



*With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union*

**„Identifying Barriers in Promoting the European Standards and Guidelines  
for Quality Assurance at Institutional Level“**

**IBAR**

Agreement number – 2010 – 4663/001 - 001

WP10  
**Quality and Teaching Staff**  
National study – Portugal  
2012

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

# QUALITY AND TEACHING STAFF – THE PORTUGUESE CASE

---

## Work Package 10

### Research Team

Amaral, A.  
Cardoso, S. (Rapporteur)  
Machado, I.  
Neave, G.  
Rosa, M. J.  
Sarrico, C. (Project coordinator)  
Sin, C.  
Tavares, O. (Rapporteur)  
Teixeira, P.  
Veiga, A.

**November 2012**

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Description of cases.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.1. Conditions in the four HEIs.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.2. Synthesis.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>2.3. Good Practices.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>2.4. Barriers.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3. Recommendations.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Annex 1: Institutional Data by HEI.....</b>	<b>25</b>

## 1. Introduction

This report presents the main findings of a research developed on the Portuguese higher education institutions' (HEIs) compliance with one of the European Standards and Guidelines linked with teaching quality, namely standard 1.4. – Quality assurance of teaching staff:

*Institutions should have ways of satisfying themselves that staff involved with the teaching of students is qualified and competent to do so. They should be available to those undertaking external reviews, and commented upon in reports.*

In Portugal teaching and teaching staff are regulated by Law 62/2007, with a broader focus, defining HEIs' legal regime, and Decree-Laws 205/2009 and 207/2009, with a more specific character, stipulating the statutes of the academic profession respectively in universities and polytechnic institutions. To a different extent, this legislation, as well as Law 38/2007, establishing the legal framework for the assessment of Portuguese Higher Education (HE), also contributes to frame teaching performance assessment and the assurance of teaching quality.

HEIs have the autonomy and the responsibility for recruiting and appointing their academic staff, according to need, good management principles and budget. However, public HEIs must comply with the maximum number of staff fixed by ministerial order. There are no limits on the number of staff appointed with individual work contracts paid by the HEIs' own income (Law 62/2007). Academic staff of public HEIs is further considered as equivalent to public sector employees.

There are two career profiles for academic staff, as envisaged by the statutes of the academic profession (Decree-Laws 205/2009 and 207/2009). The first group corresponds to the permanent staff recruited for indefinite periods (subject to probation). These can occupy three professional categories<sup>1</sup>: auxiliary professor, associate professor and full professor (*catedrático*), in universities; and adjunct professor, coordinator professor and main coordinator professor, in polytechnics. The second group are the specially-employed academic staff, hired under fixed-term and renegotiated individual contracts for the above mentioned categories, but as invited or as visiting professors.

The PhD (or in polytechnics the '*especialista*'<sup>2</sup> title) is established as the minimum requirement for entering the academic career. The entry and the progression in the career are accomplished through competitions which base academics' hiring or promotion and comprise probation periods. Full, associate and auxiliary professors (in universities) and main coordinator, coordinator and adjunct professors (in polytechnics) are recruited exclusively on the basis of

---

<sup>1</sup>Besides these categories, two other existed – trainee assistant and assistant, among universities, and first and second triennial assistants, among polytechnics – but they were removed by Decree-Laws 205/2009 and 207/2009. Currently academics in these categories are considered as integrating the career.

<sup>2</sup>The *especialista* is someone holding a higher education degree, ten years of relevant professional experience and a highly relevant curriculum who can obtain this title by submitting a professional report to a jury.

documentary applications (Decrees-Law 205/2009 and 207/2009). However, auxiliary and adjunct professors are subject to a five-year probation period, while the other categories are subject to a one-year probation period if their contract has not been preceded by an indefinite period contract. Before the end of that probation period, an assessment is conducted. Should this be positive, full, associate, main coordinator and coordinator professors have their contracts changed to a tenured regime, which represents a guarantee that their position will be maintained in the same professional category in another institution, should a reorganisation of their own institution lead to the cessation of their contract (Decrees-Law 205/2009 and 207/2009).

Positions to academic professional categories are advertised both nationally and internationally. Applicants are assessed on the basis of their scientific (or technical-scientific in polytechnics) performance, pedagogic competence and other activities relevant to the HEI's mission, by a panel whose composition and procedures are regulated by law. Invited and visiting professors are recruited part-time from among national or international individualities of renowned scientific, teaching or professional competence, based on a report approved by the majority of the scientific council (Decrees-Law 205/2009 and 207/2009).

Though not directly addressing teaching quality, Law 62/2007 and Decrees-Law 205/2009 and 207/2009 foresee some aspects contributing to promote it. In order to assure pedagogic and scientific autonomy, HEIs must have a permanent body of teaching staff with employment stability, according to the terms of the statutes of the teaching and research careers. In universities there must be at least one PhD holder among the teaching staff for every thirty students and at least half of the PhD holders must be employed full-time. In polytechnics, there must be at least one PhD or *especialista* titleholder among the teaching staff for every thirty students. At least 15% of teachers must be PhD holders and full-time and at least 35% must hold the *especialista* title (Law 62/2007).

As a rule, permanent academic staff is employed in an exclusivity regime and full-time (e.g. thirty-five working hours *per week*). Their teaching load must be minimum six and maximum nine (in universities) or twelve (in polytechnics) teaching hours *per week*. If they want to accumulate teaching duties in other HEIs, the maximum is six hours *per week*. Invited professors are employed part-time (e.g. less than thirty-five hours *per week*) and, only exceptionally, in an exclusivity regime and full-time. Therefore they can undertake other teaching duties or activities.

Since 2009, in parallel with the assessment system existing for public sector employees, teaching performance assessment is mandatory for academics of both HE subsystems (Decrees-Law 205/2009 and 207/2009). Each HEI after consultation with trade unions must define its own performance assessment regulations. The assessment must be conducted at least every three years. A positive assessment acts as the condition for auxiliary professors' employment for indefinite periods; the extension of fixed-term contracts for non-permanent staff; or the change

of pay-scale. On the other hand, a negative assessment over a six-year period is sanctioned in accordance to the general regime stipulated in the Law 58/2008 (disciplinary statute of public sector employees). Academics presenting two consecutive negative performance assessments are sanctioned with dismissal (Law 58/2008). In addition, one criterion in the assessment of study programmes conducted by the national Agency for the Assessment and Accreditation of HE (A3ES) deals with the quality of teaching and teaching staff: academics' qualifications, suitability to HEI's mission, teaching and learning methods and student assessment procedures (Law 38/2007). Finally, one of the benchmarks proposed by A3ES to be developed by HEI's in the definition of their own quality assurance systems (which is envisaged by Law 38/2007 and Decree-Law 369/2007) also relates with the promotion of teaching quality. It is proposed that HEIs have the appropriate mechanisms for teaching staff recruitment, management and training ensuring that teachers have the qualifications and competences necessary to the effective accomplishment of their tasks.

A study was conducted to find out if Portuguese HEIs do have regulations and implement measures in compliance with the legal framework and, further, with the European guidelines on teaching quality. More specifically this research aimed at understanding whether HEIs indeed perceive teachers as the single most important learning resource available to most students and, accordingly, implement mechanisms regarding teachers' recruitment, appointment and support, ensuring they have the necessary skills, competences and experience to transmit knowledge.

The report begins with a brief overview on the methodology framing the research. Then, findings for the Portuguese HEIs are presented and discussed. A synthesis of the main findings as well as the identification of institutional good practices/barriers to teaching quality also integrates this discussion. Finally, a set of recommendations are drawn for institutional managers and policy makers on the improvement of teaching quality.

## **2. Description of cases**

Following the methodology used in former work packages (WP) (see Portuguese WP 5 to 9), the analysis for this WP focuses on a sample of four public Portuguese HEIs, two belonging to the university subsystem (HEIs  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ), the other two to the polytechnic subsystem (HEIs  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$ ). These HEIs also differ according to the number of students and geographic location.

Two types of data were gathered from HEIs in order to empirically base the research: institutional policy documents referring to different aspects concerning teachers and teaching quality, and additional information on this topic obtained through interviews with distinct groups of institutional actors (see previous WPs).

Therefore, first, an online search of institutional policies on teaching staff was conducted for the four HEIs. These were analysed together with national legal texts on the same subject (see

Introduction). Next, due to methodological reasons (time constraints, sample diversification and representativeness), a selection was made, firstly, of the disciplinary areas and, secondly, of the study programmes to which institutional actors to be interviewed belonged to. Accordingly, two distinct disciplinary areas offered in the four institutions regardless of their sub-system were selected – *Engineering* and *Arts* – and two corresponding first cycle study programmes were chosen in each institution (see previous WPs).

Finally, two groups of actors belonging to each of the four HEIs and to the two selected areas were defined and interviewed. The first group comprised members of the central management and administration of each HEI, namely the Rector/President (or, in its place, a vice-rector/vice-president, or a pro-rector) and the representative of the Quality Assurance structure (or, in its place, of the Senate, of the structure responsible for study programmes, or for the Student Support Services). The second group assembled members of the faculty/schools offering the study cycles in the two scientific areas selected for the study, namely the Dean (or equivalent), the representative of the quality assurance structure (at unit level), the study programme director, and by two panels, one composed with of academics and the other with of students (around five participants in each panel). Interviews were transcribed and submitted to content analysis in order to systematise the relevant data for the study.

Findings derived both from the documentary analysis and interviews are presented in the following subsection, contributing to answer WP10's research questions. While document analysis has been the main source of information on what is defined by law and what is regulated by HEIs concerning teaching quality, as well as the rationale for the recruitment policy and its level of compliance to the ESG, the interviews allowed an insight into the support for teachers' development, the assessment of their performance and the (extrinsic or intrinsic) motivation mechanisms<sup>3</sup>.

## **2.1. Conditions in the four HEIs**

This section systematises the findings for the four analysed HEIs concerning teaching quality. Detailed findings for each institution are presented in Annex 1.

The first question driving the research was related with the *institutional policy on teaching staff quality assurance, namely what, in this context, is defined by law and what is decided by HEIs*.

Due to their public status, all four institutions must comply with national legislation regarding teaching staff recruitment, appointment and performance assessment (see Introduction). However, some documents issued at institutional level complement national legislation.

---

<sup>3</sup> Question 6 – What does it mean to be a good teacher? – has not been made by the Portuguese team to the interviewees.

In **HEI  $\alpha$**  and  **$\beta$**  there are three sets of regulations meant to assure the quality of academic staff, two linked with the recruitment of both permanent and especially hired academic staff, and one with the assessment of academic staff performance. In **HEI  $\alpha$** , with the aim to promote teaching quality, specific internal regulations define the maximum number of students allowed for different types of classes and in **HEI  $\beta$** , according to those regulations, faculties must elaborate their own regulations, adapted to their specificity, for the assessment of academic staff performance.

**HEI  $\gamma$**  and  **$\delta$**  also ensure the quality of academic staff through three sets of institutional regulations with reference to Decree Law 207/2009: regulations for the recruitment of both permanent and especially hired academic staff and for the assessment of academic staff performance.

Another research aim was to elucidate on the *rationale driving HEIs' staff recruitment policy, i.e. the criteria of staff recruitment and the appointment procedures adopted in order to assure the quality of teaching*. As previously, the compliance of public HEIs with the national legal framework seems to determine these criteria and procedures. Nonetheless, the selected institutions have their own regulations which, although mainly reflecting this broad framework, are more detailed regarding some aspects.

Such is the case of **HEI  $\alpha$**  and **HEI  $\beta$**  where the regulations for the recruitment of permanent and especially hired academic staff established at national level are followed. Similar criteria are defined by both HEIs for the recruitment of permanent academic staff: scientific performance, pedagogic performance and other activities relevant to the mission of the university. However, in **HEI  $\alpha$**  these recruitment criteria are more detailed and assigned a specific weight (scientific performance and pedagogic competence, both weighing minimum 30%, and performance in other relevant activities, weighing minimum 20%). In turn, in **HEI  $\beta$**  a deeper description of especially hired academic staff contract conditions and duration is made. For instance, invited professors are recruited part-time (below 60%) on fixed-term contracts or, exceptionally, full-time, for periods of up to one year.

Both polytechnics – **HEI  $\gamma$**  and  **$\delta$**  – also comply with national legal framework (Decree-Law 207/2009) regarding regulations for permanent and especially hired academic staff recruitment and appointment. Therefore, they follow the same criteria defined by universities. However, **HEI  $\gamma$**  and  **$\delta$**  differ, not only in relation to universities, but also among them, with regards to the relative weight assigned to each criterion. While **HEI  $\delta$**  assigns greater weight to pedagogic competence against technical scientific competence, **HEI  $\gamma$**  assigns equal weights to both competences. Additionally the pedagogic competence is generally assessed in both **HEIs** by previous pedagogic practice, publication of pedagogic material, participation in

teaching related bodies, supervision of students' dissertations, etc. Nevertheless, **HEI  $\gamma$**  provides more detailed information on how the candidate's pedagogic competence is assessed.

A third research question of this study addresses the *ways in which HEIs support the quality of teaching performance by means of opportunities for teacher development*.

In **HEI  $\alpha$**  no procedures to support the quality of teaching performance are specifically identified by interviewees, who argue that such procedures do not really exist. However, they recognise that dialogues being promoted and strategies are being planned in order to identify problems and corresponding solutions at this level. In this context, pedagogic questionnaires are stressed as an important tool, since they reveal students' global perception on teaching quality.

**HEI  $\beta$** 's representative stresses the crucial role played by the programme director as a 'mechanism' to support teaching performance quality. The programme director is seen as a bridge between schools/departments management and programme management and, in this sense, responsible for identifying teaching needs and problems; also, through collaboration with HEI's top management, for proposing strategies to overcome those problems; and, through collaboration with teachers, for helping them to improve their performance having as base the pedagogic questionnaire's results.

In **HEI  $\beta$** , differences emerge between *Arts* and *Engineering*. Contrarily to the HEI's representative, *Arts* school's representatives believe that no formal support to teaching performance quality exists, that it is not "functioning very well" or assumes an informal character (for instance, the mutual support and companionship between teachers). Therefore, initiatives such as the organisation of 'open' days allowing teachers to interact and exchange opinions and experiences should be supported. However it is also recognised that the development of such initiatives can be hindered by academics' resistance and lack of mobilisation.

Despite identifying some weaknesses regarding the institutional support to the quality of teaching performance (e.g. the lack of a specific structure supporting teachers to overcome difficulties related with courses), *Engineering* interviewees emphasise the existence of several institutional and/or school's initiatives fostering that support. That is the case of: (i) the 'teaching/learning lab', a structure which has been developing several activities aiming to overcome problems identified at course level, through the results of course evaluation, pedagogic questionnaires, student/teacher dialogue, or the monitoring committees; (ii) the peers initiative (*par em par*), through which teachers can attend each other's classes, exchange opinions and share good practices; (iii) pedagogic incentive measures based on the discussion between teachers about pedagogic improvements; (iv) teachers participation in international teaching forums in the area of Engineering; (v) the council for continuous improvement of teaching, responsible for coordination and discussion of teaching problems; (vi) the pedagogic

support initiative through which teachers with bad results in pedagogic questionnaires analyse their courses in order to solve problems; (vii) and the long distance and e-learning methods.

Despite the more vocational and professional nature of the education they provide, in both polytechnics – HEIs  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$  – teaching performance is unexpectedly identified with research performance. As a result both institutions support the quality of teaching performance by giving teachers the opportunity to improve as researchers, exempting them from teaching duties so that they can complete Master's and PhD programmes. However, recent financial cuts are seen by HEI  $\delta$  as a particular obstacle to this institutional support.

Nevertheless, in HEI  $\gamma$  other forms of support exist, more strictly directed at teaching performance quality: the digital platform, seen as substantially improving the quality of teaching, and the performance assessment which takes into consideration some teachers' projects to increase course success rates.

In none of the two HEIs ( $\delta$  or  $\gamma$ ) differences emerged among *Arts* and *Engineering* interviewees concerning the support to the quality of teaching performance.

In line with the former question, this research also tried to understand *if HEIs are implementing initiatives and mechanisms specifically supporting the development of teaching skills*.

The apparent lack of support to teaching performance quality, identified in HEI  $\alpha$ , seems also to apply to the development of teaching skills. Thus, there are no training activities for teachers or support with student related issues (diversification, special needs, etc.). The teaching performance assessment is expected to reveal teachers' major pedagogic weaknesses which can inform the design of a training system. When established, this system will be managed by an institutional structure responsible for identifying teaching and non-teaching staff training needs and for delivering training. Moreover, the incipient stage of teacher training is seen as a consequence both of an underestimation of this matter by study programmes directors, and of the HEI's current financial constraints.

Probably due to the weak development of teacher training, both *Arts* and *Engineering* interviewees also think that mechanisms designed to support the development of teaching skills do not exist or are scarce and, therefore, need to be developed. However, *Engineering* school representatives argue that even if training opportunities are given to teachers, their willingness to accept them is low due to their current workload, mainly bureaucratic.

