

# Traits to evaluate in teaching performance. The students' voice

—

Raciel Sánchez Rincón  
racieluatx@gmail.com  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1989-4158>

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION SCIENCES, UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE TLAXCALA,  
TLAXCALA, MÉXICO



To quote this article:

Sánchez Rincón, R. (2021). Los rasgos a evaluar en el desempeño docente. La voz de los estudiantes. *Espacio I+D: Innovación más Desarrollo*, 10(28). <https://doi.org/10.31644/IMASD.28.2021.a05>

— Abstract —

The objective of this work was to determine the main features to be evaluated in the teaching performance from the opinion of the students from the dimensions: personal, disciplinary, didactic-pedagogical, and professional that allow feedback to the instrument of evaluation of the teaching performance via the opinion of the student used in the School of Education Sciences of the UATX. A study was carried out under the quantitative approach, analyzing the responses of 204 students belonging to the two degrees offered by the School of Education Sciences of the Universidad Autónoma de Tlaxcala: Educational Sciences and Educational Communication and Innovation. It was found that the main features to evaluate are related to didactic planning, learning evaluation strategies, the interpersonal teacher-student relationship, as well as assiduity and punctuality.

**Keywords:**

*Teacher evaluation; evaluation of teacher performance; modalities of teacher evaluation; features of teacher performance evaluation.*

The evaluation of university teaching is a complex issue that we have been trying to understand over time from various approaches, methodologies, and techniques. The purpose of teacher evaluation is to improve the quality of teaching, pay for accountability, and decision-making in institutions. In this regard, it is important to differentiate between teacher evaluation, teacher performance evaluation, and academic performance evaluation (Sánchez-Rincón, 2019). The first, in the case of the university professor, considers the substantive functions: teaching, research, management, and tutoring (Caballero & Bolívar, 2015; Mas & Olmos, 2016). The second considers only teaching, that is, everything the teacher does from planning their classes to putting them into practice (Rueda, 2018). And the third is related to research, which includes the writing of articles, books, lectures, conferences, and consultancies. This work addresses, first of all, an approach to the teacher performance evaluation questionnaires, the student as an evaluating agent, the dimensions of the teacher performance evaluation, and the teacher performance evaluation practiced at UATX. Next, the methodology and methods that governed this research are presented, in which the approach, the subjects as well as the instrument used are specified. Afterward, the results and discussion are presented based on the information obtained; lastly, the conclusions.

#### *Teacher performance evaluation questionnaires*

The evaluation of teacher performance in higher education has been carried out through various instruments since the 1940s (García, 2003). There are different instruments to understand the reality of educational practice, however, the most widely used in the world to evaluate teaching effectiveness is the questionnaire via the student's opinion (Gómez & Valdés, 2019). Commonly, questionnaires assume teaching as a multidimensional activity and are based on the notion of generic characteristics of effective teaching (Marsh, 1984). That is, the important qualities of effective teaching are substantially unchanged, they do not change according to courses, disciplines, and institutions (Marsh, 1984).

The research has shown that the questionnaires reflect what the student sees and experiences in the classroom, and it is argued that these instruments are valid and reliable (Luna & Torquemada, 2008; Luna & Reyes, 2015). However, the wrong design, the times of application, and the misuse of the results show the bad practices and the continuous disparity between what is found in the investigations and the procedures implemented by the institutions (Luna & Torquemada, 2008; Silva, 2016).

Initially, the teaching evaluation questionnaires were designed based on a conservative pedagogy supported by knowledge transmission models (Luna & Torquemada, 2008). It was not until the early nineties that it was

questioned to include only the dimensions associated with teaching effectiveness in the questionnaires. In addition, there is a need to incorporate the particularities of the pedagogical context and focus teaching on the needs of students, favoring collaborative learning practices as a way of responding to the educational models of each institution (Luna & Torquemada, 2008; Luna & Reyes, 2015). In the same way, dimensions are included to evaluate the opinions of the students of what they learned in the course. However, its massive use arouses disbelief in teachers, because many of these instruments have been developed by the same institutions, or are adaptations of other questionnaires and not always under criteria of methodological rigor and adequate guidance.

