

International Journal of Human Sciences Research

UNIVERSITIES MANAGEMENT POLICIES IN ANGOLA: NATIONAL QUALITY SYSTEM

Tuca Manuel

Departamento de Ciências Sociais
do Instituto Superior de Ciências da
Educação de Benguela (Angola).

<https://iscedbenguela.org>

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2150-6687>

Maria da Conceicao Barbosa Mendes

Instituto Superior de Ciências da
Educação de Benguela (Angola).

<https://iscedbenguela.org>

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4904-7056>

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: Concerns about the quality of universities have suggested to the Angolan State and Universities institutions (Universities) institutional responses aimed at making the institutions' mission compatible with national and global public expectations. The present study, based on a bibliographic review and document analysis, represented by the legislation on the subject, aims to generate an understanding of national efforts to guarantee the quality of the performance of universities. For this purpose, two guiding questions were raised: (i) what theoretical-normative elements configure the quality assurance mechanisms in Universities in Angola? (ii) what is the level of sufficiency of regulatory devices for quality assurance? It appears that the determinism of procedures influenced by bureaucratic rationalism has not been sufficient to collect the plan of intentions to the contextual reality. Resorting to the establishment of a quality management system (QMS) was another institutional response to the consubstantiation of universities management policies, requiring, however, a continued assimilation by the actors rather than the expectation of a spontaneous acquisition. This also requires the integration of admission procedures and evaluation of teaching performance, in the set of institutionalized devices for gauging the quality of the performance of universities.

Keywords: Angola, performance quality, evaluation, management policies, and quality management system.

The concern with the quality of Universities in Angola is claimed with greater incidence at the beginning of the 21st century, however, the devices and foundations for its reach are being evoked in a fragmented way. They focus on the quality of teachers, but scarcely on universities management policies and practices in their historical transcendence.

The course of Universities in Angola highlights a process of adaptation of the university to the emerging environment, as a way of overcoming the crises of legitimacy, whether responding to the supreme interests of the State, in relation to the training of cadres of this level with a view to national reconstruction, or in response to the substantial functions of universities, with the image of a university focused on meeting challenges resulting from its social commitment standing out. It is within the scope of State policies, as configured by Presidential Decree number: 203/18, of 30 August, which establishes the legal regime for evaluating and accrediting the quality of universities, and in some previous studies and approaches by Canga and Buza (2017) and Simões *et. all* (2016) that seeks to unveil ES, as a guarantee of the country's development and others, similarly to Manuel and Mendes (2021) and Silva (2016). Both inflect, generically, towards the development of the education and teaching system, as a strategic objective defined in the National Development Plan 2018-2022 and as a path to a general understanding of the development of universities in Angola, respectively.

As a social and institutional construction, the quality of universities at undergraduate and graduate levels, not being insular, is articulated between the subsystems that make up the national education system. Assessing the higher performance quality of universities implies observing the characterization of the preceding subsystems, regardless of the fragmented perspective of the university model that is experienced in the country: some concern with the stability of the State, another with excellence in teaching and research and yet another, with some economic utilitarianism.

Public concerns about the relevance of universities have suggested executive agendas that seek to adapt HE to the current demands

of the sector and society itself, resorting to revisions and reforms in educational policies, but with little incidence in clarifying the philosophical meaning of HE national. The reforms that are being carried out constitute the revision of the specific legislation on universities, seeking to strengthen regulation in search of improving the quality of performance of universities Institutions, including structural adaptation, such as scientific research centers and courses offered. Aspects inherent to institutional assessment, the creation of structures and the establishment of internal assessment mechanisms, reflect the proposals for legislative reformulation that conforms the Legal Regime for Assessment and Quality Accreditation of universities, incorporating the National Assessment and Accreditation System and all, defended as structuring assumptions for the promotion and guarantee of educational quality.

As a topic of study within the scope of educational administration and management, institutional evaluation has become, on the one hand, a on a priority training line and, on the other, on a priority and strategic specialization for the development of universities in Angola, as expressed in the National Strategy for Training Staff (ENFQ, 2012, p. 173). Thus, both quality and assessment and accreditation are part of the strategic options of guardianship and Universities, more in the context of administrative law than of educational administration, due to the focus on managerial utilitarianism, looking for effective institutions instead of the effects of institutions.

