

Working Paper

What Resources Do We Have? Toward a Context-Sensitive Framework for Evaluating Faculty-Developed Teaching Materials

Docentes:

Carlo Granados Beltrán

Francisco Pérez Gómez

Doralba Pérez Ibáñez



ÚNICA
INSTITUCIÓN UNIVERSITARIA
COLOMBO AMERICANA



Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana – ÚNICA
Programa de Licenciatura en Bilingüismo con Énfasis en Español e inglés
Reg. SNIES: 106242 Bogotá D.C. – Colombia, 2022
Vigilada MinEducación

Working Paper – Resultado de Investigación

Grupo de Investigación Innovation on Bilingual Education INNOBED

Categoría B Colciencias

Dirección de Investigaciones

Calle 19 No. 2ª-49, Piso 3,

Centro Colombo Americano

Teléfono: 2811777 Ext. 1291

dirinvestigacioneslic@unica.edu.co

www.unica.edu.co

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26817/paper.37>



Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana – ÚNICA
Programa de Licenciatura en Bilingüismo con Énfasis en Español e Inglés.
Reg. SNIES: 106242

Bogotá D.C. – Colombia, 2022
Vigilada MinEducación

Working Paper - What Resources Do We Have? Toward a Context-Sensitive Framework for Evaluating
Faculty-Developed Teaching Materials

Dirección de Investigaciones
Calle 19 No. 2ª-49, Piso 3, Centro Colombo Americano
Teléfono: 2811777 Ext. 1291
dirinvestigacioneslic@unica.edu.co
www.unica.edu.co

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26817/paper.37>

Prohibida la reproducción parcial o total de esta obra sin autorización de la
Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana – ÚNICA



WHAT RESOURCES DO WE HAVE? TOWARD A CONTEXT-SENSITIVE FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATING FACULTY-DEVELOPED TEACHING MATERIALS

Abstract

This working paper reports the Analysis and Exploration process and the initial stage of Design and Construction of an ongoing Design-Based Research (DBR) study aimed at developing and refining a context-sensitive framework for evaluating faculty-developed teaching materials in ÚNICA's BA in Bilingualism with Emphasis on Spanish and English. The study addresses the absence of a consolidated mechanism for systematically identifying, characterizing, evaluating, preserving, and supporting the pedagogical re-use of faculty-created or substantially adapted resources. Analysis draws on four complementary sources: 24 accessible digital artifacts across eight subjects, organized into 23 analytical units; a 2025 diagnostic questionnaire completed by 16 faculty members; aggregated student-evaluation data from 21 eligible faculty-level reports from 2026-1; and institutional and regulatory documents. Specialized literature provides an additional theoretical and design resource. Findings show a heterogeneous corpus and identify faculty needs related to accessibility, systematic feedback, shared design criteria, and professional learning. Student-perception means ranged narrowly from 4.40 to 4.52, supporting attention to curricular alignment, clarity, learning support, and responsiveness to feedback without establishing substantive rankings among indicators. Integration of these sources informed eight provisional evaluation dimensions and a conditional digital and multimodal module. The resulting matrix remains a design proposal to be piloted, evaluated, and refined through subsequent DBR cycles.

Keywords: faculty-developed instructional materials; design-based research; materials evaluation; teacher education; student perceptions; quality assurance.

Resumen

Este documento presenta el proceso de Análisis y Exploración y la etapa inicial de Diseño y Construcción de una investigación basada en diseño (DBR) en curso, orientada a desarrollar y refinar un marco contextualizado para evaluar materiales didácticos elaborados por docentes de la Licenciatura en Bilingüismo con énfasis en Español e Inglés de ÚNICA. El estudio responde a la ausencia de un



mecanismo consolidado para identificar, caracterizar, evaluar, preservar y apoyar la reutilización pedagógica de recursos creados o adaptados sustancialmente por los docentes. El análisis se apoya en cuatro fuentes complementarias: 24 artefactos digitales accesibles correspondientes a ocho asignaturas, organizados en 23 unidades de análisis; un cuestionario diagnóstico aplicado en 2025 a 16 docentes; datos agregados de evaluación estudiantil provenientes de 21 reportes elegibles del periodo 2026-1; y documentos institucionales y regulatorios. La literatura especializada aporta un recurso teórico y de diseño adicional. Los hallazgos muestran un corpus heterogéneo e identifican necesidades docentes relacionadas con accesibilidad, retroalimentación sistemática, criterios compartidos de diseño y desarrollo profesional. Los promedios de percepción estudiantil se ubicaron entre 4,40 y 4,52, lo que respalda la atención a la alineación curricular, la claridad, el apoyo al aprendizaje y la respuesta a la retroalimentación, sin establecer jerarquías sustantivas entre indicadores. La integración de estas fuentes orientó ocho dimensiones provisionales de evaluación y un módulo digital y multimodal de aplicación condicional. La matriz resultante continúa siendo una propuesta de diseño que deberá pilotarse, evaluarse y refinarse en ciclos posteriores de DBR.

Palabras clave: materiales didácticos elaborados por docentes; investigación basada en diseño; evaluación de materiales; formación docente; percepción estudiantil; aseguramiento de la calidad.

Introduction

Within higher education, instructional materials mediate teaching and learning by organizing knowledge, structuring learning experiences, providing explanations and examples, and inviting specific forms of student engagement. The volume edited by Parcerisa Aran (2005) emphasizes that university teaching materials should be considered in relation to their formative purposes, the learning processes they support, and the functions they perform within a broader teaching and learning sequence. Their pedagogical value therefore depends not only on what they contain, but also on how and why they are used.

Instructional materials may also make aspects of teachers' Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) visible. Shulman (1987) describes PCK as the professional knowledge involved in transforming disciplinary content into forms that are understandable and pedagogically meaningful to learners. Decisions about sequencing, examples, representations, scaffolding, anticipated difficulties, and student activity can therefore be partially observed in the materials that teachers design.



This relationship is especially relevant in teacher education. In ÚNICA's BA in Bilingualism with Emphasis on Spanish and English, faculty-developed materials can perform a dual pedagogical function: they support students' immediate learning while also providing pre-service teachers with examples of how disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge are translated into instructional practice. In this sense, materials can become part of the pedagogical knowledge to which future teachers are exposed during their professional preparation. This view is consistent with ÚNICA's curricular approach, which emphasizes student-centered learning, active participation, articulation of theory and practice, and purposeful use of educational and technological resources (Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana – ÚNICA [ÚNICA], 2022).