Evaluation actions must be consistent with the institutional philosophy to support the achievement of its mission. Likewise, the results of the evaluation must be considered credible by teachers, students, administrators, and the academic community in general (Luna & Torquemada, 2008; Moreno, 2018). The credibility of the conclusions must be based on the use of scientific methodologies that ensure the reliability and validity of the processes and political independence, as well as the professionalism of the evaluators.

#### *The student as an evaluating agent of teaching performance*

The student is one of the oldest and most used evaluating agents of teaching performance in national higher education institutions in practically the entire world (García, 2003). This practice is based on the fact that students are one of the best sources of information in the teaching-learning process, as well as in the fulfillment of academic objectives by the teacher. The existing findings indicate that teaching evaluation questionnaires are reliable and valid instruments to assess teaching effectiveness and that those concerns or natural resistances of university professors and officials to use them are not entirely supported by empirical research (García, 2003). On the one hand, the students, based on their experience in educational processes and with different teachers, are one of the best judges of the relevance of the teacher's activities in the classroom. On the other hand, some authors question the use of this source of information, since they argue that the students' vision is partial and subjective, considering that they are not experts in the discipline (Luna & Torquemada, 2008), therefore, they cannot judge learning methodologies in a particular discipline, the bibliographic relevance or a didactic sequence, so they think that their opinion does not reflect the teacher's performance (Díaz-Barriga, F. 2004).

### *Dimensions of teacher performance evaluation*

Although there is no consensus on the characteristics of a quality teacher, various studies related to teacher effectiveness can identify and classify them in dimensions, according to their importance for learning (Luna & Torquemada, 2008). Based on the research by Sánchez-Rincón (2019), four dimensions were identified that consider the main features to evaluate teaching performance: 1) personal, 2) disciplinary, 3) didactic - pedagogical, and 4) professional. The first is related to teacher-student interaction. The second considers the structural and conceptual domain of the object of study. The third, on the one hand, didactics is conceived as the study of the genesis, circulation, and appropriation of knowledge and its teaching-learning conditions (Díaz-Barriga, 2013). On the other hand, the pedagogical becomes a great umbrella that combines the contributions of different scientific disciplines to explain the educational act. The fourth is linked to compliance with the rules of the institution concerning its educational practice inside and outside the classroom (Galván & Farias, 2018).

### *The evaluation of teaching performance in the ses of the uatx*

It consists of the application of an online questionnaire via the student's opinion. This instrument is available from the last partial evaluation and each student must answer it in order to have access to review their final grades. The results of the evaluation are delivered to each teacher by the coordinator of the academic program at the beginning of the following semester, through a document that shows the obtained and optimal scores in each of the dimensions represented in a frequency polygon graph. It is important to mention that this instrument was taken from a proposal by ANUIES in 2000 to evaluate the performance of teachers. However, it needs to be contextualized to the needs of the university community and consider the participation of those involved in its preparation.

## METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

This work is part of a broader research process, so this article only presents results of the personal, disciplinary, pedagogical-didactic, and professional dimensions. It was carried out under the quantitative approach, of the exploratory, descriptive and evaluative type by statistical inference in the independent variables.

### *Population*

The total number of students from the fourth to the eighth semester of the spring 2020 period of the two curricula of the School of Educational Sciences: Bachelor of Communication and Educational Innovation (LCEE) and Bachelor of Education Sciences (LCE). 235 students corresponding to the LCE and 64 students corresponding to the LCEE.

### *Sample*

To determine the sample size of the population, the sample calculation formula was applied at a confidence level of 95%, resulting in 146 students for the LCE and 52 students for the LCEE. The final result considered 154 questionnaires answered by the LCE students and 50 by the LCEE students (two questionnaires were disregarded because they were incomplete).

### *Categorical Variables*

The categorical variables considered were semester (from fourth to eighth), educational program (lce or lcee), gender (man or woman), and academic achievement (from D to A).