The present work focuses on the management and quality assurance in universities, seeking, based on the analysis of the legislation, to apprehend contents that allow understanding the dynamics and quality management processes of universities in Angola and conferring relevance and

relevance to the management options adopted in the dimensions of teaching, scientific research, extension and administration.

The text is structured in three parts, preceded by an introduction. The first brings together brief descriptions of the mechanisms and systems of management and quality assurance, discussing the conceptualization, usefulness and some options applicable in the context of HE. The second, based on the analysis of the legislation regarding institutional evaluation and the evaluation of teaching performance, seeks to cover, for example, some quality indicators, according to specific dimensions. The text ends with a summary that seeks to reflect on the management mechanisms that are adopted to guarantee quality in the university.

QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND MECHANISMS: CONCEPTUALIZATION AND UTILITY

The ideological evocation by the States, that education is one of the key sectors for the development of society, and that universities plays a fundamental role in the generation and transfer of knowledge and technologies, is implemented through specific management options. As a result, higher demands are placed on universities, in the expectation that they will contribute to the development of the country/region, always bearing in mind the contextual complexities of competitiveness and the requirements of the levels of qualification and performance of organizations.

As there are several factors that intercept organizational action, the perception of quality becomes a social construction that requires, in addition to resilience, the ability to read the context, identify critical factors and configure alternative scenarios for the positioning of actors, whose dynamics, although proactive, are in tune with the strategic assumptions of

organizational management.

In Africa, university has been analyzed as a complex reality, due not only to the ontological dimension of this typology of organizations, but also to its youth entangled by the historicity of its establishment in these territories. If diversity is a common characteristic, the potentialities, difficulties and prospects for development (VARELA, 2013) are contextualized according to the structure and overall functioning of the respective States. In Angola, for example, the massification of HE was the response to the expression of the number of students, which caused the multiplication of universities, thus generating the unquestionable difficulties of seeking parity between quantitative evolution and qualitative *status*. This has been taking shape in a scenario in which “the demand to improve the quality of services provided by educational institutions, whether in the public system or in the private system” (SIMÕES; SAMBO; FERREIRA & FRESTA, 2016, p. 78) present themselves as the standard basis for the political regulation of universities in the country.

The observations according to which, in Angola, there are “signs of modernity and also evidence of its discontinuity, through social, political, economic and cultural disruption, perpetuating regional or local asymmetries” (CANGA & BUZA, 2017, p. 2) underlying concerns related to the formulation of policies and the adoption of strategic management practices. This way, the implementation of Internal and External Systems of control, guarantee and promotion of quality becomes relevant, whose conception and implementation derive from an institutional planning based on a collaborative strategic thinking in the different psychosocial levels of intervention.

At the *macro level*, the evaluation refers to the Education and Teaching System, consisting

of “measuring the quality of the performance and results achieved by the Education Institutions and other structures of the system in the areas of organization, administration and management of education, training and research with a view to ensuring its efficiency and effectiveness” (number: 1, article 118.º, Basic Law of the Education and Teaching System/LBSEE). However, its implementation at the *meso level* (IES) is conditioned by the absence of objectively verifiable indicators due to the insufficiency or even absence of collaboratively conceived strategic planning processes, but decidedly suggested in the normative perspective, as determined by the same Law: the “measurement of the quality of performance and results achieved by Education and Teaching institutions must be based on a set of norms, mechanisms and coherent and articulated procedures that ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of the national education and teaching system, expressed in the National System of Evaluation and Quality Assurance” (Number: 3, Article 118, LBSEE). It was expected that the coherence of such norms, mechanisms and procedures would result from a participatory social construction, in which the experiences of the field actors would contribute to the construction of quality measurement indicators. It is a tendency in countries with centralized administration, with a predominance of the public education system (BARROSO, 2005).

The *meso level* can be seen as the field of conformation of management and quality control devices for each of the teaching subsystems, embodied by programs and strategic plans based on the norms and procedures established by the National System of Quality Assessment and Assurance (SNAGQ), as established in number 3, article 118.º (LBSEE). However, the aberrant quasi-intellectualism reinforced by administrative law has been characterizing the intervention

of this level that is more concerned with normative compliance, than with questioning and adapting standardized mechanisms and procedures, depending on the specific contexts of universities and global challenges. This level constitutes an irreproachable space for consolidating self-management in all its fullness, but individual autonomies influenced by personal freedoms seem to be conditioning the success of this level.