At the same time, faculty-developed resources may remain dispersed across courses and academic periods when they are not systematically identified, documented, and examined. Their pedagogical value may therefore remain largely confined to their immediate contexts of use instead of contributing to a shared pedagogical memory that supports reflection, improvement, and informed re-use. This concern is reinforced by the current higher education quality-assurance framework in Colombia. Characteristic 13 of Agreement 01 of 2025 includes the production, relevance, use, and impact of teaching materials as a dimension of program quality and calls for their periodic evaluation through defined academic criteria and mechanisms (Consejo Nacional de Educación Superior [CESU], 2025).

Against this background, the study seeks to develop and iteratively refine a context-sensitive framework for evaluating faculty-developed teaching materials. Following a Design-Based Research (DBR) approach, the evaluation framework is treated as a design artifact to be developed, piloted, evaluated, and refined in authentic academic practice. This working paper reports on the Analysis and Exploration process and the initial stage of Design and Construction, drawing on the available corpus, the 2025 diagnostic faculty questionnaire, aggregated student perceptions, institutional and regulatory documents, and relevant specialized literature. Its findings are therefore preliminary and intended to inform subsequent cycles of evaluation and redesign.

Problem Statement

Faculty members in the BA in Bilingualism regularly create, adapt, and organize instructional resources as part of their teaching practice. The corpus available for this study provides evidence of



substantial diversity in disciplinary areas, pedagogical purposes, and formats, including worksheets, presentations, templates, assessment tools, interactive resources, videos, and other forms of pedagogical mediation. The issue addressed by the study is therefore not the absence of faculty-developed materials, but the lack of a consolidated mechanism for systematically identifying, characterizing, evaluating, preserving, and facilitating the pedagogical re-use of this production.

When resources remain primarily associated with individual courses, faculty members, or academic periods, pedagogically valuable design decisions may have limited visibility beyond their immediate context. Materials may remain stored as files without the pedagogical reasoning behind their design – such as decisions about selection, sequencing, examples, activities, assessment, and technology use – being documented or shared as part of the collective knowledge of the program. Systematization is therefore understood not simply as archiving resources, but as making their pedagogical characteristics and potential uses open to analysis, reflection, and improvement.

A related issue concerns evaluation. ÚNICA already collects student perceptions through faculty-evaluation reports that include items related to teaching materials. However, these aggregated perceptions have not been systematically connected to the analysis of the instructional artifacts themselves. Nor does the program yet have a shared framework that translates relevant pedagogical theory, institutional expectations, student perceptions, regulatory requirements, and corpus characteristics into explicit criteria for reviewing faculty-developed resources.

This evaluative gap is especially relevant considering Characteristic 13 of Agreement 01 of 2025 (CESU, 2025), which calls for the periodic evaluation of teaching materials through defined academic criteria and mechanisms. The challenge is therefore to develop a contextually appropriate way of examining pedagogical value and supporting continued improvement without reducing the process to a standardized checklist or to an evaluation of individual faculty performance. The project consequently approaches materials as evolving pedagogical artifacts and uses DBR to develop an evaluation mechanism from the realities of the program and to refine it through subsequent cycles of application and feedback.



Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this ongoing DBR study is to develop and iteratively refine a context-sensitive framework for the systematic evaluation and continued improvement of faculty-developed teaching materials in the BA in Bilingualism at ÚNICA. At the current stage, the study seeks to characterize the materials available for analysis, examine faculty practices and perceived needs through the 2025 diagnostic questionnaire, describe general tendencies in student perceptions through basic descriptive statistics, identify initial evaluation criteria from relevant literature and institutional and regulatory sources, and integrate these inputs into a first iteration of the evaluation matrix.

Research Questions

The study is guided by the following main research question:

How can a context-sensitive framework for the systematic evaluation and continued improvement of faculty-developed teaching materials be designed and iteratively refined in the BA in Bilingualism at ÚNICA?

At the current stage of the Design-Based Research process, this working paper addresses the following subquestions:

- What formats, pedagogical purposes, and instructional functions characterize the faculty-developed teaching materials currently available for analysis in the program?
- What faculty practices and perceived needs related to the development, review, feedback, and improvement of teaching materials emerge from the 2025 diagnostic questionnaire?
- What general tendencies emerge from students' evaluations of teaching materials in relation to comprehension, clarity and organization, curricular alignment, support for learning, and responsiveness to feedback?
- What initial evaluation dimensions and criteria emerge from the integration of corpus evidence, faculty practices and perceived needs, student perceptions, relevant literature, and institutional and regulatory frameworks?



Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework brings together perspectives on teacher knowledge, reflective professional practice, situated teacher competence, and materials development. Together, these perspectives support an understanding of faculty-developed materials as pedagogical artifacts that reflect decisions about content, learners, instructional activity, context, and improvement. Since the corpus spans several disciplinary and pedagogical areas, language-teacher education literature is combined with a broader perspective on university teaching materials.

Teacher Knowledge and Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Shulman's (1987) knowledge base for teaching provides a central analytical lens. Curricular knowledge is relevant to relationships among materials, course objectives, learning outcomes, and content; content knowledge informs disciplinary accuracy and adequacy; and knowledge of learners and contexts directs attention to language, difficulty, scaffolding, and diversity. Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) is particularly important because it concerns the transformation of disciplinary knowledge into forms that support understanding. Faculty-developed materials may therefore make aspects of pedagogical reasoning visible through decisions about selection, sequencing, explanations, examples, representations, learner activity, and assessment.

These categories are used to examine instructional artifacts rather than to measure individual teacher competence. Materials can make specific pedagogical decisions observable, but it cannot represent the full range of interactions, explanations, adaptations, and relationships involved in teaching. The analytical focus is therefore the resource and its design, not the overall performance of its author.

Reflective Practice and Situated Teacher Competence

Schön's (1983) reflective practice supports treating teaching materials as evolving rather than finished products. Their adequacy may change across groups and contexts as teachers respond during implementation and reconsider organization, examples, scaffolding, technological features, or alignment afterwards. This perspective informs the attention of the framework to feedback and iterative improvement without requiring every material to display a documented revision history.

Perrenoud's (2004) situated conception of teacher competence complements this view. Particularly relevant are organizing and facilitating learning situations, differentiating in response to learner



heterogeneity, and using technologies pedagogically. These dimensions direct attention to meaningful learner activity, contextual responsiveness, scaffolding, and purposeful technology use. Together, Schön and Perrenoud reinforce the principle that pedagogical adequacy depends on learners, purposes, resources, and conditions of implementation rather than on technological sophistication alone.

Materials Development and Contextualization in Language Teacher Education

Materials-development literature positions teachers as designers, adapters, and pedagogical users of instructional resources. Tomlinson (1998, 2011) broadens materials development beyond textbook production to include the design, adaptation, use, and evaluation of diverse resources, while Graves (1996) situates materials within interconnected decisions about learner needs, objectives, content, activities, assessment, resources, and contextual constraints. Colombian authors similarly emphasize teachers' agency in producing and adapting locally relevant materials and link this work with reflection and professional development (Ramírez Salas, 2004; Núñez Pardo & Téllez Téllez, 2009, 2015; Núñez-Pardo & Téllez-Téllez, 2021).

