LEX LOCALIS-JOURNAL OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT
ISSN:1581-5374 E-ISSN:1855-363X
VOL. 23, NO. S5 (2025)

PERCEPTION OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY IN A TECHNOLOGICAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAMME: A STUDY WITH LECTURERS AND STUDENTS

Dr. Alex Dueñas Peña[1], Mg. Diana Mireya Cuellar[2] ,Dr.Luis Fernando Vásquez Zora[3]

[1]Docente investigador, Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca, Bogotá, Colombia
2Docente investigador, Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca, Bogotá, Colombia
3Docente investigador, Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca, Bogotá, Colombia

aduenasp@universidadmayor.edu.co[1]
dmcuellar@universidadmayor.edu.co[2]
dmcuellar@universidadmayor.edu.co[3]

Abstract
The accreditation of higher education programmes and institutions in Colombia, granted by the Ministry of National Education, is based on self-regulation processes aimed at the continuous improvement of educational quality. In this context, the present study aimed to analyse teachers' and students' perceptions of the quality of a technological programme in the administrative field, drawing on the evaluation of factors established by the institutional self-evaluation and accreditation policy. The research adopted a mixed-methods approach and used an institutional survey as the main instrument, with the participation of 92% of teachers and 80% of students. The results revealed high levels of satisfaction in areas such as teaching methodology, pedagogical and technological strategies, academic support, and the promotion of cultural, artistic, sports, and research activities. Progress was also noted in well-being initiatives, research training, and the provision of physical and technological resources. However, opportunities for improvement were identified in relation to the relevance and dissemination of student regulations, the visibility of institutional incentives and support, the implementation of internationalisation policies, and the strengthening of specialised facilities such as laboratories and classrooms. The findings highlight the value of participatory evaluation as a tool to reinforce a culture of continuous improvement in higher education, while underscoring the need to ensure equitable and relevant conditions that foster an inclusive, coherent learning experience aligned with academic quality standards.

Keywords: Educational quality; Self-evaluation; Accreditation; Perception; Continuous improvement.

Introduction

In the current context of Colombian higher education, educational quality has become a central axis of institutional discussion and action. The need for academic programmes to respond appropriately to the demands of the labour market, as well as to student expectations, has driven processes of evaluation, self-regulation, and continuous improvement. Within this framework, the perceptions held by lecturers and students regarding the quality of teaching and the resources available play a fundamental role in the consolidation of sustainable quality policies.

The National Accreditation System, led by the National Accreditation Council (CNA, 2013), is the main instrument for ensuring quality assurance in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). This system goes beyond the mere recognition of quality standards; it promotes a dynamic process of continuous improvement that encompasses institutional resources, internal processes, and academic outcomes (CNA, 2013). The comprehensive approach adopted by the Ministry of National Education through the accreditation model aims to

demonstrate that institutions are actively engaged across multiple dimensions that influence educational quality.

In this regard, the CNA model commits HEIs to self-regulation processes grounded in their university autonomy, oriented towards strengthening the core functions of teaching, research, and outreach. As Cruz-Acosta and Cassungo-Cruz (2024) affirm, ensuring quality in these three dimensions is essential for sustaining a relevant and competitive educational offering. Likewise, Weber (2014) and Bonett et al. (2024) emphasise that self-evaluation must remain in alignment with the institutional mission and vision, linking strategic objectives with concrete academic practices.

Within this framework, knowledge management emerges as a key strategic tool. Portocarrero-Sierra et al. (2020) highlight that, in the face of increasing complexity in the educational environment, an institution's capacity to identify, store, share, and apply knowledge effectively becomes a crucial differentiator. Such management not only fulfils accreditation requirements but also drives innovation, continuous improvement, and the sustainable development of institutions.

Fostering an institutional culture that values collective knowledge and its circulation among academic stakeholders strengthens the position of HEIs within the national and international educational system. Knowledge management, therefore, becomes a catalyst for academic excellence, in harmony with the guidelines established in Decree 1330 of 2019, which regulates quality assurance processes and the relevance of academic programmes.