The legislative amalgamation for the university's subsystem, seeking quality and evaluation, highlights the alleged institutional clarity on the effectiveness of the quality of universities, configuring evaluation as one of the mechanisms, in its bipolarity (internal and external). The Legal Framework for the Assessment and Accreditation of the Quality of Educational Institutions (Presidential Decree Number: 203/18, of 30 August 2018), the Regulation of the External Assessment and Accreditation of Educational Institutions universities and the respective courses (Executive Decree number: 109/20, of March 10, 2020), the Regulation of the Self-Assessment Process of Universities Institutions (Executive Decree number: 108/20, of March 9 of 2020) and the Regulation for the Evaluation of the Performance of Teachers in the universities Subsystem. At a certain level, the National Institute for the Assessment, Accreditation and Recognition of universities Studies (INAAREES) intervenes, a structure that is normatively competent to assess universities and their respective courses and programs (article 2, Presidential Decree number: 306/20, of 2 December). However, the impossibility of field actors to assimilate the set, combining with their socio-professional and academic paths, often alien to cognocratic authority (the nature of this typology of institutions), tend to mitigate the effectiveness and efficiency of this normative conglomerate.

If it is through evaluation that the notion

of merit of something is produced and measures for continuous improvement are established" (SILVA, 2016, p. 164), quality will be the conformation of the merit enunciated by the evaluation, for institutional, socially defined, ethically and culturally defended. The referenced legal devices that seek to establish quality through internal evaluation, external evaluation and evaluation of teaching performance, associated with accreditation, can result when the devices and evaluations constitute institutional learning and continued social assimilation. That is, the rooting of evaluative practices that conform to the culture of quality and evaluation aimed at the continuous improvement of the performance of actors and institutions.

The *micro level* refers to the operationalization of the evaluation policy, in this case of the SNAGQ, via internal quality control systems, the design of which requires the necessary articulation with the Quality Evaluation and Accreditation System of Teaching Institutions. The sufficiency of this level is highly conditioned by the consistency between the cognocratic authority and the functional authority held by the actors/managers, under penalty of the consistency between the different quality management systems being a reflection of normative determinism and not so much a contextualized organizational construction. The aim is to create benchmarks for comparability and guiding guidelines for the quality management process, whose flexibility allows room for adaptations and innovations at an operational level.

The articulation of the integrated elements at the different levels, macro, meso and micro, of the management of processes inherent to quality, constitutes the principle of the confluence of the interventions of the different actors to the institutional goals. It is a combination of efforts in the sense of

configuring internal quality management systems, at the micro level of the universities (internal quality policy), logically articulated with the devices defined at the meso level of supervision (reporting to the universities Subsystem) and at the macro level of the national education policy (reported to the Education and Teaching System). The harmonization of quality management systems is sought to allow the strategic alignment of university intervention with national development policies established for universities, in an approach centered on systemic convergence.

The importance and usefulness of Quality Management Systems (QMS) are specifically related to the strategic management of institutions, as mechanisms designed and implemented for monitoring organizational processes and practices, focusing on changes with a view to bringing organizational action, given by objectives/goals, to the formal and socio-constructivist expectations of society, given by institutional purposes. Quality management mechanisms take the form of structured parameters and objectively verifiable performance indicators, in a perspective aimed at expanding institutional legitimacy. Distance is sought from the *uselessness* (BARROSO, 2005, author's italics) given by an administration of education carried out solely by respecting the norms and rules that established the procedures and routines to be adopted.

Designing performance, program and project evaluations that have multiple purposes and that develop in a variety of contexts, is to generate understanding about the goals, the impact and the involving processes. Looking at the goals reflects, according to Singer (1996), a more traditional study whose purpose is to measure the degree of success of the program. Assessing the impact means apprehending the effects produced by the institution from

the program or project on the population. Evaluating processes, on the other hand, comprises a systematic investigation, tending to apprehend the coverage, satisfaction and procedures of the action, with a view to detecting and correcting defects that could compromise performance and its quality.

In this sense, we agree with Pires (2019), regarding two fundamental issues at the conceptual level:

(i) Quality is defined as the level of compliance with requirements and given by a set of distinctive characteristics/properties, denoting variability. Therefore, quality is not universal and its perception is consistent with socially constructed and culturally guided levels and requirements.