These perspectives are especially relevant in teacher education, where faculty-developed resources may both support university learning and model how curricular, pedagogical, and contextual considerations inform instructional design. For this study, a faculty-developed teaching material is understood as a discrete instructional artifact, or coherent set of artifacts, created or substantially adapted by faculty for student use in support of an identifiable learning purpose. When external texts, videos, websites, or applications are integrated within faculty-designed instructions, sequencing, scaffolds, tasks, or assessment, the resulting pedagogical structure may constitute part of the unit of analysis. This distinction recognizes pedagogical curation without treating the simple inclusion of an external resource as faculty authorship.

University Teaching Materials as Pedagogical Mediation

Parcerisa Aran (2005) provides a broader higher-education perspective by relating materials to formative purposes, learning processes, student autonomy, and their functions within instructional sequences. Materials may introduce or organize content, activate prior knowledge, guide activity, support practice, facilitate assessment, or enable independent learning. Resources intended for greater learner independence require particular attention to clarity of purpose, instructions, organization, accessibility, and expectations for student action.

A second contribution is the recognition that different types of materials should not be evaluated through entirely identical criteria. The relevance of particular criteria depends partly on format and function:



audiovisual resources may require attention to audibility and multimodal coherence, while independently used written resources may depend more strongly on instructions, sequencing, and navigation. This cross-disciplinary and format-sensitive perspective provides an important basis for combining common pedagogical dimensions with conditional criteria.

Toward an Analytical Framework for Faculty-Developed Teaching Materials

Taken together, these perspectives suggest that pedagogical quality should be examined through relationships among disciplinary content, curricular intentions, learners, activity, context, usability, and opportunities for improvement rather than through aesthetic or technological sophistication alone. Table 1 summarizes their principal contributions to the emerging framework.

Table 1

Contribution of the theoretical sources to the evaluation framework

Theoretical source	Central construct	Implication for the emerging evaluation framework
Shulman (1987)	Teacher knowledge and PCK	Curricular alignment; disciplinary adequacy; pedagogical transformation; representations, examples and scaffolding
Schön (1983)	Reflective practice	Responsiveness to implementation evidence, feedback, revision and continued improvement
Perrenoud (2004)	Situated mobilization of professional resources	Learning situations, differentiation, contextual responsiveness and purposeful technology use
Graves (1996); Tomlinson (2011)	Course/materials development	Relationship among learner needs, objectives, content, materials, activities and evaluation
Ramírez Salas (2004); Núñez Pardo & Téllez (2009, 2015); Núñez-Pardo & Téllez-Téllez (2021)	Teacher-generated and contextualized materials	Teacher agency, contextualization, learner responsiveness, reflective development and local relevance



Theoretical source	Central construct	Implication for the emerging evaluation framework
Parcerisa Aran (2005)	University materials as pedagogical mediation	Formative purpose, sequence, autonomy, clarity/usability, pedagogical function and format-sensitive evaluation

These theoretical perspectives constitute one source for the initial matrix and are integrated with corpus evidence, the diagnostic faculty questionnaire, student perceptions, and institutional and regulatory expectations. The resulting framework is therefore context-sensitive and provisional rather than a direct application of any single theoretical model.

Methodology

Design-Based Research Orientation

This study adopts a Design-Based Research (DBR) approach to develop and iteratively refine a context-sensitive framework for evaluating faculty-developed teaching materials. DBR is appropriate when research seeks both to understand a problem of practice and to develop and improve a solution within the setting where that problem occurs. The Design-Based Research Collective (2003), Anderson and Shattuck (2012), and McKenney and Reeves (2019) emphasize the iterative relationship among analysis, design, enactment, evaluation, and redesign in authentic educational contexts.

The design artifact in this study is the evaluation framework, operationalized at this stage through an initial matrix. Its criteria are informed by corpus evidence, a diagnostic faculty questionnaire, aggregated student perceptions, specialized literature, and institutional and regulatory expectations. Rather than transferring an existing generic instrument to the program, the study develops criteria from the local context and treats the framework as provisional and open to revision through subsequent DBR cycles.

The study combines qualitative and descriptive approaches. Qualitative content analysis is used to characterize instructional resources and generate candidate evaluation criteria. The 2025 diagnostic faculty questionnaire and the material-related indicators from student evaluations are analyzed descriptively, while institutional and regulatory documents provide contextual requirements relevant to framework design.



Research Setting and Current DBR Cycle

The study is situated in ÚNICA's BA in Bilingualism with Emphasis on Spanish and English in Bogotá, Colombia. The available teaching materials represent eight subjects—Low Intermediate English, Assessment, Phonology, Principles of Research, Microteaching Middle, Economics, Educational Informatics, and Hispanic American Literature—and vary in disciplinary orientation, format, interactivity, pedagogical purpose, and expectations for student independence.

Following McKenney and Reeves (2019), the study is organized around four iterative processes: Analysis and Exploration, Design and Construction, Evaluation and Reflection, and Implementation and Spread. Analysis and Exploration incorporate both pre-existing institutional evidence and evidence examined specifically for the present DBR cycle. In particular, a diagnostic faculty questionnaire administered during 2025-1 provided information about materials-development practices, feedback processes, and perceived needs before the evaluation framework was developed. This working paper reports Analysis and Exploration and the initial stage of Design and Construction. Later processes are included only to clarify the planned trajectory of the study.

Table 2

Process of Design-Based Research

DBR process	Status in this study	Main evidence or activity
Analysis and Exploration	Reported in this working paper	Diagnostic faculty questionnaire administered in 2025-1; systematization and characterization of the available corpus; review of relevant scholarship; examination of institutional and regulatory documents; and descriptive analysis of aggregated student-perception data.
Design and Construction	Initial stage reported in this working paper	Integration of evidence from the analysis phase; identification of provisional evaluation dimensions and criteria; distinction between common and format-sensitive criteria; and development of the initial evaluation matrix.



DBR process	Status in this study	Main evidence or activity
Evaluation and Reflection	Subsequent DBR cycle	Pilot application of the framework with a diverse selection of instructional materials; comparison of reviewer interpretations; collection of post-use faculty perspectives on clarity, relevance, applicability, overlap, and usability; and revision of criteria, descriptors, and framework structure.
Implementation and Spread	Later DBR cycle	Broader use with faculty and academic peers; continued refinement; and exploration of applications for documentation, improvement, preservation, responsible re-use, and institutional learning.