Against this backdrop, the present study aims to analyse the satisfaction of lecturers and students of a Technological Administrative programme at a Colombian university with regard to the quality of teaching and the resources available, with the purpose of identifying opportunities for innovation and continuous improvement.

Theoretical Framework

Educational excellence has become a growing priority globally and in Latin America, due to its direct influence on the holistic development of individuals and the sustainable development of societies. Within this context, the quality of higher education is a central dimension of public debate, particularly in relation to the mechanisms that ensure, promote, and evaluate it (UNESCO, 2016). Among these mechanisms, quality assurance systems—and, in particular, institutional self-evaluation processes—play a fundamental role.

Educational quality is conceived as a dynamic, multidimensional, and contextual concept that responds to the social, economic, and cultural needs of a country. According to Vargas et al. (2010), quality must be assessed by considering multiple factors, ranging from curriculum relevance to the social impact of institutions. Cano et al. (2017) emphasise that continuous improvement, holistic training, inclusion, equity, innovation, and transparency must be at the heart of any education policy aimed at quality.

In the Latin American region, various national experiences have contributed to consolidating a culture of evaluation and quality. In Argentina, for instance, the National Commission for University Evaluation and Accreditation (CONEAU) has developed a robust system that promotes both self-evaluation and external evaluation, incorporating academic, institutional, and management dimensions (Páez et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2020a, 2020b; Calderón-Arregui, 2022). In Cuba, the University System of Accreditation Programmes (SUPRA, 2014) and the National Accreditation Board (JAN) have succeeded in integrating evaluative processes into institutional practice through a participatory and formative

approach (Páez et al., 2021). In Chile, the National Accreditation Commission (CNA, 2015) has structured a model that links institutional evaluation with public criteria, promoting self-regulation and accountability (Cancino and Schmal, 2014; Martín-Sabina and Villavicencio, 2015).

These international experiences make it possible to identify common elements and valuable lessons for strengthening quality assurance systems in Colombia. In particular, they highlight the importance of linking internal evaluation with institutional planning processes, fostering the active participation of the academic community, and consolidating an institutional culture oriented towards continuous improvement (Vaillant and Rodríguez, 2018).

In the Colombian case, the regulatory framework clearly establishes the State's responsibility for guaranteeing educational quality. Article 67 of the Political Constitution states that education is a right and a public service that fulfils a social function, while Law 30 of 1992 organises the higher education system, stipulating that institutions must implement self-evaluation processes as part of their institutional management.

The National Accreditation System (SNA), led by the CNA, has defined a set of guidelines, criteria, and indicators that guide quality evaluation. According to the Ministry of National Education (2018) and the CNA (2020), these criteria encompass factors such as institutional mission, academic processes, research, social outreach, well-being, management, and national and international visibility. Self-evaluation is the starting point for these processes, enabling institutions to identify strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement.

Institutional self-evaluation thus emerges as a strategic tool that integrates planning, management, and decision-making from a participatory and critical perspective. Guevara et al. (2011) underscore that self-evaluation is a systematic process of internal reflection that strengthens institutional identity and promotes organisational learning. Parada (2016) argues that this practice is key to advancing towards a culture of quality, understood as a set of shared values, beliefs, and practices that guide institutional action.

Active participation from all sectors (management, lecturers, students, graduates, and employers) is essential to ensure the validity and legitimacy of the process. Toro and Peláez (2018) emphasise that self-evaluation should be a collaborative exercise involving the entire academic community, with the aim of fostering collective commitments towards excellence. In the same vein, Dueñas-Peña et al. (2023b) indicate that internal evaluation promotes alignment between the institutional mission, strategic goals, and everyday actions, consolidating a sustainable culture of quality over time.