(ii) Quality is perceived as an effective way of achieving the intended results and represents the determined reference standard, that is, the “referent in the name of which it becomes possible to appreciate reality” (HADJI, 1994, p. 29). However, within the scope of the application of a QMS in universities, the concepts associated with the very definition of quality assume specific dimensions and generate a multiplicity of views and opinions.

The multiplicity of views is based on the various existing quality management models. Tischler (2010, ap. Pires, 2019, p. 250) specifies, for example, the two points that distinguish quality approaches from traditional management approaches:

“1. Vision that better and sustainable processes lead to better products and services, and that these processes can be continuously improved and

2. understanding that those approaches use a particular type of culture to get the mindset of continuous improvement and sustainable effort”.

In this perspective, the QMS, as an articulated set of assumptions that make up devices for measuring, guaranteeing and improving organizational performance, require a strategic and integrated approach. An orientation based on purely quantitative logics can not only superficialize and bias subsequent analyzes on quality, but also limit decision-making on deeper aspects of institutional intervention in future times.

As Pires (2019, p. 251) points out, the tendency for universities to be concerned with traditional approaches for the purposes of promoting “quality of education, such as the degrees they can offer, the professional experience of teachers and the authorship of educational activities research and development” mean that these “are not receptive to new management approaches, such as the QMS which, identified as coming from companies, are not, therefore, considered as applicable to universities”. A position, tending to be aberrant, but resulting from the bureaucratic decisional determinism that is embodied in normativism to the detriment of constructivism. That is, when the QMS is a legislative consequence, assimilation by the actors may not be immediate, due to the prevalence of possible margins of organizational mistrust, due to potential gaps of opportunism that entangle the norms, subjecting, according to Bush (1986), the institutions, to complex and unstable functioning.

The pressures arising from the context and, in many cases, the demand to maximize available resources and accountability have been signaled as factors that make it unavoidable to adopt management policies and practices based on performance assessment and efficiency. In the context of HE, massification, the reduction of public funding, the more competitive environment (for funding, for students, for teachers), among

others, are considered the factors that induce greater focus on efficiency, effectiveness, responsibility and greater concern with quality and performance (POLLITT & BOUCKAERT, 2011; TEIXEIRA & Dill, 2011, ap. ROSA et al., 2017). These decision-making modalities used in conventional schemes and instruments often collide with the unpredictability of the environment, the problematic dimension of objectives and the lack of clarity of educational technology (Cohen et al., 1972). As a result, they commonly lead to questions about the efficiency and effectiveness of the instruments, when, previously, the appropriate procedures were not taken.

MANAGEMENT MECHANISMS: MANAGEMENT BY PROCESSES

The process of globalization, suggesting new types of relationship between the economy, the State and society, underlies the call for universities to demonstrate positive results in the domains that make up their mission, that is, teaching, research and extension. They seek to encourage institutions to rethink the forms of their internal organization, especially in terms of management, replacing traditional models with more entrepreneurial management models in the name of neoliberal agendas.

With regard to the internal organization of universities, the Paradigm of Organization of Services of Public universities institutions (IESP) when establishing the Quality Management Office/Department (Article 12, Presidential Decree Number: 256/21, of October 21), raises expectations regarding its functionality, in the field of management and development of the evaluation process and processes within the scope of quality management. From this point of view, the base is set. Because, as stated by Simão et al. (2002, p. 101), “for the university to reach its objectives, it is crucial that it integrates, organically, its performance evaluation

systems”, being essential to internally structure quality management systems, which go through scrutinizing the inputs of students, teachers and managers, to whom the results of the action are responsible.

The systemic view of performance management has been referenced in the context of universities, based on the specification of indicators that involve the three substantial functions of universities. Thus, the well-known process approach can also be applied to universities (PIRES & LOURENÇO, 2010), defining as processes, the study cycles themselves, the curricular year/semester, the curricular units and the apprehension of the quality of the actors involved in the process.

Performance management understood as an integrated system in which performance information is related to strategic decision-making (ROSA et. al., 2017, p. 24), obeys, in the view of some authors, three phases [RADNOR & BARNES, 2007, MELO, SARRICO & RADNOR 2010, *ap.* ROSA et. al. (2017, p. 24)], namely:

- “The first corresponds to the measurement of performance and involves the quantification/qualification of *inputs*, *outputs*, level of activities or impact of organizations, people and programs, contributing to the collection of information on performance;
- the second corresponds to the reporting stage, which involves communicating information about performance to the decision-making bodies, so that they can decide what to do;
- the third is the management stage, which consists of using information and taking actions based on it, with the aim of improving behaviors, motivations and processes”.