In HEI  $\beta$  support to the development of teaching skills seems to be better organised than in HEI  $\alpha$ . Training is offered to teachers with the aim to improve their skills based on previously identified performance problems. Training actions are organised both within an institutional continuous training programme and by the 'teaching/learning lab'. On the other hand, a support

mechanism for the development of teaching skills consists of the use of pedagogic questionnaire results to identify problematic issues and teachers' training needs.

However *Arts* and *Engineering* interviewees consider that training should be better developed and that it does not attract many teachers, due to their heavy workloads and shortage of time to attend training sessions. Other support mechanisms targeting teachers were suggested: an institutional working group to deal with students with special needs; daily support for "complex and time consuming tasks", such as the design and structuring of courses; and an ombudsman helping to deal with specific issues, such as teaching strategies, conflict and time management.

Maybe due to the identification of teaching performance with research, in **HEIs**  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$  the development of teaching skills materialises in support for teachers to do PhDs. Both polytechnics recognise the absence of an institutional policy to improve pedagogy through training programs. Issues regarding students' diverse needs, competences or learning problems are addressed informally, discussed among teachers and managed by the programme director.

In **HEI**  $\gamma$  *Arts* and *Engineering* interviewees argue that training is not compulsory and depends upon individual demand. When a teacher intends to attend training, the institution supports him/her through the reorganisation of teaching timetables or the exemption of 50% of the teaching duties. Additionally, there is a unit which delivers short training courses which have a low participation due to their non-mandatory character. However, teachers do not feel any responsiveness to their training needs. Perceiving training as an investment in research, teachers complain about the lack of financial support and time to develop it. This lack of support is justified by the HEI's constrained budget, as a consequence of the country's current financial crisis.

In **HEI**  $\delta$  teachers' pedagogic training is considered as something unfortunately completely outside the tradition of Portuguese HEIs. **HEI**  $\delta$  reacts to the results of pedagogic questionnaires and develops solutions to eventual problems identified at programme level. Seminars, conferences, dissemination actions or other events are understood as ways of supporting the development of teaching skills. When pedagogic problems arise they are usually solved at that time, on an informal basis. Some support is given to students with difficulties, but not to teachers.

A second dimension under analysis regarding HEIs' support to the quality of teaching performance comprised *other strategies, such as the modernisation of teaching equipment or the resizing of students groups*.

The **HEI**  $\alpha$  representative reports the inexistence of such problems: class size is adequate (around twenty-five students) and investments are foreseen or being made for equipment acquisition (for

instance, laboratories for Science and Technology programmes, or the recent Arts school's equipment and library).

However, *Arts* school interviewees recognise some difficulties concerning equipment acquisition and renewal, mainly motivated by financial constraints. *Arts* teachers and students are particularly critical of these constraints, which are seen as preventing not only the acquisition and better distribution of equipment and materials for classes, but also the training of teachers to handle new/specific equipment. According to them, if these constraints were overcome this would improve study programme quality and national and international recognition. Another factor contributing to enhance teaching quality is the current concern with schedules. These are designed with the aim to meet student needs and availability.

*Engineering* teachers and students are critical, arguing that not enough investment has been made in equipment, mainly due to the current financial crisis and institutional budget limitations. Therefore, new equipment is needed for laboratories. Nonetheless, some initiatives perceived as contributing to a better teaching quality are mentioned: classes comprising ten to fifteen students, especially in practical and laboratory courses; the increasing use of information and communication technologies; tutors for teachers and mentors for students; and considering students' opinion on timetables and exam calendars.

In **HEI** support to teaching quality through the modernisation of teaching equipment has received increasing attention, especially motivated by the Bologna Process. Examples are the widespread access to and use of technological and bibliographical online resources and communication platforms to support classes.

In *Arts*, reference is made to support measures such as the definition of the annual teaching workload distribution, based on the pedagogic questionnaire results, and the existence of a timetable committee responsible for timetable design taking into account teachers' availability and constraints, the specificities of each course and the maximisation of teaching effectiveness. Students also mention the existence of a maximum number of students in optional courses. However, weaknesses are also emphasised and are related with infrastructures, resources and shortage of equipment; the decrease of classes and contact hours, following Bologna; and the lack of sufficient human resources.

The need for more support is also noted in *Engineering*. Despite the excellent quality and suitability of infrastructures and timetables prioritising students' interests, additional measures are perceived as necessary: reducing teachers' workload or giving them more administrative support to perform bureaucratic tasks related with student assessment, course attendance and enrolment. Students would also welcome more site visits to get them a taste of "reality", a more technical and practical knowledge, and access to teaching resources (texts, articles, etc.) through digital platforms.

HEI is perceived as having well-equipped classrooms (all include overhead projectors and computers). When a shortcoming is identified, the institution has the capacity to allocate more resources to solve it. However, each school also manages its own resources, even though, due to their different running costs they also have different budgets for equipment and materials acquisition. Some tools were mentioned, such as a digital platform enabling multimedia contents for e-learning.

Several differences emerge between *Arts* and *Engineering*. While *Arts*' interviewees were more critical about the available equipment and rooms, *Engineering* interviewees were more satisfied. In *Arts* lack of sufficient facilities and poor conditions of the existing ones is identified. Overall, the school is seen as very badly equipped and the facilities as increasingly deteriorated. Moreover, the size of students groups cannot be reduced since there are no financial conditions. Teachers stress the specific requirements of their study programme, as for instance a great need for materials for practical classes, and argue that such requirements are not being completely met. Additionally they complain about having to bring, at their own expenses, the necessary materials, make claims for a specific space within the HEI and criticise the programme student/teacher ratio.

Unlike *Arts*, *Engineering* interviewees are moderately satisfied with facilities and equipment. Since management is done centrally, there is an effort to make best use of the available spaces and laboratories and these are deemed sufficient. An investment was also made in the provision of digital resources and learning contents. Attention is also paid to the size of student groups, by resorting to attendance parameters, electronic record/control and taking into account classroom and teacher availability. Students consider their labs better than those of other HEIs and are satisfied with classrooms, their overhead projectors and overall equipment.

HEI  $\delta$  does not have the financial capacity to improve the quality of teaching performance through the modernisation of equipment. On the other hand, since the institution does not have many students, classes end up being small, so the issue of class size is solved *per se*. When practical lessons have too many students enrolled, the solution is to divide them into smaller groups. Seminars which encourage exchange between students, teachers and external stakeholders (as labour market representatives) and tutorial classes as a way to increase completion rates were two other measures mentioned.

Although recognising the flexibility they get to manage and overcome their needs, *Arts* teachers complain about the infrastructure since it fails to respond to the study programme's needs. Teachers also identify shortcomings regarding technical and logistical space compromising the teaching and learning quality. *Engineering* teachers argue that circumstances beyond the control of teachers, the school and even the institution, led to an increasing number of students *per* class, negatively affecting the quality of teaching. Overall, *Arts* and *Engineering* students are

rather satisfied with the infrastructure improvement and consider that some obstacles were overcome.

*The assessment of teaching performance, the way it is addressed at institutional level and how its results are used*, constituted another question leading the present study.

Regulations for teaching performance assessment have been developed by Portuguese HEIs since this was made mandatory in 2009 (Decreets-Law 205/2009 and 207/2009).

In **HEI  $\alpha$** , the assessment of academic staff performance (first applied for 2011-2013) includes four dimensions: teaching; research, artistic and cultural creation; additional activities (such as dissemination, knowledge transfer and training); and HE administration. Specifically, the teaching dimension comprises teaching itself, student supervision, publication of teaching material, as well as activities for teaching enhancement. Each course is assessed through pedagogic questionnaires and the results published on the university website. The consequences of teaching performance assessment are those deriving from the law.

The assessment regulations are common to all disciplinary areas (and corresponding study programmes) of the institution, although for each one, different international benchmarks exist (SCOPUS, ERA, etc.). Academics' research activity and productivity are the aspects most highly valued since quality at this level is seen as fundamental for teaching quality. The main tools for assessment are: (i) a digital repository assembling and classifying teachers' publications, whose quality is validated by senior peers; (ii) the systematisation and availability of information on teaching activity (courses, summaries, number of students attending classes, etc.), for better monitoring and control of its quality; (iii) the inclusion of student feedback from pedagogic questionnaires and its conversion into a comparability indicator; (iv) the reports produced and requirements foreseen by the internal quality assurance system.

From previous tools, the one most often recognised by interviewees is the pedagogic questionnaires. However, students complain not having access to the questionnaire results and the measures deriving from them. *Engineering* teachers argue that pedagogic questionnaires are more effective than the teaching performance assessment itself. Nevertheless, questionnaire results are not always used to support changes, due to their non-representativeness linked with low response rates.

Teaching performance assessment has already produced some effects, such as the creation and improvement of the bibliographic repository, or a better knowledge of teachers' problems. There is also the expectation that, in the medium or long term, assessment can lead to a global improvement of research and teaching, a better organisation of teaching activity and a readjustment/decrease of teachers' workload.

However performance assessment is criticised by *Arts* and *Engineering* interviewees, due to its several unbalanced aspects: it does not comprise certain dimensions of teaching activity difficult

to measure; it does not truly recognise teachers' work and the diversity of activities they currently have to engage in; it is especially harmful to the 'bottom' academic categories; and it can be used by top management to dismiss teachers. Additionally, *Engineering* interviewees (mostly teachers) are critical about the delay in the implementation of the assessment system and the fact that it overrates research (or management activities) over teaching.

In **HEI β** regulations for the assessment of academic staff performance exist and are common to the whole university. As in **HEI α**, assessment includes four main dimensions which assume different weights: research (20% to 60%); teaching (20% to 60%); knowledge transfer (0% to 30%); and HE administration (0 to 30%). Schools with a strong artistic component can consider a fifth dimension related to the assessment of the artistic merit of academic staff. Each dimension is assessed by means of various parameters, both quantitative and qualitative. However, quantitative parameters are considered more significant. A qualitative assessment can complement the quantitative one, for items difficult to quantify. Again, assessment consequences are those foreseen by law, with one specific addition: performance awards to a maximum of 20% of teaching staff, depending on the availability of funds. Additionally, the HEI has adopted regulations for the assessment of activity undertaken during probation with a view to the indefinite-term employment of academic staff. The same four dimensions, as in the case of the general assessment regulations, apply. For the teaching dimension, these are: taught modules and number of teaching hours *per* week; previously validated results of the pedagogic questionnaires; and pedagogical and curricular innovations.

Beyond institutional regulations, each school must have its own regulations establishing the parameters, the criteria and the respective scores to assess each dimension. In *Engineering* some parameters for the teaching dimension (both quantitative and qualitative) include: the number of pedagogic publications, of extra-curricular activities with students and of master thesis supervisions; the participation in training actions or other events aimed at enhancing teaching skills; pedagogic texts for teaching support, computer applications and experimental prototypes for pedagogic contexts; pedagogic content impact, originality, diversity, scientific and pedagogic rigour; and the originality, scientific/technological depth, relevance, trans-disciplinarity and awards related to master thesis and extra-curricular projects. In *Arts* the regulations for the assessment of academic staff performance were suspended a week after coming into force (May 2012) since during their definition and contrary to what it is stipulated by law, trade unions were not consulted.

Teaching performance assessment is perceived by the HEI's representatives as adequate given the suitability of the weights linked to each assessed dimension and the fact that it might help teachers to improve. However, these opinions are not shared by the remaining interviewees who, maybe due to a lack of global awareness on its attributes, tend to adopt a more critical position towards performance assessment.

Specifically *Arts* and *Engineering* teachers perceive performance assessment as unbalanced due to an emphasis on research over teaching and, therefore, as prejudicial to teachers whose main activity is not research. Furthermore, it is seen as not impacting directly on teachers' pedagogic skills. Instead, this impact is more likely to be induced by one of its tools, namely pedagogic questionnaires. Despite the low response rates and subsequent non-representativeness, questionnaires help forming a global idea on teaching quality. However both *Arts* and *Engineering* teachers and students question the effectiveness of this tool, given its subjectivity (derived from the partiality of student opinions greatly influenced by the student/teacher relation) and inability to induce visible effects.

Other criticisms targeting teaching performance assessment include: the fact that it does not reflect the specificities of artistic teaching, maybe because of the difficulty of quantifying and assessing pedagogic issues related with artistic practice; the risk of teachers' dismissal; and the fact that it is too demanding and time consuming.

Both **HEIs  $\gamma$**  and  **$\delta$**  adopted in 2011 similar regulations for the assessment of academic staff performance. In both HEIs, consequences of performance assessment derive from the law. The assessment considers three dimensions: technical-scientific, pedagogical and organisational. However, while **HEI  $\gamma$**  gives equal weight to technical-scientific and pedagogical performance (30% to 50%), **HEIs  $\delta$**  assigns more weight to the pedagogical dimension (a maximum of 55 points against maximum 30 points for the technical-scientific dimension). For the assessment of the pedagogic dimension, there are a number of common criteria: teaching load, taught courses and modules, development of pedagogic material, the results of the student pedagogic questionnaires and participation in pedagogic activities. However, **HEI  $\gamma$**  regulations are much more detailed, including other components such as the internationalisation of pedagogic activity or the use of the institution's digital platform.

As argued by **HEI  $\gamma$**  representatives, teachers can choose the dimension within which they prefer to be assessed. The pedagogical component is assessed based on a range of criteria, such as the production of pedagogic materials, pedagogic questionnaires, teaching hours, subjects taught or success rates. In the case of a negative assessment, the teacher is called to draw solutions to overcome the identified problems. Even if performance assessment does not currently translate into career progression (currently frozen), all teachers aim for a good assessment. This is mainly because a negative assessment is perceived as affecting teachers' position within their schools/department. The assessment of teaching activity comprises pedagogic questionnaires, and the subsequent reports address different levels: course, teacher, programme and department. Thus, there are both individual and aggregate reports, and the latter are made available at the end of each academic year. One of the most significant results expected to stem from this assessment is the increased involvement of all the actors of the institution (teachers, students, etc.). Teaching performance assessment mainly targets full-time

teachers. Part-time teachers are assessed by their peers and by their department, based on a qualitative self-assessment report, and also through the feedback from students. Part-time teachers with a negative assessment in the present academic year will not be hired for the next one.

**HEI  $\gamma$**  teachers, both from *Arts* and *Engineering*, are critical about the assessment model followed by the institution. This is seen as unadjusted to polytechnic institutions' mission and more focused on research over teaching. Moreover, the assessment grid needs adjustment in order to prevent penalising those areas with less scientific production, value other areas where cooperation with external stakeholders is fundamental and decrease the pressure on teachers to publish, since this is not that relevant for the polytechnic mission. *Arts* teachers complain that all bureaucratic and administrative tasks are overvalued, while teaching is underestimated. Teaching is only assessed in terms of the pedagogic materials, number of students and courses taught, neglecting other relevant teaching activities. Contrary to *Engineering* teachers, who recognise the value of being assessed by their students, *Arts* teachers criticise pedagogic questionnaires since these have aspects needing to be improved. For instance, students who did not attend most of the classes should not be able to fill out the questionnaire as a way to prevent inconsistencies and subjectivity.

According to *Arts* and *Engineering* students, they must fill in three pedagogic questionnaires every academic year. However, students complain about the absence of feedback regarding questionnaire results, which are superficially analysed and diffused.

In **HEI  $\delta$**  the institutional strategy was to give more weight to the pedagogic dimension because, when assessment started, the majority of teachers were finishing their PhDs and could not be assessed by their scientific activity. Three years from now, the weight of each dimension might be readjusted. If the scientific dimension (research) is deemed a priority, then it will be given more weight.

Students play an important role in teachers' assessment, not only by answering pedagogic questionnaires, but also by participating, through student representatives, in study programme's committees and thus discuss issues related to teachers and teaching. The results of pedagogic questionnaires are not public; they can only be accessed by each teacher and by institutional representatives. An overall assessment report is made for each programme, as it was considered unethical to publish teachers' individual results and the law does not require it. However, these results are taken into account for teachers' assessment. In order to provide a balanced assessment, from one hundred points, four or five are for the results of pedagogic questionnaires. Teachers with a negative assessment will be asked to produce annual reports and will be followed closely by the assessment commission. The existing perception is that teachers in this situation will end up being dismissed. However, teachers at the top of their career will not be affected by this because of their tenure.

According to *Arts* and *Engineering* representatives, teaching assessment performance has some positive effects: it helps to form an idea on institutional quality, promotes healthy competition and fosters improvement. However, both *Arts* and *Engineering* teachers were critical about the assessment model. *Arts* teachers argue that many aspects of their activity are not taken into account precisely because they are not included in this assessment model. They were also a little reticent regarding the effectiveness of pedagogic questionnaires because students are constantly asked to fill them in, increasing demotivation, subjectivity and inaccuracy. In turn, *Engineering* teachers complain about the frozen career progression and argue that a negative assessment implies a very complex and bureaucratic process, most of the times ineffective.

Finally this research also aimed to understand *how teachers are motivated by HEIs in order to assure and improve the quality of teaching*.