Data Sources and Unit of Analysis

Analysis and Exploration draw on four complementary empirical and documentary sources, supported by specialized literature as a theoretical and design resource. The first source is the corpus of faculty-developed teaching materials. On May 6, 2026, 21 faculty members were invited by institutional email to voluntarily contribute one or two materials developed for student use. The invitation suggested materials with whose design faculty members were satisfied or that they perceived as having produced positive results. Five faculty members contributed materials, and collection remained open until June 19, 2026.

The corpus is therefore purposive, voluntary, and self-selected rather than representative of all faculty production. The solicitation may also have introduced positive self-selection bias because contributors were encouraged to submit materials that they regarded as successful or well designed. The corpus comprises 24 accessible digital artifacts across eight subjects, organized into 23 analytical units. These include worksheets, presentations, hyperdocuments, planning templates, assessment resources, interactive materials, audiovisual resources, graphic organizers, and a spreadsheet-based resource.

The second source is a diagnostic faculty questionnaire administered during 2025-1. Sixteen faculty members responded to questions concerning materials development, perceived effectiveness, accessibility,



curricular alignment, updating, feedback, and perceived improvement needs. Since the questionnaire preceded the framework, it is treated as contextual evidence within Analysis and Exploration rather than as an evaluation of the matrix.

The third source consists of institutional faculty-evaluation reports from 2026-1. Twenty-two reports were available, of which 21 were included in the descriptive analysis. One report was excluded because material-related indicators appeared more than once with different aggregate values, preventing unambiguous extraction of a single score for each indicator. Only five student-evaluation items directly related to teaching materials were analyzed. Access to these data was authorized by the Academic Vice-President's Office, and findings are reported only as aggregated program-level results.

The fourth source comprises institutional and regulatory documents relevant to curriculum, teaching materials, faculty development, and quality assurance, including ÚNICA's Curricular Policy, the 2025 Program Self-Evaluation Report, and Characteristic 13 of Agreement 01 of 2025.

Unit of Analysis

The primary unit of analysis is a discrete instructional resource or coherent instructional sequence organized around an identifiable pedagogical purpose. A unit may therefore consist of one file, a complete digital sequence within one interactive resource, or several files that function together as one instructional package.

Accordingly, one Stations–TBL presentation and the accompanying Task-Based Learning Lesson Plan Template were treated as one instructional sequence, whereas self-contained hyperdocuments and Genially resources were treated as individual units despite containing multiple stages or screens. One Hispanic American Literature sequence consisted of two videos intended to be viewed in order. Because the first video could not be accessed, the sequence was retained as one pedagogical unit but classified as partially accessible, and coding was limited to observable features of the accessible component.

Faculty authorship was also distinguished from pedagogical curation. External texts, videos, websites, or applications were not considered faculty-developed merely because they were linked or embedded; however, faculty-designed selection, sequencing, instructions, scaffolding, assessment, or contextualization around such resources could constitute part of the instructional unit.



Analytical Procedures

Corpus characterization recorded subject, format, pedagogical function, student activity, interactivity, relationship with assessment, and expectations for guided or independent work. The 23 analytical units were then examined through qualitative content analysis using a coding framework that combined deductive and inductive logic (Schreier, 2012).

Coding was conducted jointly by the research team, and categorization decisions were discussed and resolved through consensus. Deductive categories were informed by the theoretical framework, ÚNICA's Curricular Policy (ÚNICA, 2022), the Program Self-Evaluation Report, Characteristic 13 of Agreement 01 of 2025, the diagnostic faculty questionnaire, and the five material-related student-evaluation indicators. The framework remained open to inductive categories emerging from the corpus, particularly those related to format, interactivity, pedagogical curation, multimodality, learner independence, and instructional function.

Analysis proceeded iteratively. Categories were compared across materially and pedagogically different resources to identify overlaps, gaps, and format-dependent criteria. Analytic notes documented category definitions, borderline cases, decisions concerning the grouping of files into analytical units, and relationships among categories. Qualitative content analysis thus supported both corpus characterization and the identification of candidate criteria for later DBR testing.

The 2025 diagnostic faculty questionnaire was analyzed descriptively. Closed-ended responses were summarized through frequencies and counts, while open-ended responses were reviewed for recurring practices, perceived needs, and opportunities for improvement. The questionnaire was used to establish contextual design requirements rather than to evaluate the framework.

Student perceptions were analyzed through basic descriptive statistics using only the five material-related items. For each indicator, the arithmetic mean was calculated across 21 eligible faculty-level aggregate scores. One additional report was excluded because duplicated indicators with different values prevented unambiguous extraction of a single score. Since the reports provide faculty-level aggregates rather than individual student responses, the analysis is descriptive and does not support causal claims or direct links between student ratings and particular instructional units.



Institutional and regulatory documents were examined to distinguish expectations concerning the characteristics of materials from expectations concerning the review process itself. Finally, evidence from the corpus, faculty questionnaire, student perceptions, specialized literature, and institutional and regulatory documents was mapped across the emerging framework dimensions. Sources were treated as complementary rather than interchangeable, and a criterion was retained when it had a clear pedagogical, empirical, contextual, or regulatory rationale.

Rigor, Reflexivity, and Ethical Considerations

Methodological transparency was supported by documenting how materials were obtained and accessed, how files were grouped into analytical units, how categories were created and revised, and how borderline cases were resolved. Evidence mapping was used to make relationships between data sources and emerging framework dimensions explicit.

As the researchers work within the institutional setting under study, reflexivity was necessary to distinguish observable material characteristics from interpretations based on insider knowledge. Subsequent DBR cycles will provide additional opportunities to compare reviewer interpretations and refine criteria that prove ambiguous or difficult to apply consistently.

The project was institutionally reviewed by ÚNICA's Research Committee on February 27, 2026. Act No. 01 (ÚNICA, 2026) records the project on the systematization of faculty-developed teaching materials as pertinent and necessary and approves or ratifies its continuation during 2026. This is reported as institutional approval, not as formal ethical approval.

Faculty participation was voluntary. Faculty members whose teaching materials were considered for inclusion in the study were invited to provide informed consent for the use of their materials for research purposes. The consent process informed participants about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, the intended use of the materials, and the conditions under which the information would be analyzed and reported. Faculty could decline participation without penalty or adverse consequence. Materials made available for research analysis are not assumed to be authorized for unrestricted reproduction, redistribution, or publication.

Access to the 2025 diagnostic faculty questionnaire responses for secondary analysis in this study, as well as access to the 2026-1 institutional faculty-evaluation reports and use of the five material-related



items, was authorized by the Academic Vice-President's Office. Individual faculty scores, qualitative student comments, and identifiable questionnaire responses are not reported; findings from both sources are presented only in aggregated form. The study distinguishes evaluation of instructional materials from evaluation of faculty performance.

Faculty-developed materials are also treated as intellectual products. Authorship, sources, copyright, permissions, licenses, and conditions for adaptation or reuse must therefore be considered separately from pedagogical evaluation, particularly before materials or identifiable excerpts are reproduced externally.

Methodological Scope

This working paper is limited to Analysis and Exploration and the initial stage of Design and Construction. It provides the characterization of the corpus, the descriptive analysis of the 2025 faculty questionnaire and aggregated student perceptions, an examination of theoretical and contextual sources, and a first iteration of the evaluation framework.

The study does not establish that the framework is valid, reliable, or ready for institutional adoption. The matrix is a provisional design proposal whose clarity, applicability, completeness, consistency, and usefulness must be examined through pilot application, reviewer comparison, faculty feedback, and subsequent DBR cycles.

Preliminary Findings

The findings correspond to Analysis and Exploration and the initial stage of Design and Construction. They describe the corpus, faculty practices and perceived needs, student perceptions of teaching materials, and the design requirements emerging from the integration of complementary evidence sources.

A Heterogeneous Corpus with Multiple Pedagogical Functions

The corpus comprises 24 accessible digital artifacts across eight subjects, organized into 23 analytical units. The distinction reflects the fact that digital files do not necessarily correspond one-to-one with pedagogically meaningful resources or sequences. The corpus varies substantially in disciplinary orientation, format, pedagogical purpose, interactivity, and expected student participation. One



Hispanic American Literature sequence was classified as partially accessible because only the second of two ordered videos could be viewed.

Table 3

Overview of the Available Corpus of Faculty-Developed Teaching Materials

Subject	Accessible digital artifacts	Analytical units	Main formats represented
Low Intermediate English	5	5	Worksheets and guided language-learning resources
Assessment	3	3	Hyperdocument, self/peer assessment resource, presentation
Phonology	3	3	Presentation, graphic organizer, visual reference
Principles of Research	2	2	Faculty-created audiovisual resource, interactive resource
Microteaching Middle	4	3	Worksheet/assessment resources, presentation, stations activity with lesson-plan template, interactive resource
Economics	3	3	Spreadsheet-based resource, presentations
Educational Informatics	3	3	Content-curation activity, academic writing guide, presentation
Hispanic American Literature	1 accessible component*	1 partially accessible unit	Faculty-created audiovisual sequence
Total	24	23	Heterogeneous print, digital, audiovisual, and interactive formats

Note. Digital artifacts and analytical units are not equivalent. In Microteaching Middle, the Stations–TBL resource and its accompanying lesson-plan template were treated as components of one coherent instructional sequence. In Hispanic American Literature, two videos were contributed as an ordered



sequence, but only the second was accessible to the research team; the sequence was therefore retained as one partially accessible analytical unit.

The corpus includes materials that explain or organize content as well as resources that structure discussion, analysis, analysis, planning, problem solving, collaboration, self-assessment, and application. Some depend strongly on teacher mediation, whereas others support greater learner independence. Materials also vary in the relationship between faculty creation and pedagogical curation: external texts, audiovisual resources, websites, and digital tools are sometimes incorporated into faculty-designed sequences through selection, contextualization, scaffolding, and connection to learning tasks.

Format did not determine pedagogical function. Similar formats supported different purposes, while different formats contributed to comparable learning processes. This finding supports an emerging design principle: the framework requires a common pedagogical core combined with format-sensitive criteria when technical, interactive, or multimodal characteristics become relevant.

Faculty Practices and Perceived Needs for Materials Improvement

The 2025 diagnostic questionnaire provided contextual evidence about faculty practices and perceived needs. Among the 16 respondents, nine considered their materials fully aligned with course objectives and curriculum and seven mostly aligned; 12 perceived that their materials contributed to learning outcomes to a great extent and four to a moderate extent. Practices were less consistent in accessibility and feedback: four respondents considered their materials highly accessible to diverse learning needs, seven moderately accessible, and five reported limited accessibility. Formal student feedback was collected regularly by three respondents and occasionally by seven, while six did not formally collect it but expressed interest in doing so. Thirteen respondents similarly reported not receiving formal feedback from program leadership but indicated that they would value it.

Faculty identified training in instructional-material design (15 respondents), structured student feedback (9), and clear guidelines for creating and updating materials (7) as priorities. These patterns are consistent with the 2025 Program Self-Evaluation Report (ÚNICA, 2025) and suggest that the main institutional needs concern shared criteria, accessibility, systematic feedback, review processes, and professional learning, rather than a perceived absence of curricular alignment or educational purpose.



Student Perceptions of Teaching Materials

Aggregated student-evaluation data provided a complementary perspective. For each of the five material-related indicators, the arithmetic mean was calculated across 21 eligible faculty-level aggregate scores on the institutional five-point scale. The results represent broad program-level tendencies rather than pooled individual student responses.

Table 4

Student Perceptions of Teaching Materials

Student-perception indicator	Arithmetic mean
Materials help students understand course topics	4.40
Materials are well organized, clear, and easy to read	4.43
Materials are directly related to course objectives and content	4.52
Activities, examples, or illustrations in the materials support learning	4.51
Student or peer feedback is considered to improve materials	4.43

All five means were favorable and closely grouped, ranging from 4.40 to 4.52. Given the small differences among indicators and the absence of individual-level distributions or measures of dispersion, the results do not support substantive rankings among dimensions. Instead, they indicate that curricular alignment, clarity and organization, support for understanding and learning, and responsiveness to feedback are all relevant to students' experience of teaching materials. Since the reports cannot be linked one-to-one to the 23 analytical units, they should not be interpreted as evidence of the effectiveness of particular resources.

Institutional and Regulatory Design Requirements

Institutional and regulatory sources identified expectations relevant both to teaching materials and to the process through which they should be reviewed. ÚNICA's Curricular Policy (ÚNICA, 2022) emphasizes student-centered and active learning, articulation between theory and practice, learner participation and diversity, independent learning, and purposeful use of educational and technological resources. These expectations inform criteria related to curricular alignment, learner activity, scaffolding, inclusion, contextual responsiveness, and pedagogical technology use.



The 2025 Program Self-Evaluation Report (ÚNICA, 2025) provides a more specific institutional diagnosis. It recommends clearer materials-design criteria, professional development, systematic feedback, and an institutional route for formative evaluation addressing pedagogical quality, accessibility, linguistic and cultural relevance, and alignment with learning outcomes. At the national level, Characteristic 13 of Agreement 01 of 2025 (CESU, 2025) emphasizes the production, relevance, use, impact, and periodic evaluation of teaching materials through defined academic criteria and mechanisms.

These requirements operate at different levels. Some inform artifact-level criteria, while others concern the evaluation process, including periodic review, structured feedback, professional learning, and documentation. Together, they support a formative and developmental approach through which materials can be examined, improved, documented, and responsibly re-used.

Emerging Design Requirements for the Evaluation Framework

Integration of the different evidence sources informed eight provisional dimensions for the evaluation framework. The dimensions were not expected to be supported equally by every source. Instead, each emerged from a particular combination of corpus evidence, faculty practices and perceived needs, student perceptions, specialized literature, and institutional or regulatory expectations. Table 5 makes these relationships explicit by identifying the principal sources informing each dimension.

Table 5

Provisional Dimensions of the Evaluation Framework and Principal Evidence Sources

Provisional dimensión	Main focus	Principal evidence sources
Pedagogical purpose and curricular alignment	Relationship among the purpose of the material, intended learning, course content, and curricular expectations	Corpus; diagnostic faculty questionnaire; student perceptions; specialized literature; institutional documents
Content quality and disciplinary rigor	Accuracy, disciplinary appropriateness, currency where relevant, and appropriate use of sources	Corpus; specialized literature; Curricular Policy



Provisional dimensión	Main focus	Principal evidence sources
Learning facilitation and scaffolding	Explanations, examples, representations, sequencing, guidance, and other supports for understanding	Corpus; student perceptions; specialized literature; Curricular Policy
Learner activity, autonomy, and assessment	Meaningful student participation, independent learning, assessment opportunities, and feedback	Corpus; specialized literature; Curricular Policy
Clarity, organization, accessibility, and usability	Instructions, organization, navigation, readability, accessibility, and ease of use	Corpus; diagnostic faculty questionnaire; student perceptions; specialized literature; institutional documents
Contextualization, diversity, and inclusion	Responsiveness to learners, context, linguistic and cultural diversity, and potential barriers to participation	Corpus; diagnostic faculty questionnaire; specialized literature; Curricular Policy; Program Self-Evaluation Report
Responsiveness to feedback and iterative improvement	Opportunities for reviewing and improving materials through feedback and implementation experience	Diagnostic faculty questionnaire; student perceptions; specialized literature; Program Self-Evaluation Report; quality-assurance requirements
Authorship, sourcing, rights, and conditions for re-use	Identification of authorship and sources and documentation of conditions for adaptation, preservation, dissemination, and re-use	Corpus; institutional documentation on intellectual production and rights; project requirements for preservation and responsible re-use

The evidence mapping shows that the dimensions have different evidentiary profiles. Alignment, learning facilitation, clarity and accessibility, and responsiveness to feedback are informed by several complementary sources, whereas dimensions such as disciplinary rigor or authorship and conditions for re-



use depend more strongly on particular theoretical, corpus, or institutional evidence. This variation is treated as a feature of the design rather than requiring artificial agreement among sources.

The eight dimensions constitute a provisional common pedagogical core. Because some criteria depend on modality, the framework also includes a conditional digital and multimodal module addressing technical accessibility, navigation, multimodal coherence, audibility and legibility, interaction design, and the pedagogical contribution of technology. The complete draft matrix appears in Appendix A and should be understood as a first proposal for design, whose clarity, relevance, overlap, applicability, and completeness remain to be examined in subsequent DBR cycles.

Discussion

The findings support a context-sensitive approach to evaluating faculty-developed teaching materials. The corpus varies not only in format but also in pedagogical purpose, degree of teacher mediation, learner participation, expectations for independent work, and relationships with assessment. Teaching materials should therefore be examined in relation to the learning processes they are intended to mediate rather than primarily through formal or technological characteristics.

This heterogeneity provides the rationale for combining a common pedagogical core with conditional format-sensitive criteria. A uniform instrument could overlook characteristics relevant only to specific modalities, whereas separate instruments for every format could fragment shared pedagogical expectations. The proposed framework therefore retains common dimensions such as curricular alignment, disciplinary quality, learning facilitation, learner activity, accessibility, contextual responsiveness, and iterative improvement, while applying criteria such as navigation, audibility, multimodal coherence, or interaction design only when relevant.

Faculty-developed materials may also make aspects of pedagogical decision-making visible through content selection, representations, sequencing, scaffolding, learner activity, assessment, and the integration of external resources. This is particularly relevant in teacher education, where materials can both support immediate learning and model instructional design for future teachers. However, an instructional resource represents only one dimension of teaching practice and should not be interpreted as evidence of a faculty member's overall competence or performance.



The 2025 diagnostic faculty questionnaire and Program Self-Evaluation Report (ÚNICA, 2025) situate the framework within an institutional need that preceded the present design cycle. Faculty reported generally favorable perceptions of curricular alignment and educational value, but less systematic practices concerning accessibility, formal feedback, and continued review. They also identified professional development, clearer guidelines, and structured feedback as priorities. The institutional self-evaluation similarly recommends a formative route for reviewing faculty-developed materials, including criteria related to pedagogical quality, accessibility, linguistic and cultural relevance, alignment with learning outcomes, and systematic feedback. The framework can therefore be understood as a design response to an already documented institutional need.

Student perceptions provide complementary rather than confirmatory evidence. The five material-related means were favorable and closely grouped, but their small differences and the aggregated nature of the reports do not support meaningful rankings among indicators. More appropriately, the results suggest that alignment, clarity, support for understanding and learning, and responsiveness to feedback are all relevant aspects of students' experience with instructional materials. Because these reports cannot be linked directly to individual analytical units, they do not validate particular criteria or demonstrate the effectiveness of specific resources.

More broadly, the framework emerges from the integration of complementary evidence sources with different functions. Corpus analysis identifies observable pedagogical characteristics; the faculty questionnaire identifies practices and perceived needs; student reports contribute broad perceptions of materials use; specialized literature provides conceptual lenses; and institutional and regulatory documents establish contextual expectations. The resulting dimensions therefore need not be supported identically by every source. Their explicit evidence-mapping provides a more transparent basis for design than assuming uniform convergence.

The framework also positions materials review as a formative rather than merely compliance-oriented process. Systematic review can support reflection, professional learning, documentation, improvement, preservation, and responsible re-use while contributing to a shared institutional pedagogical memory. Nevertheless, the current matrix remains a first proposal for design rather than a validated instrument. The next Evaluation and Reflection cycle will pilot it with heterogeneous instructional resources, compare reviewer interpretations, and collect post-use faculty perspectives on its clarity, relevance, applicability, completeness, overlap, and usefulness. Unlike the 2025 diagnostic questionnaire,



this future instrument will generate evidence specifically about the framework and guide its subsequent revision.