The measurement of process performance will reflect the institution, for the simple fact that the reported results represent the

integrated coordination of actions and their management depends on the competence with which the coordination is carried out. For this reason, the *Shewart cycle* (FERREIRA, 2013, p. 28) defines four stages for process management, namely: planning, execution, verification and correction. From the definition of goals and objectives, through the execution of tasks and their confrontation with the goals, to the elimination of causes that generate deviations, the most relevant procedure is the sharing between the actors.

CONDITIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE QMS

The specificities and complexities inherent to the QMS result from multiple methodological, technical and procedural aspects, whose implementation requires the creation of some relevant conditions, including:

- a) Policy setting: obliges the management team to find a consensus of doctrine/guideline and action. This suggests the involvement and effective participation of organizational actors at different levels and structural units. It is organizational learning that permeates the perspective of normative guidelines, moving to the constructivist dimension of the process, configured in the joint construction of the evaluation and its procedures and instruments;
- b) Planning: includes the definition of objectives, assuming a minimum control over the context (social, local), resources (human, material and financial) and means (methods, procedures, instruments). The actors’ experiences are mobilized, short of a formal alignment due to single-person decision-makers;
- c) The implementation and operation of the QMS: conception, operationalization

and logistics, requiring effective leadership/authority from the management bodies over the processes, as a guarantee for the achievement of the objectives (participation and accountability of all intervening parties);

d) Monitoring: analysis and improvement (involvement of interested parties), requiring systematicity, identification of strengths and weaknesses, projection of corrective measures/actions in view of the determined objectives (Improvement Plan, number: 5, article 3. Self-Assessment of Universities, DE number: 108/20, of March 9th).

Monitoring is required to maintain the foundational perspective of the system through specific corrections in the face of possible deviations, legitimized by the transformation of reality based on knowledge of it.

e) The review of the QMS, based on relevant and defined information, with a view to promoting continuous improvement, which is not consistent with centralized and bureaucratic management (Meta-evaluation, paragraph f) article 3.º Legal Regime for Quality Assessment and Accreditation of Universities, DP number: 203/18, of 30 August).

Contrary to the idea of establishing a dirigiste and formal QMS entangled by bureaucratic rationalism, the effectiveness and efficiency of measuring performance with social legitimacy suggests strategic planning, whose structuring, implementation and monitoring are constructively participated. The need to align the QMS with the organization's strategic objectives and from these to design the quality policy, does not exclude the objectives, guiding principles, performance indicators, policy monitoring

procedures, systems and control mechanisms internal.

The involvement and efforts of all the organization's actors (Self-Assessment Committees, managers, students, professors, researchers and technical-administrative staff subparagraphs d) and e), article 20, DP number: 203/18, of 30 de Agosto) tends to mobilize experiences and knowledge, by specifying the participation of the intervening parties and their respective roles/responsibilities in view of the established objectives.

If neutrality and credibility are recognized, according to Pires (2019), to employees external to the organization (figure of the critical friend), full-time employees are reserved for hegemony and relevance in the process, although they are not always willing to and experienced to innovative dynamics, as a result of their socio-professional and academic trajectories. The author proposes, within the scope of QMS management, and in relation to the integrator (process manager), several solutions that can be combined with the norms and instances, as illustrated in the table.

The previous assumptions given by the socio-professional and academic trajectories of the integrators prove to be relevant for guaranteeing the quality of the process based on objectively verifiable indicators, as constituent parts of the whole.

QUALITY INDICATORS IN UNIVERSITIES IN ANGOLA

The Basic Law of the Education and Teaching System (Law number: 17/16, of October 7, republished in 2020, by Law number: 32/20 of August 12), establishes quality as one of the general principles, associated with high standards of performance and the achievement of the best results in the scientific, technical, technological and cultural fields and the promotion of academic success,

Proposed solutions (Pires, 2019)	Framework in ES/Angola legislation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Study cycle coordinators. • Year coordinators. • Learning Area Coordinators. • Study cycle board/committee. • Pedagogical advice. • Technical-Scientific Council” (Pires, 2019, p. 255). 	Undergraduate course manager Graduate course coordinator Discipline Regent (article 3 ECDES_DP number: 191/18, of 8 August). Quality Management Office/Department (Article 12, DP number: 256/21, of 21 October_University - self-assessment committees (point d), article 20, DP number: 203/18, of 30 August_RJAAQIES).