In **HEI  $\alpha$**  performance assessment is seen by the institution's representative as a motivating factor. Assessment is perceived as allowing teachers' work (namely research) to be recognised; as contributing to some teachers and even schools and study programmes differentiation; and as promoting teachers' thorough engagement in the development of their research activity and productivity. However, performance assessment is also perceived as undermining motivation, as it might prevent some teachers' proper recognition for their work, especially if their main activity is not research and are negatively assessed.

Moreover, other factors harming motivation were identified: the country's current financial situation; teachers' excessive workload; or their obligation to systematically provide data on students (success rates, class summaries, etc.) and penalties for not doing this.

As argued by *Arts* and *Engineering* interviewees, incentives and strategies to effectively motivate teachers do not exist, are hard to identify and need to be developed.

Finally, interviewees identified other motivational factors, more intrinsic to teachers, such as self-motivation, i.e. developed by them individually or within their working groups. At this level, the ability to dialogue, to seek for advice from other teachers to solve problems, or the informal support teachers give to each other, play a preponderant role. Motivation can also derive from the teacher/student relation and the will to improve without thinking necessarily about career progression.

In **HEI  $\beta$**  motivating and demotivating factors, related or not to the teaching performance assessment, are also identified. Specifically, performance assessment is seen by institutional representatives as motivating teachers to improve their quality. Besides having financial consequences, assessment also entails a ranking of teachers which gives information on their performance in teaching, research, knowledge/technology transfer and management. However, performance assessment can also act as a demotivating factor when its results are negative or these are used by institutional management in a way that may be detrimental to teachers.

*Arts* and *Engineering* interviewees find it hard to identify motivation mechanisms, argue that motivation is not specifically linked with performance assessment or that teachers are already committed. Motivation can be promoted through the HEI's incentive bonus system, based on the attribution of pedagogic incentive awards to teachers (with positive results in the pedagogic questionnaires) for their pedagogic and scientific performance. In fact, since the implementation of this system, teachers started to improve. Other factors perceived as motivating teachers to assure and improve the quality of teaching are: teachers' self-motivation; a non-automatic career progression (but dependent on teachers' performance); teachers' personal contact with students and students' 'informal' recognition of teachers' quality; and the school management's receptivity and support (more symbolic than financial) to teachers' initiatives.

In HEI  $\gamma$ , institutional representatives assume that teaching performance assessment, by itself, motivates teachers to improve. This is corroborated by *Engineering* students who argue that assessment increases teacher awareness on students' needs and problems.

However, teachers feel that assessment does not motivate them to improve. There are no financial incentives to motivate good performance, besides career progression (currently frozen). Moreover, assessment is understood as a time-consuming burden, a concern forcing teachers to care about scoring points in the assessment grid. Teachers can be led to work and have a good performance only to get a positive assessment in this grid and, once this is reached, to lose interest in maintaining that same work level, or to engage in some activities which are less valued. Finally, assessment should be more flexible and more adjusted to each disciplinary area and type of institution.

In HEI  $\delta$ , motivation is perceived as a postponed issue. Given the current financial constraints of the institution, financially rewarding teachers for their good work is not feasible. A way to overcome this and to motivate teachers to improve was to include teachers in the decision-making process, to provide information and to prevent them from feeling punished when they get a negative answer (for instance when asking for funding to attend a conference).

There are no formal rewards for teachers' good performance, except "additional work", as ironically stated by *Arts* representatives. However, some motivation factors were identified, such as: belonging to a group of teachers; inviting teachers to assume coordination tasks; promoting regular meetings with teachers, thus enhancing communication and interaction; and the institutional attempt to positively reply to most of the initiatives proposed by teachers at programme level (e.g. study visits). Regarding informal motivation, while *Arts* representatives do not recognise its existence, *Engineering* representatives argue that it occurs whenever teachers feel their work recognised as a positive contribution to teaching and learning.

Nevertheless, both *Arts* and *Engineering* teachers express their low motivation. Among *Arts* teachers this is linked with the overweight of bureaucracy teachers have to increasingly deal with as well as with the current financial constraints, which have implications for the frozen career

progression. Besides making it impossible to progress to better paid professional categories, this situation also affects HEIs' democratic management since only academics in top career positions can assume management roles at school or institutional level. However, *Art* teachers feel informally motivated by the good feedback received from their students or by the possibility of benefiting from schedule flexibility. In turn, *Engineering* teachers argue that there are no formal ways for the HEI to reward or to punish 'good' and 'bad' teachers and, hence, to motivate them to improve. Therefore, motivation is above all a consequence of teachers' self-motivation. This is not, however, easy to achieve since teachers do not feel any institutional enthusiasm, interest or recognition.

## 2.2. Synthesis

From the analysis one can conclude that all four Portuguese HEIs partially comply with the ESG related to teaching quality. Indeed, HEIs have selection and recruitment mechanisms ensuring that *staff involved with the teaching of students is qualified and competent to do so*. However, given the absence of information made available on the subject (both by institutional regulations and interviews), one can only assume that these mechanisms *are available to those undertaking external reviews, and commented upon in reports* since during these reviews data on such mechanisms can be requested. Additionally, regarding other measures to continuously improve teaching quality (skills development, material support, performance assessment, and motivation strategies) HEIs are still in an incipient stage. Improvements at this level can nevertheless be expected in a near future, partly as a consequence of the development by HEIs of their internal quality assurance systems.

Portuguese HEIs assure the quality of teaching staff, firstly and mainly by complying with national legislation regarding teaching staff recruitment, appointment and performance assessment, and secondly by issuing regulations at institutional level to complement national legislation. National legislation defines academic recruitment (categories and type of contracts) and stipulates the composition, ratios between categories, and maximum number of staff, the rules for the accumulation of teaching duties and for teaching performance assessment (including its consequences). Most of the institutional regulations closely follow the law. Regarding staff recruitment and appointment procedures, the four HEIs establish as main criteria: (i) the scientific performance, (ii) the pedagogic performance and (iii) other relevant activities. The relative weight assigned to criteria and the level of detail describing each of these differs according to the institution's strategy.

Institutional support to the quality of teacher performance seems incipient in some cases and non-existent in others or, at least in general, does not seem to be recognised. Apparently, while only one university is developing some support to teaching performance, the other three institutions do not seem to formally do it. A negative repercussion of this is the relative absence

of systematic policies to improve teaching skills through training. Moreover, student diversification, competences or knowledge deficit are problems only informally addressed. HEIs seem to expect that teaching performance assessment, as well as the pedagogic questionnaire results, will provide information to support the implementation of measures at this level.

Most of the HEIs are trying to support teaching performance through the modernisation of teaching equipment, size of student groups, etc. However, while most of institutional representatives tend to consider that equipment and facilities are adequate and sufficient to assure teaching quality, teachers and students are more critical, arguing that shortcomings needing to be addressed exist at this level. Financial constraints seem to emerge as the main factor negatively impacting material support to teaching quality.

Overall, the four HEIs have their own systems for performance assessment as a response to legal requirements. Pedagogic questionnaires emerge as a transversal tool for the assessment of the pedagogic dimension. These systems comply with the national legal framework, which in turn is aligned with the ESG. Once again given the absence of data on this topic one can only assume that reports produced in this context are made available to those undertaking external reviews since this is one of the items envisaged by external assessment in Portugal. However, these systems seem neither to value the teaching dimension as a core academic activity, nor to consider the specificities of the disciplinary areas (e.g. *Arts*) and institutional mission.

There is, among HEIs, a relative absence of concerted and systematic strategies to motivate teachers and thereby contribute to improve and ensure the quality of teaching. This absence is especially valid for financial rewards (one university aside). Moreover, teaching performance assessment emerges as both a motivating and a demotivating factor depending on the actors involved (namely institutional representatives and teachers). Teachers' motivation seems therefore to depend greatly on intrinsic factors, linked with self-motivation or the motivation arising from the belonging to peer groups.

### **2.3. Good Practices**

From the analysis of all the data collected, the following institutional good practices emerged:

- The selected Portuguese HEIs comply with national legislation with regard to the procedures and criteria for the selection and recruitment of academics. This alignment acts, by itself, as a transparency tool and as a guarantee for the quality of teachers and teaching.
- Although incipient, support to the quality of teachers' performance is provided through several mechanisms, as those promoted by HEI  $\beta$ -the 'teaching/learning lab'; the peers initiative (*'par em par'*); pedagogic incentive measures; teachers' participation in international teaching forums; the council for the continuous improvement of teaching; the pedagogic support; and the long distance and e-learning methods.

- There are also some institutional initiatives to support the development of teaching skills as, for instance, the case of a unit responsible for training, in **HEI α**.
- Support to teaching is also provided through the modernisation of facilities and equipment. At this level one can highlight the availability of digital platforms across HEIs, overhead projectors in classrooms, the division of classes in smaller groups (for practical lessons) and the flexibility of teaching timetables according not only to students but also to teachers' needs.
- The inclusion by teaching performance assessment of student participation and feedback (pedagogic questionnaires).
- Finally, the financial rewards and awards offered by **HEI β** to motivate the improvement of teaching.

#### **2.4. Barriers**

As previously, the analysis of the global set of data concerning the four Portuguese HEIs, allowed identifying the following barriers to teaching quality:

- The country's current financial crisis and its negative impact on HEIs' budget. Although a strong incentive to teaching quality never truly existed before this crisis the fact is that it seems to be negatively impacting on institutional capacity to provide proper support to the development of mechanisms promoting teaching skills development, infrastructures, equipment and size of student groups, teachers' career progression and motivation.
- Regarding the development of teaching skills, the following aspects can be seen as endangering teaching quality: (i) the institutional underestimation of teachers' training and its non-mandatory nature; (ii) the absence of institutional structures supporting teachers to overcome pedagogic issues; (iii) and the lack of time for teachers to attend training due to their current workload, including bureaucratic/administrative tasks, which could be minimised if there were sufficient human resources.
- Concerning infrastructures, equipment and size of student groups, one can stress as barriers the inadequacy of the existing facilities/equipment with regards to the specific needs of different disciplinary areas or programmes (e.g. *Arts*).
- The model adopted by HEIs regarding teachers' performance assessment does not seem to be the most appropriate. As globally stressed by teachers performance assessment tends to privilege research over teaching and does not meet the specificities of some disciplinary areas (as *Arts*), or even institutional mission (as that of polytechnics).
- Given the early stage of its implementation, academics and students cannot fully articulate the components and effects of performance assessment.

- Additionally, students are neither fully involved in performance assessment (as evidenced by low response rates to pedagogic questionnaires) nor do they get proper feedback on this involvement.
- Overall, HEIs do not have solid and systematic strategies to motivate teachers. HEIs have a very narrow concept of motivation mostly associated with financial rewards. In a time of financial crisis, this constitutes a problem.
- Furthermore, contrarily to HEIs' expectations, teaching performance assessment appears to act as a demotivating factor. In one institution, although career progression and corresponding higher salaries could act as external motivation factors, this is not possible since progression is currently frozen.

### **3. Recommendations**

Finally, based again on the research findings concerning the four Portuguese HEIs, one can make the following recommendations, targeting both institutional managers and policy makers.

#### *Recommendations for institutional managers*

- Enhance teaching quality through the development of training systems.
- Turn pedagogic training mandatory.
- Reduce teachers' current bureaucratic and administrative workload, by offering them additional support from administrative staff.
- Adjust the existing facilities and equipment to the specific programme needs.
- Adapt size of student groups to the specific programme needs.
- Adapt teaching performance assessment to the specificities of disciplinary areas and to institutional mission.
- Enhance student participation in teaching performance assessment.
- Promote a greater discussion with teachers and students on assessment and its results.
- Develop a broader perspective on motivation mechanisms, including financial and non-financial rewards.
- Consider the restructuring of teaching performance assessments so that this can act as a motivational factor.

#### *Recommendations for policy makers*

- Provide adequate support to HEIs (financial or otherwise) so that teaching quality can be properly enhanced.
- Enable academic career progression.

- Update legal framework to emphasise teachers' pedagogic training as a condition for career progression, so HEIs ascribe it a bigger value.

## References

Decree-Law 205/2009: Statute of the Academic Profession in Universities.

Decree-Law 207/2009: Statute of the Academic Profession in Polytechnics.

Decree-Law 369/2007: Creates the Portuguese Agency for the Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Education and approves its regulations.

Law 38/2007: Legal Framework for the Assessment of Higher Education.

Law 58/2008: Disciplinary Statute of Public Sector Employees.

Law 68/2006: Juridical Regime of Higher Education Institutions.

Machado dos Santos, S. (2011). Análise comparativa dos processos europeus para a avaliação e certificação dos sistemas internos de garantia da qualidade [Comparative analysis of European processes for the assessment and certification of internal quality assurance]. A3ES Reading, nº 1. Lisbon: A3ES.

## Annex 1 – Institutional Data by HEI

### Documental (Institutional Policies) and Interviews' Analysis by HEI

#### Universities

#### HEI $\alpha$

Questions	Institutional policy
<p><b>Q1. What is the institutional policy on assuring quality of teaching staff?</b></p>	<p>There are three sets of regulations which are meant to assure the quality of academic staff, issued in 2011, two related to recruitment and one to performance assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regulations for the Recruitment of Permanent Academic Staff</li> <li>- Regulations for Specially Employed Academic Staff</li> <li>- Regulations for the Assessment of Academic Staff Performance</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the Internal Academic Regulations (2008) state the maximum number of students allowed for different types of classes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In practical application sessions, a maximum of 16 students if in the lab, or 20 students if in a normal classroom</li> <li>- In theoretical-practical sessions a maximum of 30 students</li> <li>- In tutorial sessions (destined to provide further clarifications on taught subject matter), a maximum of 20 students</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q2. What are the criteria of staff recruitment and appointment procedures? How they assure the quality of teaching?</b></p>	<p><b>Regulations for the Recruitment of Permanent Academic Staff</b> (full, associate and auxiliary professors, in the university, and main coordinator, coordinator and adjunct professors, in the polytechnic, since HEI <math>\alpha</math> comprises both subsystems)</p> <p>The recruitment criteria are defined by the Scientific or Technical-Scientific Council in accordance with the regulations. Compulsory elements are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The scientific performance (universities) or technical-scientific and professional performance (polytechnics) weighing minimum 30%. It includes: academic qualification and, in polytechnics, professional competence; scientific, artistic, cultural or technological production; scientific, artistic, cultural or technological coordination; recognition within the academic community.</li> <li>- Pedagogic competence, weighing minimum 30%. It includes: teaching experience; student supervision; publication of manuals; innovation</li> <li>- Performance in other relevant activities, weighing minimum 20%. It includes: administration and other activities such as dissemination, training, knowledge transfer etc.</li> </ul> <p>‘Teaching experience’ cannot be a criterion for the exclusion of the candidate.</p> <p>In accordance with the national statutes for the academic profession, full and associate professors and main coordinator and coordinators are employed</p>

	<p>for an indefinite period. If their contract is not preceded by an indefinite period contract, it is subject to a one-year probation. Auxiliary and adjunct professors are employed for an indefinite period, subject to a 5-year probation. An assessment is conducted at the end of the probation period.</p> <p><b>Regulations for Specially-Employed Academic Staff</b> (Invited and visiting professors)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- These cannot exceed one third of the number of permanent academic staff</li> <li>- Are recruited among individuals (national or international) of renowned scientific, pedagogic or professional competence in the disciplinary area in question</li> <li>- In accordance with the national statutes, specially employed staff is recruited by invitation with the approval of the absolute majority of the Scientific or Technical-Scientific Council. They are employed on fixed-term contracts.</li> <li>- Visiting professors are employed in an exclusivity regime, full or part-time. When full-time on an exclusivity regime, the contract cannot exceed four years.</li> <li>- Invited professors are employed usually part-time. Only in exceptional cases can they be employed full-time, in an exclusivity regime.</li> </ul>
--	---

<p><b>Q3: How the HEI is supporting the quality of teaching performance?</b></p>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b>  There is the perception that teaching has been neglected (by the HEI) and therefore it needs a more effective monitoring (follow up). In sense strategies are to be implemented based on the analysis of results and the attempt to find solutions to identified problems.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b>  <i>Arts</i>  <b>Representatives</b>  <u>School Director</u>  The perception is that there are no procedures directed at supporting and enabling teaching performance development.</p> <p><u>Pedagogic Council</u>  Though teaching performance assessment was implemented for the first time in the current academic year (2011/12) there has not been a strategy of the school to support the quality of teaching performance. However, some dialog has been occurring in order to identify problems and solutions. Therefore, it is acknowledge the need to implement mechanisms allowing monitoring quality processes achieving goals. Some work has been done to gather the opinions of school's departments, study programmes' directions and students, the aim to define a model allowing monitoring these processes.  In this context pedagogic questionnaires to students are stressed as a very important tool. Questionnaires are seen as enabling a global view of student opinion on teaching quality. More specifically, questionnaires results, as they allow identifying the strong and weak points stressed by students, serve as a framework to study programmes directions' actions regarding teaching.</p>
--	--

	<p><b>Teachers</b> Teachers mention aspects which are not 'real' institutional measures to support teaching performance quality. That is the case of feedback given by students that go abroad to study (under Erasmus mobility programs) and which, after returning, argue that they more in their (Portuguese) HEI and study programme than in the ones attended abroad. The same positive feedback concerning teaching/learning quality is given by foreign teachers collaborating with the school/study programme, or by the HEI top management (rector) regarding the study programme (Arts) quality when compared with other study programmes offered by the institution.</p> <p><b>Students</b> Students argue that they do not have any perception or information on the institutional mechanisms supporting teaching performance. They state having only heard about "some kind of assessment" constituted by the online pedagogic questionnaires students have to answer to teachers and courses.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b></p> <p><b>Engineering Representatives</b> School Director The feeling is that in what concerns teaching it could be done more (by the HEI and the School) than what has been done until the present moment.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b> No answer</p> <p><b>Students</b> No answer</p>
<p><b>Q3a: In which way the HEI is supporting development of teaching skills?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there trainings (programs) assessing/developing/improving teaching skills? If yes – are they compulsory for teachers?</li> <li>• How teachers are supported by HEI with problems of diversification of students competencies or deficit of knowledge (e.g. secondary graduates, students of the 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle graduated of different programmes)</li> </ul>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b> The HEI representative argues that one thing needing to be determined is the effectiveness of, on the one hand, the recently implemented teaching performance assessment system and, on the other hand, of the training actions directed at teachers for the development of teaching skills. This will also help identifying teaching weaknesses, besides those that are already known. Further it is stated that the control of teaching quality and the creation of a training system aligned with teaching problems identified are of the compromises assumed by the HEI. In the representative's opinion the recently implemented teaching performance assessment system is based on these features. One of the expectations regarding this system is that it gives information to teachers regarding their path to major problems and, based on this, that it allows designing a training system with the aim of trying to help solving these problems. The problems are twofold: pedagogic problems potentially solved through pedagogic training; and shortcomings regarding teachers' research activity solved through training on publications, papers' drafting, databases, and scientific production. In this last context, an institutional structure – the IFA – will play a preponderant role, since it is integrated by research centres of excellence. By its turn, pedagogic training will be managed by other institutional structure which is responsible for identifying teaching and non-teaching staff training needs and delivering training.</p>

However it is also recognised that the still unsolved problems regarding teachers' training are partly due to the fact that the direction of study programmes often underestimate this issue. Also, training actions that are promoted are much more determined by the existing financing to promote them than by the real needs in this field. The expectation is that the implementation of the new system for teaching performance assessment will help solve the current problems and, consequently, improve the HEI's functioning.