Similarly, Rosas and Sánchez (2016) argue that self-evaluation should not be understood merely as a requirement for accreditation, but as both a pedagogical and political practice that contributes to strengthening university autonomy and the social relevance of higher education. In this sense, self-evaluation enables more democratic, transparent, and service-oriented management (MEN, 2022).

Thus, the self-evaluation process is configured as a strategic axis in consolidating a culture of quality in higher education, by integrating institutional stakeholders, national and international regulations, and evaluation criteria that allow institutions to progress towards excellence and meet contemporary social demands.

Methodology

This study adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative methods with the aim of providing a more comprehensive and in-depth understanding of the issue under investigation. This methodological triangulation allows the integration of the subjective perceptions of stakeholders with the rigorous analysis of empirical data (Forni and Grande, 2020), in alignment with the accreditation and quality evaluation processes of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

From a qualitative perspective, the aim was to capture the experiences, assessments, and subjective perceptions of lecturers and students regarding various aspects of the Technological Administrative Management programme. This approach made it possible to delve into factors influencing satisfaction and perceptions of educational quality, such as the importance of artistic, sports, and cultural activities; perceptions of teaching methodology and the use of technology; and the evaluation of curricular flexibility and the interdisciplinary nature of the programme.

From a quantitative perspective, objectivity and generalisability were ensured through the collection and analysis of numerical data. Likert-type scales were used to measure overall satisfaction and to assess the prevalence of opinions regarding the various factors defined by the Ministry of National Education (MEN) in self-evaluation processes. In addition, correlations were analysed between specific variables such as curricular flexibility and student satisfaction. This perspective assumes the existence of an objective reality, which should be analysed with a certain degree of detachment by the researcher (Berardi, 2015).

The methodological design falls within a descriptive study, enabling the characterisation of stakeholders' perceptions based on their own experiences. In the words of Koh and Owen (2000), it is essential to consider how individuals make sense of their educational trajectories in real contexts, taking into account their attitudes, beliefs, and everyday practices.

The study population consisted of students and lecturers from the Technological Administrative programme. A convenience sampling strategy was employed, following Huaman's (2022) approach, which allows for the selection of accessible participants whose characteristics are representative of the target group. The sample included 80% of the student body and 100% of the teaching staff, ensuring significant representation of both units of analysis.

Data were collected using a structured Likert-type digital instrument, designed and validated by the Accreditation Office of the Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca and the programme's curriculum committee. This instrument assessed key factors defined by the MEN, including retention and graduation rates, institutional well-being, academic aspects, interaction with the environment, educational resources, administrative organisation, and physical and technological resources. The factors evaluated are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.
Factors and Characteristics *to be Evaluated*

Factor	Characteristics
2. Students	Participation in holistic training activities. Student regulations and academic policy. Incentives and support for students.
3. Lecturers	Recruitment, appointment, and retention. Lecturers' statute. Academic staff development. Incentives for academic career progression. Production, relevance, use, and impact of teaching materials. Merit-based remuneration. Lecturer evaluation.
5. Academic Aspects and Learning Outcomes	Flexibility of curricular components. Interdisciplinarity. Pedagogical strategies. Student assessment system. Evaluation and self-regulation of the academic programme.
6. Retention and Graduation	Policies, strategies, and structure for retention and graduation. Student profiling and early alert system.
7. Interaction with the National and International Environment	External relations of lecturers and students.
8. Contributions of Research, Innovation, Technological Development, and Creative Work Associated with the Academic Programme	Training in research, technological development, innovation, and creative work.
9. Well-being of the Academic Community within the Programme	Programmes and services.
10. Educational Resources and Learning Environments	Support strategies and resources for lecturers. Support strategies and resources for students. Bibliographic and information resources.
11. Organisation, Administration, and Financing of the Academic Programme	Organisation and administration. Leadership and management. Students and institutional capacity.
12. Physical and Technological Resources	IT and communication resources.