Table 1: Integration solutions

Source: Own elaboration (based on the interpretation of regulations and indicated authors)

Dimension	Indicators
Training/Education	Courses: curriculum, graduate profile correspondence and curriculum content (point c), article 20.º, DE number: 109/20, 10 March). Pedagogical projects of the courses. Teaching and assessment methodologies. Incoming and outgoing. Student engagement. Professional internships.
Scientific investigation	Publications, type of journal, topicality of publication (point c), article 20.º, DE number: 109/20, 10 March).
Extension	Interaction with the community, academic and social impact of the extension actions carried out (point d), article 20.º, DE number: 109/20, 10 March). Partnerships with companies and other organizations.
Organizational administration and management	Institutional development plan (mission, vision, strategic objectives). Procedure manuals. Management processes. Operational processes. Communication flow. Human resource management policies. Student support policies. Quality management policy. Financial resource management policies.
educational devices	Infrastructure: equipment and installations to support teaching, research and extension (paragraph e), article 20.º, Decree number: 109/20, 10 March).
faculty	Employment regime, academic title, areas of training and specialization (point b) DE number: 109/20, 10 March).

Table 2: University External Evaluation Dimensions and Indicators

Source: Own elaboration (based on Executive Decree number: 109/20, March 10)

quality, excellence, merit and innovation (article 14). Thus, quality assurance has been referred to evaluation procedures, based on the specification of indicators framed in specific dimensions or aspects.

In the context of universities, institutional evaluation as a “measurement process of the quality of performance and results achieved by institutions [...], in accordance with the provisions of the National Quality Assurance System” [paragraph d), article 3., 203/18, of August 30], is seen as a central procedure. This meaning reflects an evaluation centered both on the process and on the results, and it is expected that, through the evaluation, a picture of the performance of the Universities will be produced.

Associated with the guarantee and promotion of quality, it is expected that the operationalization of the evaluation will focus on the specific indicators, as established in the Legal Regime for the Evaluation and Accreditation of Quality of the Universities, in the Regulation of the Self-Evaluation Process of the Universities and in the Regulation for the Evaluation of the Performance of Teachers in the Universities Subsystem. We exemplify the dimensions, parameters and respective indicators in tables 2 and 3.

The established dimensions and indicators tend to a comprehensive evaluative physiognomy, focusing on the configuring elements of the university mission, that is, teaching, research and extension, including administration and organizational management. It is up to the implementation to make these indicators objectively verifiable through their qualification and quantification, depending on their adaptability, representativeness, simplicity, traceability, availability, economy, practicality and stability (FERREIRA, 2013, p. 40).

A global evaluation of universities is foreseen, which articulates self-evaluation and

external evaluation, whose complementarity could enhance the strategic, regulatory and quality improvement sense of universities. Teaching performance, for example, is also the object of assessment in this perspective, whose assessment dimensions coincide with those established for external assessment. However, the indicators refer to aspects that substantiate the execution of the teaching-learning process and to more specific elements of research and extension, as shown in table 3.

The measurement of teaching performance will tend, therefore, to be a constitutive part of the performance of the university, under penalty of fragmenting the global reading. It is not without reason that the Universities Teaching Career Statute mentions performance evaluation as one of the key elements for managing the teaching staff, careers and promoting quality, valuing the pedagogical and scientific dimensions. Management is aligned, in a way, with the principle of globality, understood as the extensiveness of the assessment of teaching performance to the different functions and tasks assigned to universities.

CONCLUSIONS

The establishment of devices inherent to quality management emerges as one of the priority focuses in the reconfiguration of Universities management strategies, with a view to measuring, tendentially, more objectively the performance of universities in terms of the quality of courses and teaching performance. respect. Operation is centered on a logic that seeks quality through assessment and accreditation based on quality, the assumption of which will depend on the particular dynamics of the institutions.