**2<sup>nd</sup> group**

**Arts**

**Representatives**

School Director

This representative is not aware of the existence of institutional mechanisms designed to support the development of teaching skills. The existence of some "specific training actions" on, for instance, conflict management, but not specifically aimed at the improvement of teaching and teachers skills (competences).

Pedagogical Council Director

The school representative opinion is that there are no institutional mechanisms at place designed to support the development of teaching skills. This representative is not aware of the existence of such mechanisms.

**Teachers**

Teachers argue that nothing is done by the institution (HEI or/and school) to promote the development of teaching skills. The major reasons identified justifying such lack are the HEI's current financial constraints. Therefore, the development of teaching skills is something teachers have to do on their own, by trying to identify problems, hearing students' complaints and by trying to find out solutions. So, improvements at this level depend solely of teachers and of their effort to improve.

**Students**

No answer

	<p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b></p> <p><b>Engineering</b></p> <p><b>Representatives</b>  <u>Study Programme Director</u>  Although not directly mentioning the existence (or not) of institutional support of teaching skills development, the representative of Engineering study programme argues that, currently, the existing conditions among teaching staff are not suitable for such development. Teaching staff is overwhelmed with bureaucratic work and, from the part of the HEI/School, there should be more awareness of this and the need to reduce teachers' workload. Conditions should be given to teachers to improve and to improve teaching. However, what is happening nowadays is the decrease of teaching importance at the expenses of a great preponderance given to research.</p> <p><u>School Director</u>  It is recognised that some training actions directed at teachers, and the development of teaching skills, exist, promoted by a specific structure of the HEI (responsible for organising and delivering training actions to the whole institutional community). Further it is argued that, given the specificities of teachers' training needs, the School, given its size and resources, does not have the best conditions to offer training actions for teachers. Some training is offered occasionally to a restricted number of teachers.  According to this School representative there is no link between the assessment of teaching performance and the design and promotion of training actions for teachers, that is, the assessment exercise might not contribute to identify needs at this level.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b>  Teachers identify this subject as a weakness. They do not recognise measures being taken to improve teaching competences. For instance, teachers' mobility should be encouraged so teachers could contact with other teaching realities (methods) and, therefore, improve. This lack of measures is lacking.</p> <p><b>Students</b>  No answer</p>
<p><b>Q3b: How the HEI is supporting quality of teaching performance by modernisation of teaching equipment, size of students groups,</b></p>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b>  The HEI representative reports having no problems at this level: classes size is adequate (around 25 students); it is foreseen the acquisition of equipment, especially for laboratories (in the field of Science and Technology); the Arts School has recently been the target of a great investment so it is very well equipped.</p>

**2<sup>nd</sup> group**

**Arts**

**Representatives**  
School Director

The representative of the School stresses as an example of institutional support to teaching quality the recent creation of a library which is one of the weaknesses of the School. Support is also given to teachers' attendance to scientific events, which is a more logistic support (dissemination) than a financial one. Finally a brief mention is also made to some difficulties regarding equipment due to its high price and the difficulty, due to this, of replacing damaged equipment.

Pedagogic Council Director

It is recognised that, at this level, the school does what is possible with the resources available. Each school depends on the budget attributed to them centrally by the HEI. Whenever there is a need to invest in new equipment this issue is discussed by the school's management having in mind the identified necessities and their priority. Constraints existing at this level are recognised to hinder the achievement of defined objectives regarding equipment.

**Teachers**

Teachers argue that there is a general concern regarding schedules mainly from the perspective of student needs. Schedules are a task for teachers and their design always have in mind the aim to improve student learning experience. Regarding equipment and other material resources the absence of financial resources to warrant them is recognised. For instance, some teachers have to assure the payment of and attendance to specific training on a new computer program without which no one will know how to handle some equipment. Teachers also stress the need for new equipment and material resources and also for the renewal of some existing equipment. This would help to improve the study programme and its national and international recognition.

**Students**

Students stress the existence of infrastructures but also a certain difficulty regarding their daily maintenance. They also think that, although existing, investment at this level is mismanaged promoting lack of investment in areas thought as really important. That is the case of materials for students doing their work for several courses. Finally, students also identify the existence of a certain tension between two study programmes (Visual Arts and Design) regarding management and distribution of the school's equipment and infrastructures.

**2<sup>nd</sup> group  
Engineering**

**Representatives**

**Study Programme Director**

Globally, there is the concern and the effort to create classes of 10-15 students especially in practical and laboratory courses. Regarding equipment, this representative assumes that it is always a way to get financing. The only difficulties might be related with the fact that HEI has two campuses that are distant from each other, raising displacement problems to students, namely those from the 1<sup>st</sup> academic year.

**School Director**

This representative recognises the existence of material resources and initiatives promoting teaching quality. There is, for instance, an effort from teachers to use information and communication technologies in classes (powerpoint, audio-visual resources, etc.) allowing for a greater teacher/student interaction and for an improvement of teaching (better and more updated didactic material, teachers knowledge update). HEI has invested in order to make largely available such technologies.

**Teachers**

According to teachers the HEI has not been investing in equipment. They assume having several proposals to equipment improvement and acquisition, with the aim to improve teaching, but the current economic crisis and HEIs' budgetary limitations hinders their achievement. Teachers identify as one of the existing measures to support teaching quality the resort to the best students to serve as intermedial between teachers and other students. Best students are intended to help, to give support and resolve other students difficulties name practical courses. More recently another mechanism was implemented, indicated by the HEI top management (the rector), consisting in the designation of tutors, among teachers, and mentors, among students. However the effects of such measure were still unknown.

**Students**

Students assume that there has been an increasing concern of teachers in hearing students' opinion concerning timetables. Efforts are being made so in the next academic year exams from the courses with high failure rates do not coincide with the timetables of other courses, which will help students that have failed in some courses to still attend other courses from subsequent years. Regarding equipment, students argue having the expectation that new equipment will be available for laboratories.

<p><b>Q4: How the quality of teaching performance is assessed? In which way the assessment is done? How does the HEI use results of the assessment?</b></p> <p>Note: good to trace especially as follows (or according to your national background):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the main tools of assessment: students' reviews, exams results, periodic general assessments of the teaching staff, other measures?</li> <li>• What is the students' role in the assessment?</li> <li>• Is there any influence impact of them on the HR policy?</li> <li>• What if individual staff teaching performance continues to be demonstrably ineffective?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Regulations for the Assessment of Academic Staff Performance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Done every three years, compulsory for and applicable to all academic staff. First applied for 2011-2013.</li> <li>- Includes four dimensions: 1. Teaching; 2. Research, Artistic and Cultural Creation; 3. Additional activities such as dissemination knowledge transfer, training, etc.; 4. Administration</li> <li>- Specifically in relation to teaching, this dimension includes teaching, student supervision, publication of teaching material</li> <li>- The results of assessment can have impact on employment contracts and pay, as follows: a positive evaluation (Excellent, Relevant, Adequate) is a pre-condition for the indefinite nature of auxiliary and adjunct professors' employment contracts and for the extension of fixed-term contracts for specially employed academic staff. The assessment also influences the change of pay scale according to established by the regulations.</li> </ul> <p>The Internal Academic Regulations also stipulate that each module must be assessed by student questionnaires (Inquérito de avaliação unidade curricular) and the results must be published on the university website.</p> <p><b>1st group</b></p> <p>One of the strong points of the institutional assessment model, also recognised by the A3ES, and generally accepted by the academic community, relies on the inclusion of teaching performance assessment. This assessment is seen as having several positive effects, a creation of a digital repository, a tool assembling and allowing to count teachers publications, facilitating the attribution of points within assessment exercise. The quality of publications inserted in this repository is validated by senior peers.</p> <p>Another positive aspect introduced by teaching performance assessment is the systematisation and availability of information on teaching activity, also to be considered in teachers' assessment. This allows for a better control of teaching (namely through collection of data courses, summaries, number of students attending classes, etc.) and its quality.</p> <p>Although with a more residual character, other positive aspect is the integration of student feedback on teachers' quality in the teaching performance assessment. This feedback is enabled through surveys, then converted into an indicator to be used in teachers' assessment. Such measure had as effect the increase in student response rates to surveys on teachers and courses, maybe due to a great motivation. Students who see themselves as having a more active role in the assessment process (previously to this, the response rates were low).</p> <p>Thus, teaching performance assessment has a very important role for the quality of teaching and, therefore, for the quality of research. assessment and quality of teachers' research and research productivity integrates and plays a central role for the teaching performance assessment precisely because it is seen as a way to improve teaching. As a consequence, teachers are more concerned about productivity at this level. Also as a consequence, research activity assessment is assumed as the aspect mostly valued in the teaching performance assessment.</p> <p>Teaching performance assessment has a sole institutional regulation for all the disciplinary areas, although for each one, different international benchmarks exist (SCOPUS, ERA, etc.).</p> <p>It is expected that the teaching performance system enables the organisation of teaching activity, which might have impact in medium term. In short term it has already produced some effects, as the creation and improvement of the bibliographic repository or a better knowledge of the teachers' problems. Along with the future definition of improvement strategies directed at teaching all this will contribute to improve teaching quality.</p> <p>Other existing assessment mechanisms consist in the comparability indicator of teachers resulting from the assessment that students make</p>
--	--

teachers (surveys) and the reports produced and requisites foreseen by the institutional quality assessment system. This system has a plan which presently is more directed at improving the study cycles, since, according to students opinions, teachers and courses (curriculum units) are good, but study programmes as a whole need to be improved. Study programmes' problems might be linked with the fact that really are not considered as projects with a specific strategy but rather as a sum of teachers that tend to work separately. This lack of strategy has been already recognised as a problem to be solved by the HEI which as a strategy of improvement at this level, reflected namely by the institutional quality assurance system. This system is now more concerned with teaching since research is envisaged by the teaching performance assessment.

## **2<sup>nd</sup> group**

### **Arts**

#### **Representatives**

##### School Director

The teaching performance assessment is seen as a critical issue by this representative. This is because teachers do not totally agree with since they believe that certain aspects of their activity cannot be measured. That is the case of the supervision work which is a demanding and time consuming activity and there is no way to count supervision hours; the same is valid for the amount of work teachers do during non-working hours. Therefore the teaching performance assessment is seen as having many unbalances which are disadvantageous.

##### Pedagogic Council Director

No answer

### **Teachers**

Teachers also mention as an institutional initiative allegedly linked to teaching quality support: the teaching performance assessment. Teachers have a somewhat negative perception on this assessment since they find it as not truly revealing the good work done by teachers does not truly recognise teachers work and does not truly value the diversity and amount of activities they have to engage in nowadays. Teaching assessment system is further seen as more prejudicial to some teachers' categories, as the invited professors, and as a mechanism which can be used by the top management to fire teachers under the argument of negative results, independently of the global quality of school/departament for which they work for and its reputation (both within the HEI or external).

### **Students**

Students argue that the only thing they know of concerning teaching performance assessment is the existence of surveys through which evaluate teachers and courses. However they complain not having access to the results of such surveys and, therefore, they do not know measures are taken based on those results. One possible result advanced by students was one teacher being removed from a specific course which was the target of many complaints from students on her teaching.

Another change reported, though not directly linked with surveys' results, concerns the study programme syllabus which has been changed after teachers have asked students to give their feedback on this subject. As a consequence syllabus readjusted and now is more focused on Visual Arts than in Design.

**2<sup>nd</sup> group  
Engineering**

**Representatives**

Study Programme Director

This representative argues that teaching performance assessment concerning the 2004-2010 period had no regulation and that this regulation only appeared in 2011. This representative perception on this assessment is that the research is overrated; the teaching quality is less valued and the management activities are even less preponderant. Due to this, teachers will tend to look at the assessment regulation trying to obtain the most valued activities and, therefore, orient their activity in order to obtain better results in those aspects.

School Director

Only in the beginning of 2011 an informatics platform was made available for teachers to fill in the different fields concerning the assessment of their performance. By the time of the interview teachers were waiting for the selection of assessors who would evaluate each teacher on every field: teachers' competence at several levels, namely research, services to the community, teaching (number of teaching hours, supervision work, etc.) and management activity.

Another aspect of this performance assessment is the fact that it foresees bonus points to teachers' workload if a positive result is obtained in the surveys to students. In other words, besides scores and indicators, a teacher having a positive feedback from students will see a workload benefiting from this (no concrete example was given). The problem at this level is the global low motivation of students to answer surveys and the teachers' inability to raise that motivation. This might be due to the fact that usually students question the utility of surveys. However, surveys are seen by this representative as important, a mechanism helping both teachers and school management to identify problematic situations regarding teaching and maybe adopt strategies in order to overcome them.

Besides teaching performance assessment mention is also made to some top management (rector, pro-rectors) requests in order to give more attention to quality, namely among courses experiencing worst results in the assessment (conducted internally under the frame of an institutional quality assurance system). Teachers from these courses are asked to draft a report analysing the reasons for those results proposing improvement measures.

**Teachers**

The perception of teachers is that the teaching performance assessment is especially linked with other activities – research, management rather than with teaching. Therefore it values more and will give more scores to those activities than to teaching. Students and the collection of their opinion are seen as the only effective way of evaluating teaching quality. However, it is recognized that, until the moment the results of student surveys have not produced effects in the teaching performance, since response rates tend to be very low and, therefore, non-representative.