Note. Factors and characteristics for self-evaluation

It is worth highlighting that use of the instrument was authorised by the University Accreditation Office, in line with its informational purpose and the drive for continuous improvement. The methodological process was structured in the following stages:

Awareness-raising: A dissemination session was held with the programme's lecturers and students, explaining the study objectives and the use of the evaluation instrument.

Data collection: The digital self-evaluation instrument was administered to the units of study, focusing on the factors established by the Ministry of National Education (MEN).

Systematisation and interpretation of data: The results were processed using SPSS and Microsoft Excel, which enabled the information to be organised into tables and charts, facilitating descriptive analysis.

Preparation of the final document: A report was compiled with the results, identifying the programme's strengths and weaknesses. Based on these findings, specific improvement plans were formulated.

This comprehensive, systematic approach ensures an evaluation of the programme's quality, providing useful evidence for institutional decision-making processes oriented towards continuous improvement.

Results

The following presents the results obtained through the instrument applied by the University Accreditation Office to lecturers (Doc) and students (Est) with respect to factors 2, 3, and 5–12.

Factor 2. Students

Both students and lecturers display a tendency towards agreement regarding artistic activities. However, lecturers show a notably higher percentage of responses in the "Disagree" category compared with students. This may indicate a discrepancy between the two groups' perceptions concerning the importance or value of artistic activities within the educational environment.

With regard to sports and cultural activities, projects, and research seedbeds, there appears to be a similar trend between students and lecturers: most participants respond favourably to these items, although a significant proportion of lecturers show a slightly higher tendency towards disagreement than students.

Concerning perceptions of the relevance and application of the student regulations, there is a significant difference between students and lecturers. Some 91% of lecturers unanimously respond positively regarding their suitability for managing conflicts and promoting institutional harmony, whereas 49.3% of students are undecided about their relevance. As for application, there seems to be a similar trend between students and lecturers, as most of both groups express satisfaction in this respect.

In exploring students' awareness of available incentives and support, 75.3% reported being aware of them. Within this group, 41.1% stated that they had benefited from them. Conversely, 24.7% of respondents reported being unaware of incentives and support. As a result of this lack of awareness, 58.9% are not beneficiaries of such incentives and support. The data thus indicate a relationship between awareness of incentives and support and the likelihood of benefiting from them. It is notable that a significant proportion of those who are unaware are likewise non-beneficiaries.

The results show the different types of support and the frequency with which students have received them during their time at the university: 30.1% report having received financial support in the form of tuition recalculation on some occasions. Likewise, 24.7% have received a food voucher, 21.9% transport, 20.5% socio-economic maintenance, and 19.1% for participation in academic events. With regard to incentives in the form of a discount on tuition for a higher grade point average, 27.4% of students indicate that they have received

it. Similarly, 24.7% and 23.3% report having received discounts for participation in representation groups and tuition-free schemes, respectively. In sum, students have received a variety of support or incentives during their university trajectory.

The results indicate that most students tend to view the different forms of support and incentives positively. However, in some cases a significant proportion of students consider the support inadequate, suggesting areas where the quality or perception of services offered by the university could be improved.

On the other hand, the information provided suggests that most lecturers surveyed perceive that their methodologies are effectively designed to develop teamwork skills among students. Some 86.4% and 72.7% consider that their methodologies foster the holistic formation of students in ethical responsibility towards the profession and communities, and in values aligned with the university's philosophy and principles, respectively. All (100%) of the lecturers surveyed affirm that the methodologies they propose promote, both, the holistic formation of students in the capacity to identify their strengths and weaknesses and the capacity for reflection, creativity, and innovation. In the same order, 90% and 95.5% respectively confirm that their methodologies foster students' interest in research and contribute to social commitment both professionally and personally.