## DESIGN, VALIDATION, AND APPLICATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

### *Design*

The questionnaire is divided into seven main categories: personal factors, academic factors, personal dimension, disciplinary dimension, didactic-pedagogical dimension, professional dimension, and expectations in the evaluation of teacher performance. In this particular case, only four categories will be analyzed: personal dimension, disciplinary dimension, didactic-pedagogical dimension, and professional dimension. They were given a Likert scale of 5 adjectives ranging from not acceptable to excellent.

### *Construct validation*

For the validation of the construct, it was reviewed by a group of experts, made up of postgraduate researchers in Education at UATX, who analyzed and evaluated each of the items, considering the objectives of the research. After attending to the observations made by the experts and adjusting the questionnaire, a pilot test was carried out with some students from the School of Philosophy and Letters of the UATX. Subsequently, a statistical vali-

dation was performed to ensure the reliability of the item with Cronbach's Alpha algorithm, yielding a value of 0.84.

### *Application*

Information was collected directly with each of the students belonging to the two study plans. For the LCE, 154 questionnaires were obtained, of which 120 belong to women and 34 to men. Regarding LCEE, 50 questionnaires were obtained, of which 27 correspond to women and 23 to men.

## RESULTS

The t Student test was carried out for the approval of hypotheses as a measure of comparison in a sample by grouping data in four dimensions: a) personal, b) disciplinary, c) didactic-pedagogical, and d) professional. The results are the product derived from the statistical analysis supported by the SPSS version 19 program.

### *a) Personal dimension*

In all variables, hypothesis test values greater than 1.96 (table value) were obtained, so the null hypothesis is rejected. It was found that the variable weighted as "excellent" is respectful treatment. Likewise, the variables valued as "very good" are individual attention and the teacher's motivation for the student to attend tutoring sessions. Finally, the variable weighted as "acceptable" is the teacher's time dedicated to his or her students (see table 1).

**Table 1**  
*Personal dimension*

Item	Question	Medium	u test value	T value	Assessment of the response
X17	The teacher must treat all students with respect	4.72	4.5	5.329	****Ho is rejected
X18	The teacher must dedicate the necessary time to their students outside of class	3.39	3.0	4.232	*Ho is rejected
X19	The teacher must provide individual attention to students who request it	4.34	4.0	6.573	***Ho is rejected
X20	The teacher must motivate his students to attend tutoring sessions and solve their doubts	4.18	4.0	2.704	***Ho is rejected

\*\*\*\*Excellent, \*\*\*Very good, \*\*Good, \*Acceptable, Not acceptable  
 $U = >4.5$      $U = >4.0$      $U = >3.5$      $U = >3$      $U = <3$

Source: own elaboration

Teacher-student interaction is one of the traits best valued by students: respect, attention, and motivation. We are struck by how little importance is given to the teacher's dedication to their students outside of class.

### *b) Disciplinary dimension*

Students valued the teacher's mastery of the subject as "excellent". Hypothesis test values greater than 1.96 (table value) were obtained, compared with a test value  $u = 4.5$ , so the null hypothesis is rejected (see table 2).

**Table 2**  
*Disciplinary dimension*

Item	Question	Medium	$u$ test value	T value	Assessment of the response
X29	It is the teacher's obligation to master the contents of the subject he teaches	4.78	4.5	7.740	**** Ho is rejected

\*\*\*\*Excellent, \*\*\*Very good, \*\*Good, \*Acceptable, Not acceptable.  
 $U = >4.5$      $U = >4.0$      $U = >3.5$      $U = >3$      $U = <3$

Source: own elaboration

The university professor commits to be a specialist in his or her area of knowledge. He or she has to be dedicated to researching the content of his or her subject and teaching itself.

### *c) The didactic-pedagogical dimension*

In all variables, hypothesis test values greater than 1.96 (table value) were obtained, so the null hypothesis is rejected. It was found that the variables weighted as "excellent" are related to the planning of the class, the clarity of the teacher in his or her speech, the use of various means of support in teaching-learning, that the teacher lets them know in advance fair learning evaluation criteria.

The variables valued as "very good" have to do with the teacher following a logical and orderly sequence of the class and the presentation of the topics, as well as relating previous knowledge with new ones. Likewise, the teacher must find a way to encourage the participation of students in class by developing and presenting topics, promoting dialogue, and debate on the topics discussed. Likewise, it must use different strategies for learning evaluation, deliver the results promptly and inform students about the behavior of the apprehension of knowledge. The variable valued as "good" is related to the promotion of group work. Finally, the variable weighted as "acceptable" is related to the implementation of strategies to help organize



the new information to be learned and strategies to better understand the topics (see table 3).

**Table 3**  
*Didactic-pedagogical dimension*

Item	Question	Medium	$\mu$ test value	T value	Assessment of the response
X25	The teacher should encourage students to ask questions and participate in class	4.29	4.0	4.787	***Ho is rejected
X26	The teacher must promote student's participation in the elaboration and presentation of topics	4.36	4.0	7.340	***Ho is rejected
X27	It is the teacher's responsibility to encourage group work	4.00	3.5	7.305	**Ho is rejected
X28	It is the teacher's responsibility to encourage dialogue, reflection, and debate on the topics covered	4.24	4.0	3.777	***Ho is rejected
X29	The teacher must plan their classes in order to obtain the maximum guarantees of success	4.77	4.5	7.746	****Ho is rejected
X30	The teacher must follow a logical sequence in the order of the course topics	4.57	4.0	10.862	***Ho is rejected
X31	It is the teacher's responsibility to relate the new topics with what has been seen previously before intruding new knowledge	4.41	4.0	7.259	***Ho is rejected
X32	The teacher must be clear in his presentations	4.75	4.5	6.868	***Ho is rejected
X33	It is the teacher's responsibility to prepare syntheses or summaries of what has been reviewed or what is going to be explained	3.56	3.0	7.494	*Ho is rejected
X34	The teacher must present the topics in order	4.56	4.0	12.504	***Ho is rejected
X35	The teacher must use various means of learning support	4.66	4.5	4.222	****Ho is rejected
X36	The teacher has the responsibility of verifying at the end of the sessions if the students have understood what they have studied	4.36	4.0	6.820	***Ho is rejected
X37	The teacher must make the evaluation criteria known to his students	4.86	4.5	11.950	****Ho is rejected
X38	The teacher must be fair in evaluations	4.85	4.5	11.158	****Ho is rejected
X39	It is the teacher's responsibility to use different evaluation mechanisms according to the objectives to be evaluated	4.49	4.0	12.804	***Ho is rejected
X40	It is the teacher's responsibility to deliver the evaluations' results on time.	4.55	4.0	11.373	***Ho is rejected
X41	It is the teacher's responsibility to inform students about problems detected in their evaluation	4.59	4.0	12.709	***Ho is rejected

\*\*\*\*Excellent, \*\*\*Very good, \*\*Good, \*Acceptable, Not acceptable.  
 $U = >4.5$      $U = >4.0$      $U = >3.5$      $U = >3$      $U = <3$

Source: own elaboration

It is expected that the teacher privileges didactic strategies that guide students to the development of high-level cognitive skills, to the reasoned internalization of values and attitudes, to the appropriation and implementation of complex learning, as a result of their participation in experiential educational environments and located in real contexts (Díaz-Barriga, F & Hernández, 2010).

#### *d) Professional dimension*

In all variables, hypothesis test values greater than 1.96 (table value) were obtained, so the null hypothesis is rejected. It is evident, firstly, that the variables weighted as “excellent” refer to the teacher attending regularly and complying with the established schedules in class and tutoring. Second, the variables weighted as very good concern that teachers attend on time and finish their classes at the indicated time (see table 4).

**Table 4**  
*Professional dimension*

Item	Question	Medium	u test value	T value	Assessment of the response
X21	It is the teacher's responsibility to attend their classes on time	4.57	4.0	9.208	***Ho is rejected
X22	It is the teacher's responsibility to attend their classes regularly	4.71	4.5	5.108	****Ho is rejected
X23	The teacher must finish their scheduled classes on time	4.42	4.0	6.919	***Ho is rejected
X24	The teacher must comply with the schedule established in class and tutoring sessions	4.63	4.5	2.914	****Ho is rejected

\*\*\*\*Excellent, \*\*\*Very good, \*\*Good, \*Acceptable, Not acceptable.  
 $U = >4.5$      $U = >4.0$      $U = >3.5$      $U = >3$      $U = <3$

Source: own elaboration

It is interesting to observe that the items considered in this dimension are valued between excellent and very good, evidencing the importance of the teacher's commitment to their educational practice.

## CONCLUSIONS

The objective of this article was to determine the main features to be evaluated in the teaching performance from the opinion of the students from the personal, disciplinary, didactic-pedagogical, and professional dimensions that allow feedback to the teaching performance evaluation instrument via

the opinion of the student used in the School of Education Sciences of the UATX. The conclusions can be grouped into the four dimensions mentioned above:

#### *Personal dimension*

The findings matched Cabalín, Navarro, Zamora, and San Martín (2010) work which shows that respect is the main characteristic of a good university professor. Similarly, Casero (2016) found that the personal qualities of the teacher are one of the main features to evaluate in their performance. A good teacher does not present moments of indifference with his or her students (Galván & Farías, 2018). Regarding teacher motivation towards students, Cabalín *et al.* (2010) find different results, since, in their research, motivation is in the last place of 10 characteristics of a good university professor. It is important to mention that motivation is intrinsic, the teacher must generate challenging, pertinent, and contextualized learning environments so that students are interested in the object of study. Finally, it is interesting to observe that students give “acceptable” ratings to teacher actions related to spending time with students after class.

#### *Professional dimension*

The results agree with that evidenced by Hickman, Alarcón, Cepeda, Cabrera, and Torres (2016), who found, from the opinion of the students, that the traits related to attendance and punctuality are the second most important aspect of a total of 10 to evaluate teacher performance. In this regard, Perrenoud (2008) wonders whether complying with the school calendar or with the number of class hours of a discipline ensures that students learn.

#### *Didactic-pedagogical dimension*

As in other investigations, didactic planning is one of the most important traits to be evaluated by students (Reyes, González, & Ramírez, 2018; Leguey, Leguey, & Matosas, 2018). Likewise, Abadía, Bueno, Ubieta, Márquez, Sabaté, Jorba and Pagés (2015) found the teacher’s ability to explain the contents well to be on top. Regarding the learning evaluation strategies, there are coincidences with the work of Abadía *et al.* (2015) highlighting the importance for students of previously having the evaluation criteria in each of the products proposed by the teacher. Sanahuja and Sánchez-Tarazaga (2018) consider it necessary for teachers to demonstrate their evaluative competence: knowing how to evaluate and carrying out evaluation as a wide set of techniques and methods. Regarding the use of various means to support teaching, there is a small difference with what was found by

Martínez, Sánchez, and Martínez (2010) who show average ratings of 4.0 as "very good" for the findings of this research valued as "Excellent".

It is interesting to find evaluations of "good" to the actions of the teacher to promote group work, considering that the Universidad Autónoma de Tlaxcala has an educational model which favors sociocultural learning. In addition, students give "acceptable" weights regarding the teacher making graphic organizers to recover previous knowledge and relate the new information to be learned.

In general, it was found that the traits associated with the didactic-pedagogical are well-valued by university students (Fernandes, Sotolongo & Martínez, 2016; Ávila, Juárez, Arreola & Palmares, 2019). In this sense, Díaz-Barriga and Hernández (2010) argue that these teaching strategies intend to intentionally facilitate deep processing of the information to be learned or to reinforce what has been learned. It is important to mention that it is the teacher who, based on his experience, knows how, when, where, and why to use certain teaching strategies.

#### *Disciplinary dimension*

What was found in this research matches with the work of Galván and Farías (2018) who find that mastering the content of the subject they teach has a favorable impact on the evaluation of teacher performance. In the same way, Fernández and Luna (2004) find in the first place the subject's domain to the work of the teacher in the classroom.

The results obtained have made it possible to identify that the evaluations issued by the students regarding the main features to be evaluated in teaching performance are consistent with what was found in various studies. However, it is notable that complying with the established schedules in class and tutoring sessions is more relevant than for the teacher to work with graphic organizers to facilitate learning, or to encourage group work, even more, the dedication of time to students outside of school class to solve their doubts. Similarly, discuss whether it is convenient to maintain or differentiate weights for the traits identified as excellent to obtain the total score in the evaluation of teacher performance. It is suggested that in future investigations qualitative methods be deepened to collect the impressions of teachers and students from other Schools of the Universidad Autónoma de Tlaxcala since the different training contexts could influence different constructions of the participants.

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Abadía, A.R.,** Bueno, C., Ubieto, M.I., Márquez, M.D., Sabaté, S., Jorba, H. y Pagés, T. (2015). Competencias del buen docente universitario. Opinión de los estudiantes. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 13 (2), 363-390. <https://doi.org/10.4995/redu.2015.5453>
- Ávila, M. G.,** Juárez, L.G., Arreola, A. L. y Palmares, O. G. (2019). Construcción y valoración de un instrumento de valoración del desempeño docente en la ejecución de una secuencia didáctica. *Revista de Investigación en Educación*, 17(2), 122-142. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=7284993>
- Cabalín, D.,** Navarro, N., Zamora, J. y San Martín, S. (2010). Concepción de Estudiantes y Docentes del Buen Profesor Universitario. Facultad de medicina de la universidad de la Frontera. *Int. J. Morphol*, 28(1), 283-290. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0717-95022010000100042>
- Caballero, K. y** Bolívar, A. (2015). El profesorado universitario como docente: hacia una identidad profesional que integre docencia e investigación. *Revista de docencia universitaria*, 13(1), 57-77. <http://red-u.net/redu/files/journals/1/articles/900/public/900-3924-1-PB.pdf>
- Casero, A.** (2016). Deconstrucción del “buen profesor”. Análisis de las características formales y no formales de la docencia universitaria. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación y Evaluación Educativa*, 22(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7203/relieve.22.2.9419>
- Díaz –Barriga, A.** (2013). Construcción de programas de estudio en la perspectiva del enfoque de desarrollo de competencias. *Perfiles Educativos*, XXXVI (143). [http://perfileseducativos.unam.mx/iisue\\_pe/index.php/perfiles/article/view/44027/39836](http://perfileseducativos.unam.mx/iisue_pe/index.php/perfiles/article/view/44027/39836)
- Díaz -Barriga, F.** (2004) Aproximaciones metodológicas al análisis y evaluación de la docencia. Algunas críticas entorno a los métodos de evaluación de profesores y algunas incursiones alternativas. En M. Rueda y F. Díaz Barriga (Coords.), *La evaluación de la docencia en la universidad. Perspectivas desde la investigación y la intervención profesional* (pp. 121 – 136). México: CESU/PLAZA y Valdés.
- Díaz –Barriga, F. y** Hernández. G. (2010). *Estrategias docentes para un aprendizaje significativo. Una interpretación constructivista*. México: McGrawHill
- Fernández, E. y** Luna, E. (2004). Evaluación de la docencia y el contexto disciplinario. La opinión de los profesores en el caso de ingeniería y tecnología. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa*. 9 (23), 891 – 911. <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=14002306>
- Fernandes, D.,** Sotolongo, M. y Martínez, C. (2016). La evaluación del desempeño por competencias: Percepciones de docentes y Estudiantes en la

- Educación superior. *Formación universitaria*, 9(5), 15-24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-50062016000500003>
- Galván, J. O. y Farías, G. M.** (2018). Características Personales y Práctica Docente de Profesores Universitarios y su Relación con la Evaluación del Desempeño. *Revista Iberoamericana de Evaluación Educativa*, 11(2), 9-33. <https://doi.org/10.15366/riee2018.11.2.001>
- García, J.M.** (2003). Los pros y los contras del empleo de los cuestionarios para evaluar al docente. *Revista de la Educación superior*, 3, 79-87. [https://publicaciones.anuies.mx/pdfs/revista/Revista127\\_S3A6ES.pdf](https://publicaciones.anuies.mx/pdfs/revista/Revista127_S3A6ES.pdf)
- Gómez, L.F. y Valdés, M.G.** (2019). La evaluación del desempeño docente en la educación superior. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 7(2), 479-515. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2019.v7n2.255>
- Hickman, H., Alarcón, M. E., Cepeda, M.L., Cabrera, R. y Torres, X.K.** (2016). Significado de un buen profesor y de evaluación docente por estudiantes y maestros universitarios. La técnica de redes semánticas. *Revista Electrónica de Educación*. <https://sinectica.iteso.mx/index.php/SINECTICA/article/view/636>
- Leguey, S., Leguey, S. y Matosas, L.** (2018). ¿De qué depende la satisfacción del alumnado con la actividad docente? *Espacios*, 39(17). <https://revistaespacios.com/a18v39n17/18391713.html>
- Luna, E. y Reyes, E.** (2015). Validación de constructo de un cuestionario de evaluación de la competencia docente. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa*, 17(3), 13-27. <http://redie.uabc.mx/vol17no3/contenido-luna-pinuelas.html>
- Luna, E. y Torquemada, A.** (2008). Los cuestionarios de evaluación de la docencia por los alumnos: balance y perspectivas de su agenda. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa*, Especial. <http://redie.uabc.mx/NumEsp1/contenido-lunatorquemada.html>
- Marsh, H. W.** (1984). "Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and utility", en *Journal of Educational Psychology* (76), 707-754.
- Martínez, A., Sánchez, M. y Martínez, J.** (2010). Los cuestionarios de opinión del estudiante sobre el desempeño docente. Una estrategia institucional para la evaluación de la enseñanza en medicina. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa*, 12 (1), 1-19. <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=15513269009>
- Mas, O. y Olmos, P.** (2016). El Profesor Universitario en el Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior. La autopercepción de sus competencias actuales y orientaciones para su formación pedagógica. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa*, 21(69), 437-470. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=14045395005>

- Moreno, T.** (2018). La evaluación docente en la universidad: Visiones de los alumnos. *Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, 16(3). <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=55160077005>
- Perrenoud, P.** (2008). *La evaluación de los alumnos. De la producción de la excelencia a la regulación de los aprendizajes. Entre dos lógicas*. Buenos Aires: Colihue.
- Reyes, E.P., González, E.C. y Ramírez, P.A.** (2018). Evaluar la práctica docente a partir de los comentarios de los estudiantes universitarios. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 76(2). <https://rieoei.org/RIE/article/view/3096/3961>
- Rueda, M.** (2018). Los retos de la evaluación docente en la universidad. *Publicaciones*, 48(1), 143-159. <https://www.revistaseug.ugr.es/index.php/publicaciones/article/view/7334>
- Sanahuja, A. y Sánchez-Tarazaga, V.** (2018). La competencia evaluativa de los docentes: formación, dominio y puesta en practica en el aula. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 76(2), 95-116. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie7623072>
- Sánchez – Rincón, R.** (2019). Metaevaluación del desempeño docente. Una aproximación a la realidad. *Atenas*, 4(48), 127-143. <http://atenas.umcc.cu/index.php/atenas/article/view/513/792>
- Silva, C.** (2016). Una experiencia de participación de docentes y estudiantado para diseñar las encuestas de opinión. *Atenas*, 4(36), 119-135. <http://atenas.umcc.cu/index.php/atenas/article/view/252/433>