	<p><b>Students</b></p> <p>Students refer to the surveys that have to answer about teachers and courses. They stress the lack of feedback concerning surveys' results and of awareness concerning effects deriving from these results. According to the information teachers gave them the absence of effects is linked with the very low rate of response from students and the consequent lack of representativeness of results. However, students see the existence of other mechanisms – external assessment of study programmes, committees representing students, teacher/student relationships as more susceptible to induce some changes than the surveys' results.</p> <p>Specifically concerning teaching performance assessment, students recognise not being aware of its existence.</p> <p>One student argues once having heard a teacher saying that such assessment values research over teaching what can be negative for teaching. Pressure to do research can withdraw time to teach in a productive and efficient way.</p>
<p><b>Q5: How teachers are motivated by the HEI to assure and improve the quality of teaching?</b></p> <p>Note: good to trace especially as follows (or according to your national background):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is assessment of teaching performance used for motivation systems?</li> <li>• Are there at the HEI any financial and non-financial motivation tools dedicated to the teaching activities?</li> </ul>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b></p> <p>One of the mechanisms (a recent one) helping to motivate teachers is the teaching performance assessment. Performance assessment referential – SCOPUS – allows for the majority of teachers to see their work recognized (namely in terms of research and publications) this can act as a motivating factor. However, it is assumed that this might not be the case of Arts, where the use of SCOPUS referential does not seem to allow teachers to be so well recognized for their work (due to the fact that usually they do not engage in research activities rather in other kinds of activities). In this context, teaching performance assessment might contribute to some teachers and even schools' study programmes differentiation. It might also contribute to the more thorough development from teachers of their research activity productivity (publications). Finally, this assessment can also contribute to motivate teachers to design and implement improvement projects regarding issues less well evaluated.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b></p> <p><b>Arts</b></p> <p><b>Representatives</b> <u>School Director</u></p> <p>The only motivation existing is the self-motivation, the motivation that each teacher fosters by itself, sometimes with a great effort. This is because teachers are increasingly asked to do more work, work more hours, receiving the same salary. Therefore incentives in this field are needed.</p> <p><u>Pedagogic Council Director</u></p> <p>Factors for the motivation or demotivation cannot yet be identified, resulting namely from the teaching performance assessment. Motivation is achieved mainly through teachers' insertion in groups and namely by sharing similar values and a philosophy concerning what should be the study programmes good functioning. The motivation can come from the awareness on the roles each teacher must have for enabling good functioning.</p> <p>On the other hand, motivation can also derive from the recognition of teachers groups' performance. For instance, the design teaching group is highly motivated and this motivation derives from the excellent professional and personal relations teachers have among them and between them and students. Demotivation factors are usually related with external factors (country's situation, for instance). An example of teachers' demotivation is the fact that some of them are finishing their PhDs only because they want to improve their knowledge.</p>

qualifications and not because of the possibility of progressing in the career (which is not possible at the moment).

**Teachers**

For teachers teaching performance assessment can be a factor not of motivation, but of demotivation. Especially for those teachers who they always worked a lot and well in the context of study programmes and are evaluated with low scores. This can be highly demotivating and even contribute to teachers questioning maintaining their activity as teachers. Concerning motivation mechanisms, teachers argue are any, though the contrary is valid.

**Students**

No answer

**2<sup>nd</sup> group  
Engineering**

**Representatives**

Study Programme Director

Motivation is seen as something dependent on students and teachers. For instance, a positive feedback from graduates (regarding insertion in the labour market) can be a motivation factor. Having to present success rates, classes' summaries, being penalised for presenting these data, are, on the other hand, demotivating factors. Therefore, there are no measures to motivate but rather to demotivate

School Director

Strategies to effectively motivate teachers are hard to identify according to this representative. However, a factor that seems to demotivating teachers is the excessive workload ascribed to them (teaching hours, research, and little time to attend trainings).

**Teachers**

As motivating factors teachers can only identify the initiatives promoted specifically by teachers. As for instance asking advice from other teachers in trying to solve problems, the informal support teachers give to each other, meeting they promote to discuss several issues, etc.

**Students**

Students think that there are no incentives to teachers motivating them to be better. This motivation is mainly intrinsic. However it can be promoted by students when they give a positive feedback to a teacher regarding his/her teaching quality.

Questions	Institutional policy
<p><b>Q1: What is the institutional policy on assuring quality of teaching staff?</b></p>	<p>Institution-wide regulations exist for the recruitment and performance assessment of academic staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regulations for the recruitment of full, associate and auxiliary professors (2010)</li> <li>- Regulations for the recruitment of specially employed academic staff (2010)</li> <li>- Regulations for the assessment of academic staff performance (2010)</li> <li>- Regulations for the assessment of activity undertaken during probation with a view to the indefinite-term employment of academic staff (2011)</li> </ul> <p>In addition, according to the institution-wide regulations, faculties are required to elaborate their own regulations, adapted to their specificity, for the assessment of academic staff performance.</p> <p>No regulations were found which stipulate staff-student ratios, either at institutional or faculty level.</p> <p>Both regulations for recruitment are very general, closely following the stipulations of Decree-Law 209/2005.</p> <p><b>Regulations for the recruitment of full, associate and auxiliary professors mention:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The pre-requisites in terms of qualifications, i.e. PhD awards and time since the award was granted for the three categories.</li> <li>- The criteria for selection: scientific or artistic performance; pedagogic performance; and other activities relevant to the mission of the university.</li> </ul> <p><b>Regulations for the recruitment of specially-employed academic staff stipulates (Invited and visiting professors):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The maximum number of visiting and invited professors (full, associate and auxiliary) cannot exceed a third of the number of permanent teaching staff.</li> <li>- These are recruited by invitation from among national or international individuals of renowned scientific, pedagogic or professional competence, based on a report signed by two professors and approved by the majority of the scientific council. The invitation can be preceded by an application phase for potential candidates to express their interest.</li> <li>- Visiting professors are employed full or part-time (below 60%) on fixed-term contracts. In the former case, they are employed in an exclusivity regime.</li> <li>- Invited professors are recruited part-time (below 60%) on fixed-term contracts. For temporary and exceptional circumstances, these can be employed full-time for periods of up to 1 year.</li> <li>- Both categories are employed for periods of 3 months to 3 years, the maximum employment period being four years.</li> <li>- Invited professors are employed when a vacancy for any of the permanent categories could not be filled. They are contracted fixed-term for a maximum of 4 years, full- or part-time. When full-time or part-time over 60%, the exclusivity regime can apply.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q2. What are the criteria of staff recruitment and appointment procedures? How they assure the quality of teaching?</b></p>	<p>No regulations were found which stipulate staff-student ratios, either at institutional or faculty level.</p> <p>Both regulations for recruitment are very general, closely following the stipulations of Decree-Law 209/2005.</p> <p><b>Regulations for the recruitment of full, associate and auxiliary professors mention:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The pre-requisites in terms of qualifications, i.e. PhD awards and time since the award was granted for the three categories.</li> <li>- The criteria for selection: scientific or artistic performance; pedagogic performance; and other activities relevant to the mission of the university.</li> </ul> <p><b>Regulations for the recruitment of specially-employed academic staff stipulates (Invited and visiting professors):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The maximum number of visiting and invited professors (full, associate and auxiliary) cannot exceed a third of the number of permanent teaching staff.</li> <li>- These are recruited by invitation from among national or international individuals of renowned scientific, pedagogic or professional competence, based on a report signed by two professors and approved by the majority of the scientific council. The invitation can be preceded by an application phase for potential candidates to express their interest.</li> <li>- Visiting professors are employed full or part-time (below 60%) on fixed-term contracts. In the former case, they are employed in an exclusivity regime.</li> <li>- Invited professors are recruited part-time (below 60%) on fixed-term contracts. For temporary and exceptional circumstances, these can be employed full-time for periods of up to 1 year.</li> <li>- Both categories are employed for periods of 3 months to 3 years, the maximum employment period being four years.</li> <li>- Invited professors are employed when a vacancy for any of the permanent categories could not be filled. They are contracted fixed-term for a maximum of 4 years, full- or part-time. When full-time or part-time over 60%, the exclusivity regime can apply.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q3: How the HEI is supporting the quality of teaching performance?</b></p>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b></p> <p>In this institutional representative opinion a major role in the support of teaching performance quality is played by the study cycle director. This is seen as the responsible for managing the relations between the schools/departments management and the study cycles management and, in this sense, to be aware of the needs and problems, for instance in terms of teaching. He/she is also responsible for discussing teaching related issues at study cycle level with the HEI's top management (for instance pro-rector) and together for designing the best</p>

	<p>strategies to overcome problems at teaching level (for instance the replacement of a teacher based on his/hers profile). It is the study cycle director that must assume these functions and also to help teachers to improve their performance based, namely, in the results of the pedagogic assessments.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b></p> <p><i>Arts</i></p> <p><b>Representatives</b> Study Cycle Director</p> <p>According to this representative, globally there are no institutional or official mechanisms aimed at supporting the quality of teaching performance. The ones existing are informal (for instance mutual support, companionship existing between teachers) and, therefore, should not be considered as such.</p> <p><u>School Director</u></p> <p>Though recognised as an important issue, support to teaching performance quality is seen as something that it is not “functioning very well” in the school.</p> <p>One of the solutions identified in order to promote such support could be through the school/department submission to external or public critic. At internal level some initiatives can also be promote that support, as for instance the ‘open’ days or weeks organized by the school/department with the aim to allow teachers of some courses to contact with other teachers from other courses, exchange opinions and experiences and even to get to know rooms and infrastructures different from those they usually use. However a major obstacle is identified to the development of these and other initiatives aiming at improving teaching: the internal resistance which hinders academic community mobilisation to work as a whole for improving teaching.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b> No answer</p> <p><b>Students</b> No answer</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> Group</b></p> <p><i>Engineering</i></p> <p><b>Representatives</b> <u>Study Cycle Director</u></p> <p>A ‘teaching/learning lab’ is identified as the existing mechanism supporting teaching performance quality. This ‘lab’ have been developing several initiatives aiming to promote teachers’ pedagogic quality and to overcome eventual difficulties existing at the level of some courses</p>
--	--

<p><b>Q3a: In which way the HEI is supporting development of teaching skills?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there training (programs) assessing/developing/improving teaching skills? If yes – are they compulsory for teachers?</li> <li>• How teachers are supported by HEI with problems of diversification of students competencies or deficit of knowledge (e.g. secondary graduates, students of the 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle graduated of different programmes)</li> </ul>	<p>(curricular units) namely those identified through the results of the assessment of these courses (curricular units), the pedagogic questionnaires answered by students, directly by students to teachers (student/teacher relation), or through the monitoring committees.</p> <p><u>School Director</u></p> <p>Support is provided in several ways. That is specifically the case of the ‘teaching/learning lab’ which has been performing a really good work in the field. It is also the case of the ‘<i>par em par</i>’ initiative, through which teachers can assist other teachers classes; pedagogic incentive measures based on the discussion between teachers about pedagogic improvements; teachers participation in international forums on teaching for the specific area of Engineering (Engineering education); the pedagogic questionnaires/surveys and the mobilization of students to answer them; the teaching continuous improvement council, which has been doing an excellent work regarding problems’ coordination and discussion; and the distance learning methods and e-learning.</p> <p>However shortcomings are also identified. For instance course (curricular units) forms are not as good as they should be (in terms of data systematization?), there is some lack of discipline among teachers regarding the filling in of these course forms, and also the issue related with the types of classes which needs to be further developed.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <p>Teachers also mention the ‘teaching/learning lab’ as a support mechanism to teaching performance quality. They also mention an initiative promoted during the last academic year – the pedagogic support – through which teachers not so well assessed in the pedagogic questionnaires were asked to analyse their courses (curricular units) and try to understand what might went less right among them. Teachers’ adhesion to this initiative was good but it was not globally implemented. Further, teachers do not have any institutional structure, as for instance, a support office, where they can go to explain their difficulties and problems with the courses (curricular units).</p> <p><b>Students</b></p> <p>No answer</p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b></p> <p>The existence of training actions is recognised though these actions depend on the extent of the problems concerning teachers’ performance.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b></p> <p><b>Arts</b></p> <p><b>Representatives</b></p> <p><u>Study Cycle Director</u></p> <p>In this context, the only effective support that is given to teachers, though not by the school/department but by the HEI, is related students with special needs and it consists on the existence of a working group giving support whenever a student with such needs is identified. Further, some training also exists. For instance the school office for the continuous training occasionally provides, to school and HEI’s teachers, training programs with a more pedagogic orientation. However it is recognised that these training programs do not necessarily attract teachers, since most teachers have heavy workloads and, therefore, little time to attend training sessions.</p>
--	--

	<p>According to this representative opinion, teachers' pedagogic training should be better defined and developed since one of the aspects comprised by the teaching performance assessment is exactly teachers' pedagogic performance and consequently their pedagogic training. Although teaching performance assessment ascribes a great importance to research work and productivity, it should not disregard that teaching constitutes the central core of any HEI and, therefore, great attention should also be given to teachers' training and monitoring.</p> <p><u>School Director</u> No answer.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b> Teachers think that this type of support is not provided directly by the School/Department but rather by the HEI. The HEI provides a vast amount (even too vast) of training actions to teachers, comprising from e-learning to a set of activities, short courses and annual workshops. Therefore this aspect is seen as being functioning and centrally managed (reitoria). The school/department also provides less frequent training actions, though these do not directly aim pedagogic issues. That is the case of some workshops on the other organic units of the HEI.</p> <p><b>Students</b> Students argue having no idea on this subject.</p>
	<p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> Group</b></p> <p><b>Engineering</b></p> <p><b>Representatives</b> <u>Study Cycle Director</u> Usually a set of general training actions is organised depending on the issues identified as important. Also, the 'teaching/learning lab' organizes some training actions directed at more specific issues and the 'par em par' initiative allows teachers to monitor and analyse the way classes from their colleagues function and, then, eventually ask for advice with the aim to overcome some problems.</p> <p><u>School Director</u> There is an internal mechanism directly linked with pedagogic questionnaires. This mechanism consists in identifying problematic situations, namely those which are the target of great critic from students, concerning teachers' training and performance quality, and then to talk with teachers in these situations in order to find out solutions to problems. It is also argued that several training actions exist, namely framed by a continuous training program on a set of topics related with teaching, and which are attended by many teachers.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b> According to teachers the training offer on pedagogic practices and issues is big (perhaps too big) though it is up to the teachers to attend or</p>

	<p>not to training actions and sometimes they do not have time to do it. On the other hand, daily support to teachers is lacking, namely concerning the design and structuring of courses. This is a very complex and time consuming task, teachers can have some training on it, but often they do not have the proper support to do it.</p> <p>This lack of support is extended to specific problems, that is, whenever teachers have to deal with specific problems, concerning, for instance, conflict management, collective time management and teaching strategies. At this level a teacher provider (provedor do docente) is lacking. Solutions for these specific problems are found with the help of other teachers, through team work and collective effort, so teachers' relations with each other play a crucial role in trying to overcome problems.</p> <p><b>Students</b></p> <p>Students think (they are not sure) that some training exists and that teachers are free to choose to attend it or not. According to students' perception training actions can be promoted by the HEI or by other HEIs, and are attended by teachers namely because they belong to scientific committees. Training is given by specialised teachers and attended by non-specialised teachers. Students do not know, however, to what extent teachers attending training is something good in pedagogic terms, since the training is not a pedagogic training, but rather a scientific training.</p>
<p><b>Q3b: How the HEI is supporting quality of teaching performance by modernisation of teaching equipment, size of students groups</b></p>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b></p> <p>This issue has been the target of increasing attention due also to the attention that is currently given to teaching performance indicators (success rates, grades) or to teaching performance assessment, mainly under the framework of the Bologna Process. Therefore there is a widespread use of technologic resources and an increasing support given through communication platforms, which is better in some schools than in others. Further, the access to bibliographic resources (through the library or bibliographic databases) and the access to the internet have also improved.</p> <p>However, there are also some contradictions at this level, as for instance the decrease in contact hours (of teachers with students) which as a negative effect the insufficient monitoring of students and the decrease of their success (results).</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b></p> <p><i>Arts</i></p> <p><b>Representatives</b></p> <p><u>Study Cycle Director</u></p> <p>Although pedagogic questionnaires results are not always representative, they are analysed with the aim to define ways to promote this support at different levels, as is the case of the annual teaching workload distribution. Concerning timetables design there is a timetable committee which discusses with everyone before defining the timetables with the aim to meet teachers' availability and constraints, complying with the specificities of each course and trying to maximise teaching effectiveness. However, these aims are not always easy to accomplish due to space (infrastructures) constraints. These are reflected in the lack of enough classrooms for the present number of students attending the school, the lack of enough equipment, the limited number of teachers and the impossibility of hiring new ones.</p>

	<p><u>School Director</u> This representative identifies many weaknesses regarding infrastructures, resources and equipment: insufficient space for the current school number of students; lack of financing to buy and/or modernize/renovate equipment with the consequent need to 'negotiate' internally (with top management and/or other schools) its loan/shared use.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b> According to teachers shortcomings can be identified at this level, although not regarding timetables and schedules, which are managed with some flexibility. Shortcomings are specifically identified regarding resources and equipment, which are insufficient or of poor quality; classes size, which should be smaller; human resources, namely teachers, whose number should increase in order to solve/minimize the work overload of the existing teachers, specifically concerning supervision work; and classes and contact hours, which have been drastically reduced due to the adaptation to Bologna.</p> <p><b>Students</b> The initiatives identified by students at this level relate with the definition of a maximum number of students in optional courses. Concerning timetables design, students are not aware of the existence of specific measure and, concerning space (infrastructures and resources) management they only refer that some initiatives were taken to confine the use of some rooms to some specific activities and also that there is an attempt to solve issues as they arise.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> Group</b></p> <p><b>Engineering</b></p> <p><b>Representatives</b></p> <p><u>Study Cycle Director</u> No answer.</p> <p><u>School Director</u> Mentioning is made specifically to timetables design which is a very thorough task giving priority to students, and not teachers, interests. Timetables design complies with a wide range of criteria aiming to assure their quality. Infrastructures, resources and equipment (namely labs, informatics resources and library) are seen as not raising concerns, since they are of excellent quality and are adequate to teaching needs.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b> Globally teachers stress at this level the need to diminish the workload of teachers specifically the related with more 'bureaucratic' or administrative tasks, as the definition of the exams calendar, timetables design or issues related with student assessment in courses and attendance to classes. In order to be able to effectively engage in and develop teaching and research, teachers should get more</p>
--	--

<p><b>Q4: How the quality of teaching performance is assessed? In which way the assessment is done? How does the HEI use results of the assessment?</b></p> <p>Note: good to trace especially as follows (or according to your national background):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the main tools of assessment: students' reviews, exams results, periodic general assessments of the teaching staff, other measures?</li> <li>• What is the students' role in the assessment?</li> <li>• Is there any influence impact of them on the HR policy?</li> <li>• What if individual staff teaching performance continues to be demonstrably ineffective?</li> </ul>	<p>administrative support (from non-academic staff, for instance) or even be removed from some of those tasks, namely the design of exam calendars and timetables. On the other hand, informatics tools should be available to teachers in order to facilitate the systematisation and display of student assessment results in courses (this should be a more automatized task). More (administrative/non-academic staff) support should also be given to teachers or these should even be removed from tasks related with the control of students attendance to (presence) and enrolment (registration) in classes, which are very demanding and time consuming tasks. Therefore, these tasks should be more automatized whenever possible (use of magnetic cards to control students' presence in classes, for instance).</p> <p>Finally, teachers also argue that their teaching would be benefited by a more effective school daily management. At the central level, that is, for the school several issues, this management seems to work, but for teachers it does not, since they need more administrative support.</p> <p><b>Students</b></p> <p>Students do not identify problems in terms of infrastructures, equipment and resources, since the school is recent and has good conditions but rather some specific weaknesses related with teaching. For instance, students would like to have more site visits in some courses allowing them to contact with construction work reality and, thus, to a more technic and practical knowledge. On the other hand, students also argue that teachers should make a great effort to make classes' notes and teaching resources (texts, articles, etc.) in a teaching platform. Though important progress has been made at this level by teachers of almost every course, the platform should also be used to transmit knowledge to students.</p>
	<p><b>Regulations for the assessment of academic staff performance</b> stipulate the general principles applicable to academic staff across university.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Four assessment dimensions are identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Research (scientific research, cultural creation and technological development)</li> <li>o Teaching</li> <li>o Knowledge transfer</li> <li>o HE Administration</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Faculties with a strong artistic component can consider a fifth dimension related to the assessment of the artistic merit of the member.</li> <li>- Each dimension is assessed by means of various assessment parameters, quantitative or qualitative.</li> <li>- Quantitative parameters are considered more significant and are grouped in criteria, to each criterion being attributed a score.</li> <li>- A qualitative assessment can complement the quantitative one, for items difficult to quantify.</li> <li>- In the global assessment, each dimension can weigh as follows: Teaching (20 to 60%); Research (20 to 60%); Knowledge transfer (0 to 30%); HE administration (0 to 30%).</li> <li>- The results of assessment are considered for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o the employment for an indefinite period of auxiliary professors</li> <li>o contract renewal for non-permanent staff</li> <li>o change of pay-scale</li> <li>o the attribution of performance awards to a maximum of 20% of teaching staff, depending on the availability of funds.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>It also states that each faculty must draft its own assessment regulations establishing the assessment parameters for each dimension,</p>

criteria and the scores to be attributed to these. However, some compulsory assessment parameters apply across the institution. For teaching dimension, these are: taught modules and number of teaching hours per week; the results of the pedagogic questionnaires, whose conditions of validity must be established by the regulations; and the pedagogical and curricular innovations.

**Regulations for the assessment of academic staff performance in the Faculty of Engineering (2012)** establishes the parameters for each dimension, the criteria, the formula for the calculation of the score for each criterion, the weights etc. The following criteria parameters are included in the teaching dimension:

- A. Quantitative
  - Taught modules (number of taught hours and number and diversity of modules)
  - Pedagogic publications (number of formal pedagogic publications, i.e. articles, books and conference articles and proceedings)
  - Extra-curricular activities with students and master thesis supervision (number of extra-curricular projects involving students considering the number of students and teaching staff involved; number of theses supervised or co-supervised)
- B. Qualitative
  - Pedagogic questionnaire results
  - Participation training actions, workshops, seminars or formal courses on pedagogy and communication skills
  - Pedagogic and curricular innovation (i.e. new module proposals or deep restructuring of existing modules; creation or restructuring of groups of modules and study plans; initiatives for pedagogic improvement; formal experience of new pedagogic models practice)
  - Pedagogic texts for teaching support, computer applications and experimental prototypes for pedagogic contexts
  - Impact, originality, maturity, scientific rigour, pedagogic rigour, technical sophistication, content diversity and awards associated to pedagogic content
  - Originality, sophistication, scientific/technological depth, relevance, trans-disciplinarity, awards related to master theses and extra-curricular projects.

The four dimensions can weigh as follows:

- Full and associate professors: Research (20 to 40%); Teaching (20 to 40%); Knowledge Transfer (0 to 30%); HE administration (0 to 30%)
- Auxiliary professors: Research (30 to 60%); Teaching (30 to 60%); Knowledge Transfer (0 to 20%); HE administration (0 to 30%)
- Part-time teaching staff: Research (0%); Teaching (80 to 100%); Knowledge Transfer (0 to 20%); HE administration (0%)

The **Regulations for the assessment of academic staff performance in the Faculty of Arts** (May 2012) were suspended a week after coming into force since trade unions were not consulted during their elaboration. At the time of the research, they were still not finalised. In addition, the institution has adopted the **Regulations for the assessment of activity undertaken during probation with a view to indefinite-term employment of academic staff**. It indicates the same four dimensions (Research; Teaching; Knowledge transfer; administration), with the possibility of a fifth for artistic merit, as is the case with the general regulations for performance assessment.

Faculties must define their own parameters and criteria. For the teaching dimension, it stipulates the obligation to consider the teaching modules, the number of teaching hours per week, the pedagogic questionnaire results and pedagogic and curricular innovations.

**1<sup>st</sup> group**

It will take a while to notice assessment's effects since the process have just begun (it had started by the time the interview was made). However, the assessment system adopted by the HEI is seen as an interesting one, since the weights linked to each assessed dimension are well adjusted to the reality: for instance, if the system shows that a teacher is good at doing research, the weight of his/her is going to be proportional.

**2<sup>nd</sup> group**

*Arts*

**Representatives**

Study Cycle Director

This representative argues that no teaching performance (and activity) assessment exists. Rather, some mechanisms are being developed (by the HEI with the cooperation of scientific councils) to assess teachers' general and pedagogic competences, but the representative does not know the stage of that development. However this representative admits that some resistance exists, not to the idea of assessment, but to the proposed model for that assessment, namely towards its instruments and way of functioning. This resistance has been raising obstacles to the implementation of the proposed model.

It is foreseen that the results of the pedagogic questionnaires answered by students have some weight in teachers' assessment, though weight is going to be relative, since the response rates to these questionnaires are very low (for instance, in classes of 90 students, only usually answer) making results little representative. However, these results help to form a global idea on teachers' quality and to identify some problems, information that is further complemented by data given by study programmes directors and monitoring committees (comissões de acompanhamento), though often solutions (for those problems) cannot be found.

School Director

This representative thinks that assessment is very important, so he/she cannot understand why at the HEI a model has not yet been implemented and is being delayed (for instance, is now in an experimenting stage), although it should have been functioning since 2000. Academic community resistance and scepticism might be the reasons for this delay. However, he/she recognizes that the model adopted is a little complex, though it also helps teachers to know what they are doing and also what they need to change to improve.

This representative also sees teaching performance assessment has not having a direct effect on teachers' pedagogic capability and effect being rather promoted by the pedagogic questionnaires answered by students. These questionnaires are seen as an important tool to evaluate teaching quality, in general, and teachers' performance quality, in particular, and also to identify and solve some problems or prevent other problems. However, this tool is not being used to its full potential by the school/department since students tend to not answer to questionnaires and results are not representative.

### **Teachers**

Teachers argue that they have doubts concerning the assessment model (teaching performance assessment?) since it has some weaknesses as for instance the fact that it does not reflect the specificities of artistic teaching. Rather, it is a very pragmatic oriented model which emphasizes research over teaching. For instance, it gives little attention to teaching, the student/teacher relation, and the evolution of student work. So, the model might have less positive effects on teachers whose main (or one of the strongest) activity is not research. This might be due to the difficulty of quantifying and assessing pedagogic issues especially when these relate with artistic practice.

Therefore, assessment models need always to be adapted (to teachers' disciplinary field) and must focus on other issues besides research (activity and productivity) especially in the case of Arts, where only a few teachers publish and the majority develops other activities which are not quantifiable/measurable by assessment exercises. At the same time assessment can be more focused in teaching performance including classes; student success, results and knowledge; teachers' commitment and pieces of artistic work produced (specifically in the case of arts teachers)

On the other hand, every assessment is always subjective and the proposed model of assessment is not very clear and seems to be difficult to manage. For instance, the pedagogic questionnaires' results comprised by the assessment can give some clues about problems existing at teaching level, but students' responses need to be put in perspective: a teacher can be excellent in pedagogic and methodological terms and receive a negative assessment from students only because they have failed the exams.

### **Students**

Students do not directly refer to teaching performance assessment but rather to mechanisms that help to identify problems related to teaching such as the monitoring committee (comissão de acompanhamento), constituted also by students, to each student could refer issues related to classes, teachers, courses; or the pedagogic questionnaires, answered by students at the end of each semester, through which they can evaluate in more detail teaching performance. However, students are aware that they collaborate at this level as so weaknesses, translated by the low response rates and lack of student mobilisation and motivation to answer questionnaires. Concerning results of questionnaires having effects in teaching or to teachers, students argue not having a perception on those effects. It is complicated to directly link any change occurring in teaching or in teachers with the results of the questionnaires since changes can be promoted by other factor (curricular update, for instance). For instance, the major changes introduced at this level were, in recent years, mainly due to the Bologna process and not necessarily as a consequence of the results of any assessment exercise.

### **2nd Group**

#### **Engineering**

#### **Representatives**

##### Study Cycle Director

This representative cannot characterise the way teaching performance is assessed since the model for that assessment has not yet been implemented (it was only approved). Therefore, he/she cannot also identify consequences or an impact to teaching deriving from assessment. On the one hand because teaching is not the only component to be assessed; on the other hand because impact can be positive or negative but only possible to see when the system is implemented.

The reverse situation applies to pedagogic questionnaires: these are seen as having as (one) a positive effect the fact that they allow for perception on teaching performance, on what it is and it is not working at this level. In fact, independently of the representativeness of questionnaires' results, globally teachers tend to take into account these results and try to improve and change their teaching methods according to issues raised by students.

#### School Director

This representative mentions specifically the performance assessment regulation which includes components related with teaching quality and a parameter linked to the perception of students on this quality. However, the regulation establishes no direct links between assessment and consequences, so these consequences can only be deduced. For instance, one consequence might be a warning to the teacher who has having problems, or a positive remark to a good teacher, with positive effects in his/her salary and career promotion.

On the other hand, in this representative opinion, no direct link exists between the teaching performance assessment and teaching quality since a teacher may have a good classification in assessment and not be a good teacher (but a good researcher, for instance). However, it might be an opportunity for those teachers that do little research to try to improve their teaching and, thus, improve their classification.

#### **Teachers**

Teachers mainly refer to the pedagogic questionnaires answered by students recognising it as the only assessment process implemented, despite the low response rate and the lack of results' representativeness. However, they assume taking into account the results in order to have a better understanding on what is going well and wrong at courses and teaching and to try to improve. This something promoted internally by the school/department and globally valued as important by the academic community (teachers and students), regardless of the consequences it might (or not) have. Some teachers argue having introduced some changes; others admit change is not always easy, because it depends also of students or because some teachers tend to relativize questionnaire results since they are not objective or accurate (due to students' subjectivity in assessing teachers). However, teachers have the perception that the classification ascribed to them through the questionnaires is going to be used in the forthcoming teaching performance assessment.

Teachers would expect teaching performance assessment promoting, more than pedagogic questionnaires, teaching quality but they have doubts on this. They see teaching performance assessment focused, not only or above all in teaching, but mainly in other fields of activity as research. Some teachers are even afraid that part of teaching staff will be fired based on the teaching performance assessment's results because this assessment is very demanding, implying that teachers have an excellent performance in all fields of activity (teaching, research, management, etc.). This is especially true for teachers at the beginning of the career (as Auxiliary teachers) for which assessment becomes even more demanding and who will have more difficulties in getting well positioned and ascend in teachers' 'ranking'.

#### **Students**

The perception of students is that teachers and teaching quality is "controlled" through pedagogic questionnaires which are seen as directed specifically at the way teachers give classes. However, students also see this "control" as little effective since questionnaires' results are very representative due to low response rates and students' subjectivity. Further, students also stress not having seen consequences derived from questionnaires' results (namely changes occurring in teaching and teachers) though they have the idea that teachers with good results are rewarded (with medals, or diplomas of best teacher, for instance)

	<p>Besides pedagogic questionnaires students also have the idea that teachers are assessed through other mechanisms, namely that they are assessed by their research activity and articles publication. Regarding this, students even admit having heard some teachers complain because they feel that assessment is unbalanced privileging research over teaching. Students do not agree with this since, though they value research important, they also recognize teaching and its quality as being more important to students and to their training. Students value above all a teacher with good teaching skills (capable of a good knowledge transmission).</p>
<p><b>Q5: How teachers are motivated by the HEI to assure and improve the quality of teaching?</b></p> <p>Note: good to trace especially as follows (or according to your national background):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is assessment of teaching performance used for motivation systems?</li> <li>• Are there at the HEI any financial and non-financial motivation tools dedicated to the teaching activities?</li> </ul>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b></p> <p>This representative doubts that (teaching performance?) assessment might have as an effect the motivation of teachers to improve. An instrument assessment is well designed but results deriving from it can be good or bad and can be managed in many different ways necessarily promoting motivation. Therefore, sometimes assessment can even harm an eventual initial enthusiasm raised by initiative the attribution of rewards.</p> <p>Teachers' motivation can, for instance, be promoted through the incentive bonus system existing in the school, based on the attribution awards to teachers for their scientific and pedagogic performance, which occurs during an award-giving ceremony. A list of "eligible teachers is made and teachers who wish may enter the competition.</p> <p>It is argued that maybe due to this system, teachers started to be more concerned with their teaching and to improve their teaching method pedagogic skills, relation with students, etc. However, there is a concern that teaching performance assessment may contribute to end these 'motivation initiatives'. On the other hand, it can also serve as an incentive to improve, especially if teachers have poor assessment results.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b></p> <p><b>Arts Representatives</b></p> <p><b>Study Cycle Director</b></p> <p>Enhancing teachers' motivation and inducing a greater concern for teaching skills and performance improvement are two of the expected results deriving from teaching performance assessment. This is because besides implying financial consequences, assessment also entails ranking of teachers giving information on teachers' (better and worst) performance in teaching, research, knowledge/technology transfer and management.</p> <p>Another motivational factor might be the teachers' personal contact with students and their 'informal' recognition of teachers' quality (reflected, for instance, in a 2nd cycle student choosing a given teacher to be his/her supervisor).</p> <p><b>School Director</b></p> <p>This representative find hard to identify motivation mechanisms although he/she assumes that teachers are highly motivated otherwise they had already given up and leave their jobs.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <p>Teachers recognise the existence of some motivation mechanisms though indirect. That is the case of the school management receptivity</p>

and support to teachers' initiatives (for instance teachers' art exhibitions), support which is more symbolic than financial.

**Students**

Students' perception is that globally teachers are motivated and this is evidenced by the relation they establish with students, the support the inspiration and the motivation they give to students and the way they give their classes.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Group**

***Engineering***

**Representatives**

Study Cycle Director

This representative identifies as a motivation factor to teachers the school initiative to award and acknowledge, through pedagogic incentives, teachers who have good results in the pedagogic questionnaires. These awards serve as a motivation also for teachers who need to improve their performance and are a form of recognition both from students and school management.

School Director

This representative also mentions as a motivation factor to teachers the school initiative to award, through pedagogic incentive awards also through the excellence award, teachers who have good results in the pedagogic questionnaires.

**Teachers**

According to teachers, the school/department has a motivated and committed group of teachers, regardless of the existence of mechanisms to encourage/stimulate teachers to be better, as the one existing - the pedagogic incentive awards system. Besides teachers' self-motivation and this more formal mechanism to motivate them, teachers can also be motivated to improve by the fact that their career progression is automatic (teachers need to have a good performance in order to progress).

