaction, students' and directors' opinion, degree of interest in improving teaching, capacity for self-criticism, involvement in one's own training

Points to be assessed concerning the teaching results	1	2	3	4	5
I comply with the curriculum of the subjects I teach.					
I have reached the proposed teaching objectives for my subjects and my student have achieved their competences.					
I am aware of where I need to make improvements and propose specific actions for this purpose.					
I actively participate in my training.					
Those responsible for overseeing my teaching are consistently satisfied.					
My students are consistently satisfied with my teaching.					
I am satisfied with my teaching activity.					

FINAL OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Self-assessment report: Consolidated version

(Teaching staff who have been teaching at UIC Barcelona for more than 5 years)

LECTURER/PROFESSOR DETAILS

Name, surname(s):

Department/faculty:

Number of years teaching at university level:

Number of years teaching at UIC Barcelona:

Academic category:

PLANNING

Reflect upon your strengths and possible areas for improvement regarding your class planning:
Choice of content, materials and methodological and assessment strategies, teaching coordination with other lecturers/professors for the subject and degree programme, knowledge of the group's profile, etc.

Points to be assessed concerning planning teaching activity	1	2	3	4	5
I clearly inform my students about the objectives for the subjects I teach.					
I clearly inform my students about the assessment system for the subjects I teach.					
I update and review the materials and resources, as well as the planned activities, I use to teach my subjects.					
I get involved in coordination efforts with other members of teaching staff on the degree programme I teach on.					
I take into consideration all criteria and guidelines of the degree programme I teach on.					

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TEACHING ACTIVITY

Reflect upon your strengths and possible areas for improvement regarding your teaching activity:
Student guidance in the classroom, time management, implemented teaching methodologies, monitoring students' work, attendance and participation, students' academic results and acquisition of the planned competences, etc.

Points to be assessed concerning the implementation of the teaching activity	1	2	3	4	5
I plan and structure my classes well.					
I explain myself clearly and understandably.					
I answer questions and encourage class participation.					
I make correct use of the teaching methodologies.					
I apply innovative methodologies to my teaching practice.					
The implemented assessment system allows students to demonstrate the knowledge and competences they have acquired.					

RESULTS

Reflect upon your strengths and possible areas for improvement regarding your teaching results:
Degree to which the expected teaching objectives have been fulfilled, personal degree of satisfaction, students' and directors' opinion, degree of interest in improving teaching, capacity for self-criticism, involvement in one's own training

Points to be assessed concerning the teaching results	1	2	3	4	5
I comply with the curriculum of the subjects I teach.					
I have reached the proposed teaching objectives for my subjects and my student have achieved their competences.					
I am aware of where I need to make improvements and propose specific actions for this purpose.					
I actively participate in my training.					
Those responsible for overseeing my teaching are consistently satisfied.					
My students are consistently satisfied with my teaching.					
I am satisfied with my teaching activity.					

OTHER TEACHING OBLIGATIONS

Reflect upon your strengths and possible areas for improvement regarding other tasks and obligations related to teaching, and your involvement in the degree programme (whether that be coordination efforts, as a subject director, as a Final Degree Project tutor, work placement coordinator, etc.).

TEACHING RECOGNITION AND MERITS

State the possible recognitions and awards for teaching innovation or as a university lecturer, attendance to conferences and congresses on university teaching, whether you are part of a group focused on quality and teaching improvement or as a teacher trainer.

FINAL OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS