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1. Global context of quality teaching evaluation

- Quality assurance in higher education has become both essential and universal. (Henard & Ringuet, 2008)

- Students increasingly consider themselves as “clients” of institutions and they expect the learning experience be worth their money (Telford & Masson, 2005).

- Institutions support quality teaching as a vehicle for recognition, and assuring the quality of teaching becomes their core mission (Kanuka, 2010).
2. Vietnamese context of quality teaching evaluation

- The MoET: “We have not performed the task of supervising higher education quality effectively.” (Report 760/BC-BGD&ĐT, 2009).

- In 2010, the MoET approved a project named ‘Develop Educational Quality Assessment Systems for higher and vocational education in the 2011-2020 period’.

- In 2012, Vietnam had 420 higher education institutes with 2.5 million students and 84,000 teachers (including 3.5% professors and associate professors, 10% doctors and 40% masters).
3. Concerns to be taken into account

3.1. Systems’ ineffectiveness

- Teachers may teach less difficult material, more generous marking, or “being nice” to get a high grade in students’ evaluation on quality teaching. (Madu & Kuei, 1993)

- Teaching evaluation systems have not led to an improvement in academic quality but a degree of ‘performance in peer reviews’ or ‘dramaturgical compliance’. (Barrow, 1999)

- There is an ‘implementation gap’ between the intentions underpinning quality policy and the actual outcomes. (Newton, 2000).
3. Concerns to be taken into account

3.2. Compliance and resistance of academic staff

- Teaching staff do not mutely accept the changes and demands of quality assurance systems as the policy implementation is complex and uneven. (Newton, 2002)

- Teaching staff have very little faith in student questionnaires. (Douglas & Douglas, Anderson, 2006; Maisuradze, 2008)

- There are evidences of staff resistance reflected in both flexibility and control-oriented cultures. (Kleijnen, Dolmans, Muijtjens, Willems and Van Hout, 2009)
3. Concerns to be taken into account

3.3. Difficulties of teachers

- ‘Isolation’ is associated with setting where teachers learn little from their colleagues (Rosenholtz, 1989)

- ‘The intensification of teachers’ work’ creates persistent overload leading to an ‘erosion of the profession’. (Hargreaves, 1994; Scott, Stone & Dinham, 2000)
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4. Reasons underlying hindrances

4.1. Lack of agreement on evaluation criteria

- There is not an absolute definition of ‘good teaching’ depending on the teaching and learning conception. (Kember and Wong 2000, Lecouter and Del Fabbro 2001, Anderson, 2006)

- The characteristics of a ‘good teacher’ vary from faculty to faculty. (Maisuradze, 2008).
4. Reasons underlying hindrances

4.2. Lack of ‘scholarship of teaching’ perception

- “The aim of teaching is simple; it is to make students learning possible”. (Ramsden, 1992)

- “The only teaching which is valuable is, of course, that which leads to effective learning” (Boud & Brew, 1995).

- “The aim of scholarly teaching is also simple; it is to make transparent how we have made learning possible”. (Trigwell, Martin, Benjamin & Prosser, 2000)
4. Reasons underlying hindrances

4.3. Lack of collaborative communities for academic staff

- There is not enough opportunity and encouragement for teachers to work together, learn from each other, and improve their expertise as a community. (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1998; McLaughlin and Talbert, 2001)

- Successful teacher networks can build strong professional communities that help teachers together overcome their difficulties. (Van der Linden, Erkens, Schmidt, & Renshaw, 2000)
4. Reasons underlying hindrances

4.4. Lack of effective roles of middle managers

- Deans and heads play a key role in ensuring and improving quality teaching on campus. (Rice and Austin, 1990; Wright & O'Neil, 1994; Schulz's, 1988)

- Deans and heads express indifferent attitudes towards the problems and ideas of teachers and students during the process of quality teaching evaluation.
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5. Conditions to be satisfied

5.1. Conditions for the developing of evaluation systems

- Involve of the main actors of the didactic scene (teachers and students) in the period of developing teaching evaluation programs (Kember e Wong 2000, Lecouter e Del Fabbro 2001, Scriven 2003, Cousins 2003, Giles et al. 2004).

- Determine which aspects are dependent on contexts (specific to each faculty) and which are independent from contexts (transversal to faculties). (Kekale 2000, Palmer & Marra 2004, Ylijoki 2005)

- Use a variety of measurement techniques in quality teaching evaluation to have a thorough view and precise data. (Ghedin and Aquario, 2008)
5. Conditions to be satisfied

5.2. Conditions for the introducing of evaluation systems

- Create the commitment of a ‘transparent environment’ for quality teaching evaluation systems shared by managers, teachers and students. (Fullan 2001, Maisuradze 2008)

- Establish a clear understanding of effective, competent or excellent teaching shared by all didactic members. (Trigwell, 2001)

- Make a clear identification and delegation of responsibilities for actions in the teaching evaluation systems (with detailed tasks, time frame, and expectation).
5. Conditions to be satisfied

5.3. Conditions for the implementing of evaluation systems

- Explain thoroughly the characteristics of instruments and criteria to participants of teaching evaluations systems.

- Feedback data must be transformed into information that can be used within an institution, informed to managers and teachers.

- Be assured that evidence driven actions are taken following the data analysis for professional improvement.
5. Conditions to be satisfied

5.4. Fundamental condition: effective professional learning communities

- The practical knowledge for teaching is highly personal and contextualised (Retallick 1997, Mayer 2002,) and based on engaging with colleagues. (Tripp 1993, Nowlen 1988, Hiebert; Gallimore, & Stigler, 2002)

- Professional learning communities are able to affect the culture of a school by constructing a collective efficacy (Goddard, Hoy & Hoy A., 2000; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001)

- The impact of professional learning is multiplied when teachers participate in professional networks outside their schools. (Morris, Chrispeels, & Burke, 2003)
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