**Students**

No answer

**Documental (Institutional Policies) and Interviews' Analysis by HEI**

**Polytechnics**

**HEI γ**

<p><b>Q1. What is the institutional policy on assuring quality of teaching staff? How it is related to the national rules concerning QA and employment?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the HEI unit responsible for HR takes into account the QA issues?</li> <li>• Number of teaching staff/students ratio accepted at the HEI; national regulations concerning it (if any)</li> <li>• How the load of teaching is determined (on institutional and national level)</li> </ul>	<p>The quality of academic staff is ensured by three sets of institutional regulations, all issued in 2011, and with reference to Decree Law 207/2009 on the Statute of the Academic Profession in Polytechnic Higher Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regulations for the Recruitment, Selection and Employment of Permanent Academic Staff (de Carreira)</li> <li>- Regulations for the Employment of Specially Employed Academic Staff</li> <li>- Regulations regarding the System for the Assessment of Academic Staff Performance.</li> </ul> <p>No mention found in institutional academic or pedagogic regulations on staff/student ratios.</p>
<p><b>Q2. What are the criteria of staff recruitment and appointment procedures? How they assure the quality of teaching?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What kind of certificates and/or past experiences in teaching (other experiences) is required? Is teaching staff allowed to have more than one full-time position? If yes, what are the positive and negative results for the teaching quality?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Regulations for the Recruitment, Selection and Employment of Permanent Academic Staff</b> (maincoordinator, coordinator and adjunct professors) state the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The percentage of permanent academic staff in each faculty/school must represent at least 70% of the number of academic staff</li> <li>- The indefinite employment of maincoordinator and coordinator professors; if employment has not been preceded by an indefinite term contract, this is subject to a one-year probation period</li> <li>- The indefinite employment of Adjunct Professors, subject to a 5-year probation period</li> <li>- Recruitment exclusively through documentary applications</li> <li>- Vacancies open internationally and disciplinary areas not defined restrictively</li> <li>- Teaching experience cannot constitute a criterion for the exclusion of a candidate, and this cannot be limited to a specific institution or institutions</li> <li>- Candidates must present certificates of required qualifications and titles</li> <li>- Assessment criteria: technical-scientific performance; pedagogic performance; other activities considered relevant to the mission of the institution. In all dimensions, the internationalisation dimension is valued.</li> <li>- Pedagogic performance includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Teaching duties, including the publication of pedagogic material (also pedagogic innovation and new teaching methods, use of new technologies and development of e-learning courses; participation in innovative school programmes in association with primary and secondary schools and professional training centres)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Participation in assessment panels (agregação, PhD and master)</li> <li>o Teaching-related conferences (involvement as organizer or speaker)</li> <li>o Dedication and quality of teaching-related professional activities (pedagogic questionnaires, use of e-learning and similar instruments)</li> <li>o Supervision of dissertations and other work leading to academic awards.</li> </ul> <p>- Pedagogic performance counts as follows (identical to technical-scientific performance and less than other activities): 30-50% for Adjunct Professors; 35-45% for Coordinating Professors; 35-40% for main coordinator professors.</p> <p>These regulations also stipulate that the assessment of the probation period (1 year for main coordinator and coordinator professors and 5 years for adjunct professors) is done according to criteria established by the Technical-Scientific Council of the faculty/school and considering the objectives established in the employment proposal.</p> <p><b>Regulations for the Employment of Specially Employed Academic Staff (Invited and visiting professors)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Applies to national and foreign individuals of recognised scientific, technical, pedagogical or professional competence invited to collaborate with the institution as invited and visiting professors (the latter designates invited professors from foreign institutions or organisations)</li> <li>- Invitations are based on a report undersigned by two professors in the respective department and approved by the majority of the members of the technical-scientific council.</li> <li>- Invited professors are employed fixed-term and part-time. Full-time employment or in an exclusivity regime can only occur exceptionally, i.e. replacement of staff pursuing advanced qualifications; if they have been collaborating with the institution for at least four years; and in disciplinary areas with scarcity of staff. Employment in this capacity cannot exceed 4 years.</li> <li>- Visiting professors can be employed full-time or part-time, in an exclusivity regime, according to the terms agreed with the individual's own institution.</li> <li>- Invited professors are employed fixed-term, can be full-time or part-time and in an exclusivity regime. Employment in an exclusivity regime, full-time or min. 60% part-time can only take place when the vacancies for a permanent category of staff have not been filled. Maximum contract duration: 4 years.</li> <li>- For invited professor employed part-time, but less than 60%, the number of contract extensions is unlimited.</li> <li>- The institution must have a recruitment pool, permanently open, where interested individuals can express their interest in collaborating with the institution.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q3: How the HEI is supporting the quality of teaching performance?</b></p> <p><b>Q3a: In which way the HEI is supporting development of teaching skills?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there trainings (programs) assessing/ developing</li> </ul>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b></p> <p>Centrally, teaching performance is mainly associated with research. Therefore, the HEI supports teaching performance supporting PhDs programmes for their teachers. It is argued that the main line of investment in teacher training is the one that financially represents the largest effort for the institution. It is stressed that there has never been a real concern for teacher training in higher education. Historically, it is considered that a teacher is good when he is good scientifically.</p> <p>There are some tools, in recent years, that they think have greatly improved the quality of teaching, namely the entire virtual</p>

- / improving teaching skills? If yes – are they compulsory for teachers?  
How teachers are supported by HEI with problems of diversification of students competencies or deficit of knowledge (e.g. secondary graduates, students of the 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle graduated of different programmes)

platform. The assessment grid itself permeates the effort of producing contents available for that platform. It is taken into consideration for teacher assessment some projects teachers want to develop together with their school's pedagogical council in disciplines that have, for example, lower success rates. All these aspects have been considered in teachers' assessment.

**2<sup>nd</sup> group**  
**Arts**

**Representatives(School Director and Course director)**

Training programmes for teachers are not compulsory and depends upon the individual demand. The institution cannot foresee the individual needs of each professor. Once any teacher asks for training, the institution supports it through the reorganization of their teaching timetable.

**Teachers**

Within the institution, teachers do not feel any responsiveness to their training needs. A teacher doing his PhD or other type of training needs extra time to research. But no extra time is given to teachers because they must do their teaching work like everyone else. The current financial crisis that Portugal is under have constrained the institutional budget to support teachers training and those are more and more expensive to be supported by teachers. Teachers' training is seen as an investment in research or publishing a paper or attending a conference. Teachers considered that there is some teaching training but it comes from their own initiative.

**Students**

In their perception, there is no institutional support for teachers' training because their teachers are often complaining about their teaching overworking.

**2<sup>nd</sup> group**

**Engineering**

**Representatives(School director and Course Director)**

The institution supports teachers training through the exemption of 50% of the teaching component. Nothing else can be done since there is no available budget to hire more teachers in order to fulfill the remaining hours resulting from the exemptions. Also a reorganization of the teaching timetables to provide some free days for research is done. However, this kind of support mostly targets teachers' PhDs and not technical or pedagogic training. In fact, it was mentioned that any teachers were attending these latter. Finally, it was stressed that there is no institutional or systematic policy to improve the pedagogical component.

**Teachers**

According to teachers, there is a unit for short courses training and there is a teacher training courses, but adherence to these is

too low because it comes from a free choice and is not mandatory. Therefore, there were teachers who felt that need and have done it, but there are others who have never done one single course. So, teachers never felt there was an institutional desire for them to participate in those courses. Since they are Engineers, they feel this lack of pedagogic support. Finally, teachers stressed that when there was available budget, they had all the support they needed to attend a conference, for instance. Nowadays, it is much more difficult to get funded for those activities.

#### **Students**

Students argued that the pedagogic training needs are extensible to the labs' assistants (non-academic staff) since they also have an active role helping them. Students also recognized that teachers have some institutional support in order to increase their research, namely by reducing their teaching hours.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> group**

It was argued that the institution is very well equipped in terms of the infrastructures: all classrooms are equipped with overhead projectors and with good computers. When a new problem comes up, the institution has the capacity to allocate more resources to solve the problem. Some instruments to improve pedagogic quality were mentioned, such as a platform which enables teachers to record lectures and to put them available for e-learning, or some multimedia contents. Schools have the feasible autonomy, since a great amount of the budget is spent with staff. Therefore, they need to have the ability to realize that there are schools that spend more than others.

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> group**

##### *Arts*

#### **Representatives(School Director and Course director)**

The school director stressed that the size of students groups cannot be too small since there are no financial conditions to reduce them.

The course director complained about the facilities because, according to him, some temporary installations in the basement became final. Therefore, they do not have even the minimum conditions for students to work, because of the smells, toxic products with which they work, there is no sufficient ventilation. And even in rooms up, in terms of equipment, they felt they are very badly equipped and the facilities are becoming worse since it is also true that the country is in financial crisis.

#### **Teachers**

The specific needs of this course are too big, given the practice load, and it has not been possible until now to meet all the needs in terms of rooms, equipment materials and so on. Teachers do not understand why a course like this has a similar ratio as "paper and pencil" courses like French, Spanish, etc. Their concern is that this lack of materials will be reflected on the quality of the course. Some teachers complained about the fact that they have to bring from their own home the needed materials to work. They said that their work implies to make a mess and it is not accepted. They need their own space.

#### **Students**

**Q3b: How the HEI is supporting quality of teaching performance by modernisation of teaching equipment, size of students groups,**

	<p>Students complained about the size of the classes, comprising an average of 30 students, and about the space, equipment and materials. They pointed out that teachers often buy, from their own salary, the needed materials to work with students. Some machines are broken for a long time and of course this affects the quality of teaching and learning.</p> <p><i>2<sup>nd</sup> group</i></p> <p><b>Engineering</b>  <b>Representatives(School director and Course Director)</b>  Since management is done centrally, they try to monetize the available spaces and laboratories. In terms of scaling classes, they use parameters of the frequencies of previous students' attendance in an electronic record, the current values of students enrolled and cross the two variables because they know 100 students enrolled does not mean 100 students attending. More important than classrooms, it was stressed, is the academic staff: even if there are available classrooms, they cannot divide classes in smaller groups if they do not have available academic staff. Most of the times, they resort to hiring part-time teachers.  The course director stated that whenever they need, they always have available labs.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b>  Regarding the size of students groups, teachers are satisfied with the ratio student-teacher. Also they feel that the both equipment and materials are enough to develop their teaching activities. The pedagogic quality is improved by the central management of the institution who invested in the provision of digital resources and learning contents.</p> <p><b>Students</b>  Regarding classes, students stated that they are divided into smaller groups, especially on practical lessons. Comparing with other universities, students consider their labs better and are happy about classrooms, its overhead projectors and its overall equipment.</p> <p><b>Regulations regarding the System for the Assessment of Academic Staff Performance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aim to establish the rules for the implementation of the system for the assessment of academic staff performance and the rules for the change of pay-scale</li> <li>- Applies to all academic staff employed by the institution and is to be conducted every three years</li> <li>- Assessment considers three dimensions with the following weights: technical-scientific (30 to 50%), pedagogical (30 to 50%) and organizational (10 to30%)</li> <li>- Performance assessment conditions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o the indefinite nature of adjunct professors' employment contracts</li> <li>o the extension of fixed-term contracts of non-permanent staff</li> <li>o changes in the pay-scale.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The pedagogical dimension assesses the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality of teaching material developed in the taught modules (originality, innovation and variety)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q4: How the quality of teaching performance is assessed? In which way the assessment is done? How does the HEI use results of the assessment?</b></p> <p>Note: good to trace especially as follows (or according to your national background):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the main tools of assessment: students' reviews, exams results, periodic general assessments of the teaching staff, other measures?</li> <li>• What is the students' role in the assessment?</li> <li>• Is there any influence impact of them on the HR policy?</li> <li>• What if individual staff teaching performance</li> </ul>	

continues to be demonstrably ineffective?

- Number and frequency of taught modules (weekly teaching load during the assessment period; number of different modules and new modules; number of students assessed by module)
- Supervision of final projects and internships (number of supervised students who passed)
- Participation in the development of study programme content and planning (activities related to curriculum design and course plans)
- Contribution to student achievement (implementation of pedagogical methods with positive effects on teaching and student achievement)
- Additional training (attendance to courses and conferences which promote the improvement of teaching and updating of knowledge)
- Pedagogic performance (student pedagogic questionnaires)
- Internationalisation of pedagogic activity (organisation of short courses, i.e. summer courses; teaching of short courses; teaching of modules in a foreign language; teaching in modules in foreign institutions; organisation and supervision of international internships not included in Erasmus)
- Use of the institution's digital platform to publish information
- Activities related to master degrees (concluded supervisions and panel membership)
- Results of projects, dissertations or internships (licenciatura or master) which enable knowledge application and integration to the benefit of the institution and the community
- Fulfilment of professional duties (meeting deadlines related to the pedagogical activity, i.e. course plans, announcement of marks, punctuality and attendance to classes)

### **1<sup>st</sup> group**

The assessment has three components: scientific, pedagogic, and management. Therefore, teachers must be assessed in these three components, unless there is an exceptional and justifiable case. That kind of assessment allows a heterogeneous teaching performance and different teachers' profiles: for instance, a teacher can choose to be mainly assessed by his research performance instead of his management one. The pedagogical component is assessed throughout many tools: the production of pedagogic materials, students' surveys, teaching hours allocated, subjects taught, success rates, etc. Many of these tools are used by the department in collaboration with the pedagogic council.

The institution has the legitimacy, after three consecutive negative assessments, to say that this teacher is not worth it and do not fit into the institution. However, when the first negative assessment comes out, the teacher in question was already called by the board in order to overcome the problems. Moreover, even if currently the assessment cannot be translated into a career progression, all teachers desire a good assessment. When something goes wrong, teachers are the first ones to develop strategies to overcome the difficulties because no one likes to have a bad reputation.

**2<sup>nd</sup> group**  
*Arts*

**Representatives(School Director and Course director)**

School director stated that there is a pedagogical assessment of teaching activity performed by the students, through an online survey, which is anonymous and filled in a database that is common to the whole institute. The reports of this assessment are done by discipline. Therefore, the base produces a report by curricular unit, by teacher, by department and by course. Thus, there are individual reports and aggregate reports, and those reports are made available at the end of each school year. Who evaluates the quality of teaching that follows from the students' surveys are commissions and departments of the different study programmes, and obviously the management body for the whole school. Regarding the performance assessment, the regulation is online, published in "Diário da República" (official journal), and common to the whole institute. Some of the items of the assessment are evaluated both by the department and by technical and scientific council.

The consequences of a bad assessment are those which derive from the Law. The most significant result of assessment is, certainly, the greater involvement of the whole actors of the institution. At the same time, a negative assessment will affect the position of the teacher within the respective department.

**Teachers**

Teachers' performance assessment is still under an implementation stage and nobody knows, yet, how is it going to work. It was stressed that the coordinator assesses teachers and since they keep on teaching that is because the assessment is benefiting them.

Teachers were critical about the assessment model followed by the institution, especially students' surveys because they feel some issues should be improved. For instance, a student who did not attend most of the classes should not be able to fill out the survey. This brings, in their view, some inconsistencies and injustices. Moreover, some important aspects are not included in this survey: placing summaries, rooms, equipment. Furthermore, all bureaucratic and administrative functions are too important while the real teachers work has a low importance. This aspect is only assessed in one way: pedagogic materials and number of students and curricular units taught. On the other hand, actions such as going to museums and regular visits to cultural institutions do not have any weight in the assessment.

Teachers also criticised the assessment model stating that it is not adjusted to polytechnic institutions but to universities and to research. Moreover, the assessment grid should be adjusted to different scientific areas within the polytechnic institute.

**Students**

Students fill the 3 surveys, compulsively; otherwise they won't get access to the virtual platform. However, the results of their teachers' assessment are not discussed with them and they do not know the results. One of the positive effects of the assessment is that since teachers know they are under assessment, they try to get the best assessment result.

<p><b>Q5: How teachers are motivated by the HEI to assure and improve the quality of teaching?</b></p> <p>Note: good to trace especially as follows (or according to your national background):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is assessment of teaching performance used for motivation systems?</li> <li>• Are there at the HEI any financial and non-financial motivation tools dedicated to the teaching activities?</li> </ul>	<p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b></p> <p><b>Engineering</b></p> <p><b>Representatives(School director and Course Director)</b></p> <p>The assessment is built for full-time teachers. Part time teachers are assessed by their peers and by the department which hired them. Part-time teachers are asked to produce a self-assessment report, on a qualitative basis, and are also assessed through the feedback from students. It was decided, according to the school director, that in the next academic year, no part-time teacher with a bad assessment will be hired again.</p> <p>The consequences of a positive assessment should be the career progression, but it is frozen due to current financial constraints. The consequences of a negative assessment follow the ones prescribed by law. The school director thinks that all teachers are a bit afraid of the assessment and afraid of what their peers could think about them, even if they're not in a critical situation.</p> <p>If the majority of the teachers from a specific school within the polytechnic would get a negative assessment, then the assessment grid is not adjusted and should be reformed by the commission of that particular school.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <p>Teachers think that it makes all sense to be assessed by their students. However, they were very critical about application of the same grid to all disciplinary areas in a similar way. It is easier to publish in some areas than in others and all the outdoors work is neglected. Once again, teachers think that the assessment grid is adjusted to universities and not to polytechnics. Therefore, instead of being proactive in the communication with the outside world, teachers are valuing publications. That is why they ask: is it good for our students?</p> <p><b>Students</b></p> <p>Students stated that they assess teachers in the surveys. When a negative assessment is made, the teacher is called to reflect about it and to improve. The overall results of the assessment are superficially analysed within the pedagogic council but not all students are there.</p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b></p> <p>The assessment, by itself, motivates teachers to improve their teaching skills. There are no financial incentives to motivate good performance, besides the frozen career progression, but teachers feel motivated to get points for the assessment grid.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b></p> <p><b>Arts</b></p> <p><b>Representatives(School Director and Course director)</b></p> <p>It was stressed that assessment, by itself, is a motivation factor: no one wants to get a bad assessment.</p>
---	---

**Teachers**

Teachers feel that assessment is not motivating them to improve. On the contrary, assessment is not creating better teachers but runners, that is, people who just care about points and only think under the grid and for the grid.