Conclusions

This working paper reports the Analysis and Exploration process and the initial stage of Design and Construction of a DBR study aimed at developing a context-sensitive framework for the evaluation and continued improvement of faculty-developed teaching materials in ÚNICA's BA in Bilingualism. The study examined 24 accessible digital artifacts across eight subjects, organized into 23 analytical units, and integrated this corpus with a 2025 diagnostic questionnaire completed by 16 faculty members, aggregated student perceptions from 21 eligible faculty-level evaluation reports, specialized literature, and institutional and regulatory sources.

The findings support an evaluation approach that combines a common pedagogical core with conditional format-sensitive criteria. Faculty questionnaire results identified needs related to accessibility, systematic feedback, clearer materials-development guidance, and professional learning, while student perceptions provided complementary evidence concerning alignment, clarity, support for understanding and learning, and responsiveness to feedback. These sources contributed different but complementary forms of evidence to the framework.

The resulting framework comprises eight provisional dimensions and a conditional digital and multimodal module. It should be understood as a first proposal rather than a validated instrument and is intended for formative and developmental use rather than for evaluating or ranking individual faculty members.

The findings are limited by the available evidence. The corpus was voluntarily contributed and self-selected; one instructional sequence was only partially accessible, and student-evaluation data consist of faculty-level aggregates that cannot be linked directly to individual instructional units. The present cycle also does not yet establish reviewer consistency or faculty perceptions of the clarity, relevance, applicability, or usefulness of the framework.

The next Evaluation and Reflection cycle will pilot the matrix with heterogeneous instructional resources, compare reviewer interpretations, and collect post-use faculty perspectives specifically about the



framework. These data will inform subsequent revision before any broader institutional implementation is considered.

At this stage, the project contributes a transparent and context-sensitive basis for examining faculty-developed teaching materials as evolving pedagogical resources and for connecting materials review with reflection, improvement, documentation, preservation, responsible re-use, and institutional learning.

References

- Anderson, T., & Shattuck, J. (2012). Design-based research: A decade of progress in education research? *Educational Researcher*, 41(1), 16–25. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11428813>
- Consejo Nacional de Educación Superior. (2025). *Acuerdo 01 de 2025: Por el cual se actualiza el Modelo de Acreditación en Alta Calidad*. Ministerio de Educación Nacional.
- Design-Based Research Collective. (2003). Design-based research: An emerging paradigm for educational inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 32(1), 5–8. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X032001005>
- Graves, K. (Ed.). (1996). *Teachers as course developers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana – ÚNICA. (2022). *Política curricular*.
- Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana – ÚNICA. (2025). *Informe de autoevaluación: Licenciatura en Bilingüismo con énfasis en Español e Inglés*.
- Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana – ÚNICA. (2026, February 27). *Acta No. 01 del Comité de Investigaciones* [Meeting minutes].
- McKenney, S., & Reeves, T. C. (2019). *Conducting educational design research* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315105642>.



- Núñez Pardo, A., & Téllez Téllez, M. F. (2009). ELT materials: The key to fostering effective teaching and learning settings. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 11(2), 171–186. <https://revistas.unal.edu.co/index.php/profile/article/view/11449>
- Núñez Pardo, A., & Téllez Téllez, M. F. (2015). Reflection on teachers' personal and professional growth through a materials development seminar. *HOW*, 22(2), 54–74. <https://doi.org/10.19183/how.22.2.151>
- Núñez-Pardo, A., & Téllez-Téllez, M. F. (Eds.). (2021). *Defying culture hegemony through teacher generated EFL materials*. Universidad Externado de Colombia. <https://bdigital.uexternado.edu.co/handle/001/4671>
- Parcerisa Aran, A. (Ed.). (2005). *Materiales para la docencia universitaria: Orientaciones para elaborarlos y mejorarlos*. Octaedro; Institut de Ciències de l'Educació, Universitat de Barcelona.
- Perrenoud, P. (2004). *Diez nuevas competencias para enseñar: Invitación al viaje*. Graó.
- Ramírez Salas, M. (2004). English teachers as materials developers. *Actualidades Investigativas en Educación*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.15517/aie.v4i2.9087>
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. SAGE.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411>
- Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2011). *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139042789>



Appendices

Appendix A. Initial Draft of the Analytical Matrix for Faculty-Developed Teaching Materials

The following matrix represents the first design iteration of the evaluation framework. It is intended to guide systematic analysis and generate evidence for subsequent refinement, not to produce a definitive quality score or evaluate faculty performance. Reviewers may record qualitative observations for each dimension and mark criteria as not applicable when the purpose or format of the material makes them irrelevant.

Dimension	Initial criteria	Guiding questions
1. Pedagogical purpose and curricular alignment	Identifiable purpose; relationship with learning outcomes, course objectives, content, and learning sequence	Is the pedagogical purpose clear? How does the material contribute to intended learning outcomes or course objectives? Is its use coherent with the learning sequence?
2. Content quality and disciplinary rigor	Accuracy; disciplinary appropriateness; currency where relevant; appropriate terminology and sources	Is the content accurate and appropriate for the disciplinary context? Are concepts, explanations, examples, terminology, and sources adequately presented?
3. Learning facilitation and scaffolding	Explanations; examples; representations; sequencing; instructions; support for comprehension	How does the material help students understand or work with the content? Are explanations, examples, representations, prompts, or scaffolds appropriate?
4. Learner activity, autonomy, and assessment	Meaningful activity; application; independent work; self-regulation; assessment and feedback	What are students expected to do with the material? Does it promote meaningful participation? When relevant, does it support independent learning, assessment, or feedback?
5. Clarity, organization, accessibility, and usability	Organization; clarity of instructions; readability; navigation; accessibility; ease of use	Is the material clearly organized and understandable? Are instructions explicit? Can intended learners access and use it without avoidable barriers?
6. Contextualization, diversity, and inclusion	Relevance to learners and context; appropriate difficulty; diversity; equitable participation	Does the material respond to learners' characteristics, prior knowledge, language level, and context? Does it acknowledge diversity and avoid unnecessary barriers?



7. Responsiveness to feedback and iterative improvement	Revisability; feedback-informed improvement; reflection on implementation	How can feedback from students, peers, or implementation experience inform review and continued improvement of the material?
8. Authorship, sourcing, rights, and conditions for re-use	Identification of authorship and external sources; attribution; conditions for adaptation, preservation, dissemination, or re-use	Are authorship and external sources identifiable? When applicable, are relevant rights, permissions, licenses, or re-use conditions documented or identifiable?

Conditional Digital and Multimodal Module

The following criteria are applied only when relevant to the format of the material:

Criterion	Guiding questions
Technical accessibility	Can students access and use the resource with technologies reasonably available in the instructional context?
Navigation and interaction	Is navigation understandable and consistent? Do interactive elements support the learning task?
Multimodal coherence	Do text, images, audio, video, or other modes complement one another pedagogically rather than distract or unnecessarily duplicate information?
Legibility and audibility	Are visual and auditory elements sufficiently clear for their intended instructional purpose?
Interaction design	When interaction is included, does it require meaningful learner decisions or actions?
Pedagogical value of technology	Does the use of technology contribute purposefully to the learning objective rather than function mainly as a decorative feature?

Note. The dimensions, criteria, and guiding questions have not yet been validated or standardized. Their clarity, relevance, overlap, applicability, and usefulness will be examined in subsequent DBR cycles. Criteria may be revised, combined, removed, or expanded in response to evidence generated during pilot application.



Appendix B. Post-Pilot Faculty Questionnaire on the Evaluation Framework

Purpose

This questionnaire is intended for use during the Evaluation and Reflection cycle of the Design-Based Research study, after participating faculty members have applied the provisional evaluation framework to one or more instructional resources. Its purpose is to gather post-use perspectives on the framework's clarity, relevance, applicability, completeness, usability, and potential contribution to the improvement of faculty-developed teaching materials. The questionnaire has not yet been administered. Its results will be used to revise the framework and will not be used to evaluate individual faculty performance.

Section A. Experience Using the Framework.

1. **What type of instructional resource did you review using the framework?**

Select the option that best describes the resource.

- Worksheet or activity guide
- Presentation
- Assessment resource
- Planning template
- Hyperdocument or linked digital sequence
- Video or audiovisual resource
- Interactive digital resource
- Spreadsheet or data-based resource
- Graphic organizer
- Other: _____

2. **How clear were the instructions for applying the evaluation framework?**

- Very clear
- Clear
- Somewhat clear
- Somewhat unclear
- Very unclear

3. **How easy was it to identify evidence in the instructional resource for the criteria included in the framework?**

- Very easy
- Easy
- Neither easy nor difficult
- Difficult
- Very difficult

4. **Approximately how much time did you need to apply the framework to the instructional resource?**

- Less than 15 minutes
- 15–30 minutes
- 31–45 minutes
- 46–60 minutes
- More than 60 minutes



Section B. Relevance and Applicability of the Framework

5. Based on your use of the framework, how relevant was each of the following dimensions for reviewing the instructional resource?

Rate each dimension as:

Highly relevant / Relevant / Somewhat relevant / Of limited relevance / Not relevant / Not applicable

- Pedagogical purpose and curricular alignment
- Content quality and disciplinary rigor
- Learning facilitation and scaffolding
- Learner activity, autonomy, and assessment
- Clarity, organization, accessibility, and usability
- Contextualization, diversity, and inclusion
- Responsiveness to feedback and iterative improvement
- Authorship, sourcing, rights, and conditions for re-use

6. Were any criteria difficult to understand or interpret?

- No
- Yes

7. If yes, please identify the criterion or criteria and explain the difficulty:

8. Did any criteria seem to overlap or assess substantially the same aspect of the material?

- No
- Yes

If yes, which criteria?

9. Did you identify any important aspect of the instructional resource that was not adequately addressed by the framework?

- No
- Yes

If yes, please describe it:

Section C. Format-Sensitive Criteria

10. If the resource included digital, audiovisual, interactive, or multimodal features, how useful was the conditional digital and multimodal module?

- Very useful
- Useful
- Somewhat useful
- Of limited usefulness
- Not useful
- Not applicable to the resource reviewed



11. Were any format-specific criteria missing, unnecessary, or difficult to apply to the resource you reviewed? Please explain.

Section D. Usefulness and Improvement

12. To what extent did the framework help you reflect on strengths and possible areas for improvement in the instructional resource?

- To a great extent
- To a considerable extent
- To some extent
- To a limited extent
- Not at all

13. How useful could this framework be for the formative review and continued improvement of faculty-developed teaching materials at ÚNICA?

- Very useful
- Useful
- Somewhat useful
- Of limited usefulness
- Not useful

14. What aspects of the framework were most useful when reviewing the material?

15. What aspects of the framework should be revised, simplified, combined, removed, or added?

16. What concerns or conditions should be considered before using this framework more broadly within the institution?

Closing Question

17. Is there anything else you would recommend to improve the framework or the process through which faculty-developed teaching materials are reviewed?



Appendix C. Informed consent



Consentimiento informado

Título del Estudio: _ Investigador principal: _ Co-investigador: Auxiliar de investigación: _

Estimado participante,

Este es un formato de consentimiento para la participación en una investigación. El formato contiene información acerca del estudio y lo que puede esperar si decide participar. Por favor, estudie la información cuidadosamente. Siéntase libre para hacer preguntas a los investigadores antes de decidir si desea o no participar.

1. ¿Qué se investiga?
2. ¿Por qué es importante este estudio? ¿Qué beneficios traerán los resultados?
3. ¿Por qué me pidieron participar en este estudio?
4. ¿Quiénes más participan en la investigación?
5. ¿Qué actividades me solicitarán realizar en este estudio?

Dar su consentimiento para participar en este estudio permitirá que los investigadores puedan:

6. ¿Durante cuánto tiempo estaré en el estudio?



7. ¿Es voluntaria la participación en este estudio?

Su participación es voluntaria. Usted puede negarse a participar en este estudio. Si decide participar, usted puede dejar el estudio en cualquier momento. No importa qué decisión tome, no habrá ninguna sanción ni afectación.

8. ¿Los participantes incurrirán en gastos?

No. Bajo ninguna circunstancia se solicitará a los participantes el pago de dineros o que incurran en gastos relacionados con el proyecto.

9. ¿Qué riesgos o beneficios puedo esperar si participo en el estudio?

El estudio no representa ningún riesgo para su integridad. La participación en la investigación no contempla compensación.

10. ¿Cómo se garantiza la confidencialidad de la información relacionada con el estudio?

11. ¿Quién puede contestar las preguntas acerca del estudio?



Firmar el Formulario de Consentimiento

Su participación en este estudio es muy importante. Agradecemos su gentil atención y su autorización para colaborar en el desarrollo de este proyecto.

He leído (o alguien me ha leído) este formato y soy consciente que me piden participar en un estudio de investigación. He tenido la oportunidad de hacer preguntas y estoy satisfecho con las respuestas entregadas. Voluntariamente acepto participar en este estudio.

Nombre del participante	Firma del participante
Correo electrónico	Teléfono de contacto
Seudónimo	Fecha

NOTA ADICIONAL:
Doy autorización para la utilización de muestras y datos, en futuros estudios: SÍ NO _