In addition to the incorporation of units responsible for coordinating processes aimed at quality management and assurance, at the level of universities, the challenge could be

Dimension	Parameter	Indicators
Training/Education	Teaching materials	Books book chapters Pedagogical texts and articles support manuals Communications at events (...)
	Student Orientation	Guidance type: Thesis Dissertation End of Course Work Curricular stage Responsibility: Advisor Co-Advisor (...)
	teaching	teaching and conducting Introduction of innovations workshop study visits Participation in juries and examination committees. (...)
	Infrastructure	Creation of teaching support laboratories Platform creation Availability of electronic databases of UC bibliography. (...)
Scientific investigation	Scientific production	Books. Articles. Thesis. Book chapter. Minutes. Communications in scientific events (national, international). Poster in scientific events (national, international). Research project reports. (...)
	Tecnologic innovation	Patent Models Industrial draw trademark registration <i>Software</i> registered copyright computer application (...)
Participation		Responsible for R&D projects project evaluator work supervision Approval in doctoral exam Approval in public test of scientific competence and pedagogical aptitude (...)
	normative production	Participation in the elaboration of a legislative project Participation in the preparation of technical standards Participation in the elaboration of regulations Participation in the elaboration of a curricular project Issue of scientific opinion Participation in the elaboration of normative documents.
Extension	Provision of services and consultancy	Incubation and formation of a technology-based company Copyright Responsible for service provider unit (...)

Dimension	Parameter	Indicators
Management	Management positions at IES	President of the Assembly Manager Deputy Manager Director commission coordinator (...)
	Management positions at the IES/Department	Department boss Head of Research Center program coordinator (...)
	Temporary positions/tasks	program evaluator program coordinator Scientific committee members (...)

Table 3: Dimensions and indicators of Teacher Performance Assessment

Source: Own elaboration (based on Presidential Decree/DP number: 121/20, April 25)

the transition from the plan of intentions to the practical plan. That is, the design and implementation of the QMS, including the design of the quality assurance policy, as a relevant element of strategic management in universities, will imply commitment, sharing and responsibility of the actors. There may be several options regarding the configuration of the QMS, depending on the vision and objectives defined by the institutions, being fundamental the establishment of a policy that incorporates the guiding principles, the objectives, as well as the strategies for its implementation, without neglecting its alignment with the institution's strategic objectives and, if possible, suggest the revision of these same objectives.

At the legislative level, the SE subsystem has a set of regulations that establish references on evaluation systems (internal and external), as well as on structural aspects of quality management, based on multicriteria specified in the dimensions that configure the university's mission: training, scientific research and extension. Management is also an evaluable dimension for measuring teaching performance, as there are multi-referential mechanisms for measuring quality through assessment and accreditation. The promotion of a culture of evaluation and quality signals requirements of a not only philosophical nature, but also an operational one, for which the processes of admission to universities and integration into bodies must constitute prior dimensions for quality assurance, under penalty of the processes and systems become hostages of previous incompatibilities.

Quality management can contribute to strengthening the strategic intervention of institutions and their visibility, in a context full of multidimensional challenges, in which Universities are put to the test in view of their place in the national development plan and institutional socialization leading

to self-identification with the processes are considered determinant.

REFERENCES

- BARROSO, J. (2005). Administração Educacional e a Abordagem Sociológica das Organizações Educativas. In Lisboa: Universidade Aberta. Temas Universitários, nº 3.
- BUSH, T. (1986). *Theories of Educational Management*. London: Harper & Row Press.
- COHEN, M. D., MARCH, J. G. & OLSEN, J. P. (1972). A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 17, nº1, pp. 1-25
- FERREIRA, A. R. (2013). Gestão de Processos – módulo 3. Brasília: Escola Nacional de Administração Pública ed.
- Governo de Angola. *Plano de Desenvolvimento Nacional 2018-2022 (PND)*. Abril 2018.
- Governo de Angola. *Plano Nacional de Formação de Quadros (PNFQ) 2013-2020*.
- HADJI, C. (1994). *A Avaliação, Regras do Jogo: das intenções aos instrumentos*. Porto: Porto Editora.
- PIRES, A. R. (2019). *Qualidade no Ensino Superior*. Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.
- ROSA, Maria; MELO, Ana; SAÚDE, Sandra & FÉRIA, Isidro (2017). Gerir o Desempenho no ensino Superior. In Autores: vários. Indicadores de Desempenho para as Instituições de Ensino Superior Politécnico: investigação aplicada, criação cultural e impacto regional. Lisboa: Edições Sílabo. Pp. 21-33.
- SILVA, E. A. A. (2016). *Gestão do Ensino Superior em Angola: realidades, tendências e desafios rumo à qualidade*. Luanda: Mayamba Editora.
- SIMÃO, J. V.; SANTOS, S. M. dos & COSTA, A. de A. (2002). *Ensino Superior: uma Visão para a Próxima Década*. Lisboa: Gradiva.
- SIMÕES, C.; SAMBO, M. do R.; FERREIRA, A.; FRESTA, M. (2016). “Ensino superior em Angola: desafios e oportunidades ao nível institucional?”. In Revista FORGES: Vol. 3, n. 1 (2016) – Ilhéus. FORGES. Pp. 79-102.
- SINGER, D. V. (1996). Towards a Sociology of Standards: Problem of a Criterial Society. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, vol. 21, nº2, pp 203-221.
- VARELA, B. (2013). *A universidade, o currículo e o conhecimento: das origens aos tempos actuais*. Praia: Edições Uni-CV.
- Referências Legislativas
- ANGOLA. ASSEMBLEIA NACIONAL. Lei number: 32/20 de 12 de Agosto. Altera a Lei number: 17/16, de 7 de Outubro – Lei de Bases do Sistema de Educação e Ensino number: Diário da República number: 123, I Série. Pp. 4423-4453.
- ANGOLA. Decreto Executivo number: 108/20, de 9 de Março de 2020. Dispõe o Regulamento do Processo de Auto-Avaliação das Instituições do Ensino Superior. **Diário da República**: I Série, number: 26, p. 2048-2052.
- ANGOLA. Decreto Executivo number: 109/20, de 10 de Março de 2020. Dispõe o Regulamento do Processo de Avaliação Externa e Acreditação das Instituições do Ensino Superior e dos Respective Cursos. **Diário da República**: I Série, number: 27, p. 2054-2062.
- ANGOLA. Decreto Executivo number: 29/11, de 3 de Março. Dispõe o Regulamento do Processo de Criação de Cursos de Pós-Graduação. **Diário da República**: I Série, number: 42, p. 1253-1261.
- ANGOLA. Decreto Presidencial number: 121/20, 27 de Abril. Dispõe o Regulamento de Avaliação do Desempenho do Docente do Subsistema do Ensino Superior. **Diário da República**: I Série, number: 57, p. 2718-2733.

ANGOLA. Decreto Presidencial number: 191/18 de 8 de Agosto. Dispõe o Estatuto da Carreira Docente do Ensino Superior. **Diário da República**: I Série, number: 118, p. 4111-4125.

ANGOLA. Decreto Presidencial number: 193/18 de 10 de Agosto. Dispõe as Normas Gerais Curriculares para os Cursos de Graduação do Subsistema de Ensino Superior. **Diário da República** I Série, number: 119, p. 4136-4145.

ANGOLA. Decreto Presidencial number: 203/18, de 30 de Agosto de 2018. Dispõe o Regime Jurídico da Avaliação e Acreditação da Qualidade das Instituições do Ensino Superior. **Diário da República**: I Série, number: 133, p. 4348-4356.

ANGOLA. Decreto Presidencial number: 205/18 de 3 de Setembro. Dispõe o Programa Nacional de Formação e Gestão do Pessoal Docente. **Diário da República**: I Série, number: 135, p. 4396-4400.

ANGOLA. Decreto Presidencial number: 256/21, de 21 de Outubro de 2021. Estabelece o Paradigma de Organização dos Serviços das Instituições do Ensino Superior. **Diário da República**: I Série, number: 200, p. 8017-8027.

ANGOLA. Decreto Presidencial number: 273/20, de 7 de Dezembro. Dispõe o Regime Jurídico de Formação Inicial de Educadores de Infância, de Professores do Ensino Secundário. Revoga o Decreto Presidencial number: 109/11, de 26 de Maio. **Diário da República**: I Série, number: 168, p. 5193-5220.

ANGOLA. Decreto Presidencial number: 306/20, de 2 de Dezembro). Dispõe o Estatuto do Instituto Nacional de Avaliação, Acreditação e Reconhecimento de Estudos do Ensino Superior. **Diário da República**: I Série, number: 193, p. 5826-5834.

ANGOLA. Decreto Presidencial number: 310/20, de 21 de Outubro. Dispõe o Regime Jurídico do Subsistema de Ensino Superior. **Diário da República**: I Série, number: 196, p. 6257-6288.