**Students**

Students considered that assessment only matters for the non-permanent teaching staff. The permanent teaching staff do not care about assessment because their tenured position does not suffer any disturbance from being evaluated.

**2<sup>nd</sup> group  
Engineering**

**Representatives(School Director and Course director)**

While before the assessment teachers were more reticent, now teachers are more willing to participate in additional duties or tasks. Teachers work for the points. Also since the institution is very well positioned in some publish rankings, it means that teachers are working well. It is assumed that if teachers are working well it automatically means that teachers are motivated. It is argued that assessment ends up rewarding and making more visible the teachers efforts. It was stated that teachers from this institution always felt that they should work more than their colleagues from other coastline institutions in order to attract students. Being peripheral, the institution needs greater effort to attract students because funding depends on the number of students enrolled.

**Teachers**

Teachers understand assessment as a burden and not as a motivating factor. In fact, the word used to replace “motivated” was “concerned”. They complained about the process arguing that it is too time consuming. So, teachers suggested the creation of some kind of automatic system in order to save some time.

Teachers were also concerned about assessment and its possible negative effects. For instance, the natural willing can be replaced by an artificial one (to get points) and once the objectives are reached, nobody will work further. Even worse would be teachers stop doing important things just because those are not covered by the assessment grid. If it does not give you points, it is pointless.

No financial rewards are given to encourage teachers to improve.

Finally, teachers feel that the assessment should be more flexible and more adjusted to the disciplinary area and to the kind of institution.

**Students**

Students think that assessment motivates their teachers to care about them, otherwise they would be indifferent.

<p><b>Q1. What is the institutional policy on assuring quality of teaching staff? How it is related to the national rules concerning QA and employment?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the HEI unit responsible for HR takes into account the QA issues?</li> <li>• Number of teaching staff/students ratio accepted at the HEI; national regulations concerning it (if any)</li> <li>• How the load of teaching is determined (on institutional and national level)</li> </ul>	<p>Three sets of institutional regulations related to staff recruitment and performance assessment are related to the quality of academic staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regulations for the Recruitment of Permanent Academic Staff (2009)</li> <li>- Regulations for Specially Employed Academic Staff (2012)</li> <li>- Regulations for the Assessment of Academic Staff Performance (2011)</li> </ul> <p>No institutional regulations found which mention staff/student ratios.</p>
<p><b>Q2. What are the criteria of staff recruitment and appointment procedures? How they assure the quality of teaching?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What kind of certificates and/or past experiences in teaching (other experiences) is required? Is teaching staff allowed to have more than one full-time position? If yes, what are the positive and negative results for the teaching quality?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Regulations for the Recruitment of Permanent Academic Staff</b> (maincoordinator, coordinator and adjunct professors)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drafted very closely to the provisions of Decree Law 209/2007</li> <li>- Candidates must hold a PhD award or 'specialist' certificates in the area of the open position</li> <li>- The selection criteria are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o pedagogic competence with a relative weight of 45%</li> <li>o technical-scientific and professional competence with a relative weight of 35%</li> <li>o other activities relevant to the mission of the HEIs with a relative weight of 20%.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- The pedagogic competence is judged by the quality and scope of pedagogic practice, participation in bodies, groups and committees of a pedagogical nature, participation in the elaboration of manuals and other texts and materials to support teaching activities, supervision of pedagogical activities, etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Regulations for Specially Employed Academic Staff</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- These are recruited among national or foreign individuals of renowned scientific, technical, pedagogic or professional competence as invited professors (In the case of teaching staff from foreign or international institutions, these are considered visiting professors).</li> <li>- Contracts are preceded by invitation and justified by a report signed by two professors and approved by the majority of the Technical-Scientific Council</li> <li>- Invited professors are employed on fixed-term contracts and part-time. Full-time employment or in an exclusivity regime can only be done exceptionally (i.e. replacement of teaching staff exempt from teaching duties in order to pursue further qualifications or whose contract has ceased when these cannot be rapidly replaced according to the rules of the national statute); in this case the contract and its extensions cannot exceed 4 years.</li> <li>- Visiting professors can be employed in an exclusivity regime, full-time or part-time.</li> <li>- Individuals who meet the legal conditions for the category in question should preferentially be employed as invited</li> </ul>

	<p>Coordinating and Adjunct Professors; otherwise, the employment proposals must duly justify why these conditions could not be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the case of invited professors(employed when the vacancy for a maincoordinator, coordinator or adjunct professors could not be filled), preference is given to master degree holders who have had minimum three years of professional experience in the area or who are enrolled in PhD programmes.</li> <li>- A recruitment pool of interested individuals can precede the employment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q3: How the HEI is supporting the quality of teaching performance?</b></p> <p><b>Q3a: In which way the HEI is supporting development of teaching skills?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there trainings (programs) assessing/developing/ improving teaching skills? If yes – are they compulsory for teachers?</li> <li>• How teachers are supported by HEI with problems of diversification of students competencies or deficit of knowledge (e.g. secondary graduates, students of the 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle graduated of different programmes)</li> </ul>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b> Teaching performance is identified with research performance. Therefore, the institution supports training programs at the level of master and PhDs through the exemption of some teaching hours. It was also referred the support to some doctored teachers in order to develop some applied research. It was emphasized that the institutional policy is targeting applied research rather than scientific research. However, recent financial cuts tend to currently hinder this institutional support.</p> <p>There is no formal pedagogic support for teachers, unless it is counted the informal support given by the study programme director to teachers facing some difficulties. Formal support is given to students, through support classes, in order to overcome their lack of skills, particularly regarding English language or Math.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b> <i>Arts</i></p> <p><b>Representatives (School Director and Course director)</b> Some support is given to students but not to teachers.</p> <p>School director stated that there are not any pedagogic training fostered by the institution. It is considered as something that unfortunately has been completely aside the tradition of higher education institutions as a whole. But teachers are going to seminars, conferences, dissemination actions. The pedagogic quality of teachers is assured during the recruitment moment, by the study programme director. Those who have a bad pedagogic performance, that is, who does not comply with the general objectives defined, will be excluded, less wanted, segregated. Other teachers who are in the institution for longer time won't be so affected by this. The institution reacts to the students' surveys and develops solutions, at a study programme director level, to eventual complaints.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b> When problems come out, usually they are solved at that time, on an informal basis. There is no formal training for teachers.</p> <p><b>Students</b> On students' perceptions, their teachers are currently in an on-going training, doing their PhDs. Teachers are self-taught and develop their work as artists in contact with the outside world, which is perceived as an added value.</p>

<p><b>Q3b: How the HEI is supporting quality of teaching performance by modernisation of teaching equipment, size of students groups,</b></p>	<p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b> <b>Engineering</b></p> <p><b>Representatives (School director and Course Director)</b> There are no formal teaching and pedagogic training. However, it was stressed that there are pedagogical concerns and teachers try to improve by themselves.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b> The pedagogic teaching training does not exist.</p> <p><b>Students</b> Students believe that their teachers attend some teaching training programs and said that they know that because sometimes they are absent. However, teaching training is identified with PhDs. Students think that teachers' assessment has a positive effect: teachers and students proximity. It was also noted that since assessment started they could notice many improvements.</p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b> There is no financial capacity to divide classes in smaller groups. However, since the institution does not have many students, classes end up being small. So the problem is solved <i>per se</i>. When many students are in the same class, the institution divide them only for practical lessons.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b> <b>Arts</b></p> <p><b>Representatives (School Director and Course director)</b> It is fostered some seminars in order to create exchange between students, teachers and people from outside of the institution, especially from the labour market. It was reported, as a measure to improve quality of teaching, the division of classes in smaller groups, especially regarding practical lessons.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b> As it is a small department, teachers feel they have the flexibility to manage and overcome all their needs. The exception pointed out was the infrastructure. Despite having a school campus to build from scratch, which is quite adequate and very modern, it does not respond to their disciplinary area needs. Teachers feel that they are like a bubble in the institution and therefore sometimes the issue of technical and logistical space compromises the quality of their work as teachers and the quality of students learning.</p> <p><b>Students</b> Overall, students are more or less satisfied with the infrastructure improvement and consider that some obstacles were overcome.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Q4: How the quality of teaching performance is assessed? In which way the assessment is done? How does the HEI use results of the assessment?</b></p> <p>Note: good to trace especially as follows (or according to your national background):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the main tools of assessment: students' reviews, exams results, periodic general assessments of the teaching staff, other measures?</li> <li>• What is the students' role in the assessment?</li> <li>• Is there any influence impact of them on the HR policy?</li> <li>• What if individual staff teaching performance continues to be demonstrably ineffective?</li> </ul>	<p>However, they complained about the lack of a stationary store inside the institution in order to avoid going to the city centre. There are a stationary in the institution but it does not sell the materials they need.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group Engineering</b></p> <p><b>Representatives (School director and Course Director)</b> Helping students through tutorial classes is understood as something that also helps teachers since the completion rate will be higher.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b> Teachers consider that exist an institutional concern about the size of students groups and its adequacy to the existing means, namely labs and supplies. By circumstances beyond the control of teachers, school and even the institution, they were forced to increase the number of students per class, negatively affecting the quality of teaching.</p> <p><b>Students</b> Students are satisfied with the level of equipment. The institution is not equipped with the latest technology, but given the crisis they feel it is enough: all classrooms have overhead projector which is an important support for the teaching and learning process. However, they knew that some areas, namely arts, were not as well equipped as they are.</p> <p><b>Regulations for the Assessment of Academic Staff Performance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Applicable to all full-time academic staff and administered every three years (Part-time staff are assessed on the basis of a self-drafted activity report).</li> <li>- Three dimensions are assessed making up a total of 100 points: Technical-scientific (max. 30 points); Pedagogic (maximum 55 points); Organizational (maximum 30 points).</li> <li>- In the assessment of the pedagogic dimension, the following aspects count: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o years of teaching experience in higher education</li> <li>o Teaching load (yearly averages of teaching hours and number of taught courses)</li> <li>o Pedagogic support (manuals and support texts; pedagogic material)</li> <li>o Participation in pedagogic activities (academic groups and committees; interaction academic activities and extra-curricular projects with businesses and other institutions)</li> <li>o Internship supervision</li> <li>o Quality of Teaching Performance (average result over three years of the assessment conducted by the quality office).</li> </ul> </li> <li>- The performance assessment conditions the indefinite nature of the employment contract for Adjunct Professors on completion of the probation period and the extension of fixed-term contracts for non-permanent staff. It also has consequences for the change of pay-scale.</li> </ul>
--	---

### **1<sup>st</sup> group**

Assessment is made through three main dimensions: pedagogic, scientific and management. Each dimension has a minimum level and teachers are free to choose within which dimension they want to be mainly assessed. The institutional strategy was to give more weight to the pedagogic dimension because when assessment started, the majority of teachers were finishing their PhDs and could not be assessed by their scientific activity. In three years from now, the weight of each dimension will be adjusted to the strategy followed at that time. If the institution considers that research is a priority, then it will be given more weight to the scientific dimension. Therefore, some institutional funding will be ensured in order to implement the structures for applied knowledge. If teachers want to produce scientific knowledge they should do it at a university.

The results of students' surveys are not public, thus it can only be accessed by each teacher and by the highest responsible person. An overall assessment is made for the study programme because it was not considered ethical to publish individual results and the Law does not require it. However, those results are taken into account for performance assessment of each teacher but this is not over weighted. In order to provide a balanced assessment, from 100 points, 4 or 5 are for the results of students' surveys. The success rates do not count for performance assessment of teachers. A teacher with a negative assessment will be asked to produce annual reports and will be directly followed by the assessment commission. However, when a "old" and tenured teacher gets a negative assessment, it is different, much more complicated. In fact, nothing can actually be done when a teacher who is in the top of his career gets a bad assessment. It depends largely on teachers' career status. That is why the institution is so rigorous in the recruitment process, making big efforts to choose the best teachers.

### **2<sup>nd</sup> group**

*Arts*

### **Representatives (School Director and Course director)**

It turns out to be the students' surveys on two aspects: teaching and curriculum units. By comparison and analysis of data they can have a feedback. It is in the statutes that 3 negative assessments have consequences. Theoretically, but in practical terms it is not that easy.

In order to assess teachers' performance, it is overlooked the assessment of the curricular unit, the time of contact, pedagogic materials produced, time that teachers dedicate to students, either on classrooms or tutoring, if they follow the students' work or not, because unfortunately there are some kind of specificities that have to be taken into account, bearing in mind that the assessment has to be transversal and the same for everyone, but there are things that are quite different.

Assessment has some positive effects: it shows the stage where the institution is and where it should be. It also promotes healthy competition, which fosters improvement.

Students play an important role on teachers' assessment, not only regarding pedagogic surveys, but also on study programme's commissions, where their voice is heard.

### **Teachers**

It is completely unpredictable how part of assessment results will be used, because it was assumed the achievement of certain goals

<p><b>Q5: How teachers are motivated by the HEI to assure and improve the quality of teaching?</b></p> <p>Note: good to trace especially as follows (or according to your national background):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is assessment of teaching performance used for motivation systems?</li> <li>• Are there at the HEI any financial and non-financial motivation tools dedicated to the teaching activities?</li> </ul>	<p>that presupposed a career progression, and this situation is completely suspended. There are many aspects of teachers' activities that are not taken into account precisely because they are not recordable in these formats of assessment.</p> <p>Teachers were a little bit reticent regarding the effectiveness of pedagogic surveys to students. They questioned the fact that students were constantly asked to fill questionnaires and that pressing and persistence make students less interested and more negligent not to say unfairly.</p> <p><b>Students</b> Students only complained about the Bologna restructuring of their study programme and about the fact that teachers tried to concentrate 5 years in 3.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b> <b>Engineering</b></p> <p><b>Representatives (School director and Course Director)</b> When there are problematic situations, they need to be identified, addressed and solved, or at least try to resolve them so that the mechanisms will work better. Assessment improves performance.</p> <p><b>Teachers</b> Theoretically, a positive assessment would be translated in a career progression. But it is all frozen. A negative assessment implies a very complex and bureaucratic process, most of the times ineffective.</p> <p><b>Students</b> Nothing was explicitly said about teachers' assessment. Students feel that assessment results are used to improve the quality of the study programme.</p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup> group</b> Given the current financial crisis, it was stated that it is not easy to reward teachers for their good work. The way found to overcome this and to motivate teachers to improve is including teacher in the process, providing them knowledge of what is going on. That way, teachers do not have the courage to ask for money to attend a certain conference and do not feel punished for having a negative answer. Motivation is something perceived as postponed issue.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> group</b> <b>Arts</b> <b>Representatives (School Director and Course director)</b> No kind of formal motivation directed to teachersexists. In the statutes, it is expected that 3 excellent assessments will lead to a career progression but it is still frozen. Even informal ways of motivation, for instance a special recognition, are not developed. It was ironically stated that the reward for a good teacher performance is giving them more work. Everybody wants to work with</p>
---	--

people that in fact work and do a good job.

It was also stated that the interaction on regular meetings enables a good communication and that motivates teachers. Also, the institution tries to positively reply to most of the initiatives proposed by teachers at the programme level (study visits and so on). Finally, it is considered as a motivation factor the invitation of teachers to perform coordination tasks.

#### **Teachers**

Teachers expressed their lack of motivation due to the weight of bureaucracy and financial constraints. They also expressed their concern about the frozen career progression and its implications. In fact, the impossibility of obtaining higher salaries is one of the consequences, perhaps not the most important. Other important consequence is the way it affects democracy within institutions, e.g. few people can hold management positions at the course or departmental level or higher up because they cannot apply to these positions which are frozen.

Even though, teachers feel informally motivated. For instance, they appreciate the schedule flexibility given to them. Also they feel motivated by the good feedback received from students they teach.

#### **Students**

Students think that their teachers are artists and therefore artists are always motivated, otherwise they would not produce works of art and students wouldn't be able to learn from them. Students recognized the work of their teachers.

#### ***2<sup>nd</sup> group Engineering***

#### **Representatives (School director and Course Director)**

In practical terms, there are no formal rewards for good teacher's performance. Given the small size of the institution, however, everybody knows who works and who doesn't. Teachers feel motivated if everybody likes him, and that happens if he contributes positively for teaching and learning.

#### **Teachers**

Teachers considered that neither the good teacher is rewarded nor the bad teacher is punished. It all depends on the self-motivation. Teachers self-motivate teaching and contributing to society. But they feel they are not rewarded because they do not feel enthusiasm, interest or value from the institution.

#### **Students**

Students did not express any opinion on this issue.