Factor 3. Lecturers

The Technological Administrative programme recognises that academic level, dedication, type of appointment, and the quality and relevance of academic staff are fundamental to academic quality and development. Likewise, 95.5%, 90.9%, 81.8%, 77.3%, 81.8%, and 68.2% of the lecturers surveyed express strong approval of the relevance of recruitment and hiring processes; the currency and application of the lecturers' statute and faculty retention; incentives; the strengthening of programme quality; the enhancement of pedagogical, research, and social competences; and the correspondence between remuneration received and the academic, pedagogical, and professional merits arising from their teaching and research activity.

Furthermore, 90.0%, 77.3%, 72.8%, and 63.7% of respondents view positively the incentive for comprehensive development and the strengthening of programme quality through improved pedagogical, research, and social competences, respectively.

Some 81.8%, 86.3%, and 90.9% of lecturers have a positive perception of the levels of transparency, equity, and contribution to teaching performance. In addition, the quality and relevance of teaching, as well as their relationship with social, scientific, technological, and occupational demands, are evident, as 87% of students indicate for both aspects. Meanwhile, 41.1% and 84.9% of students perceive the quality, effectiveness, and currency of teaching as valid and relevant. Similarly, 89%, 78.1%, 60.3%, and 61.6% of students hold a positive view of the transparency, equity, effectiveness, and coherence of the lecturer evaluation process.

Overall, the results suggest that most students in the Technological Administrative programme perceive teaching to be of good quality, relevant, effective, and up-to-date—positive for the educational experience. They also hold a positive perception of the lecturer evaluation process, indicating that it is well communicated, equitable, effective, and coherent with the established academic objectives.

Factor 5. Academic Aspects and Learning Outcomes

This factor concerns the requirement that the academic programme demonstrate that curricular components are flexible and relevant, and remain up-to-date to facilitate student mobility through learning pathways that students themselves build, based on their trajectory, interests, and aspirations. Such pathways may be followed within the same institutional offering or outside it, nationally and internationally. All activities incorporated into these pathways contribute substantially to holistic formation and promote interdisciplinarity.

The results reveal a positive perception regarding flexibilisation processes, learning pathways, the implementation of strategies geared towards interdisciplinarity, analysis and decision-making, as well as self-evaluation and self-regulation—expressed by 82.8%, 68.2%, 95.5%, 91.8%, and 90.9% of lecturers, respectively.

Regarding lecturers' perceptions of the pedagogical strategies implemented by the programme to facilitate the achievement of learning outcomes and the development of assessment, as well as to improve strategies and pedagogical practices based on contributions from pedagogical research, 86.3% and 90.9%, respectively, view the programme's commitment to these aspects positively.

On the other hand, the results also suggest that 82.2%, 84.9%, 82.1%, 83.5%, and 80.8% of students hold a favourable perception of strategies for flexibility; assessment geared towards analysis and decision-making; criteria and procedures for evaluation; the ongoing participation of the academic community in the evaluative process; and the influence of evaluation results on the formulation and implementation of improvement plans.

With respect to students' perceptions of teaching strategies, 86.3%, 89.1%, 80.4%, 93.1%, 89%, and 87.7% of respondents are unequivocal that the teaching strategies facilitate the achievement of the intended learning, enable student feedback, promote the quality of the formative process, are relevant to the programme's purposes, are suitable and adaptable to the particular characteristics of students, and employ a range of resources that facilitate student learning.

Factor 6. Retention and Graduation

For factor 6, the results show that 81.9% and 68.5% of lecturers state that they agree that evaluation and self-regulation processes have been effective in promoting student retention and that they are familiar with the policies, processes, and strategies for retention and graduation at the university. However, 31.5% of students indicated that they are not familiar with these policies, processes, and strategies. Thus, most students appear to be familiar with policies and processes related to retention and graduation at the university.

Factor 7. Interaction with the National and International Environment

Regarding cooperation processes with other communities, both national and foreign, for the development of training, academic, teaching, scientific, cultural, and outreach activities, the results show that 40.9%, 27.3%, and 54.5% of lecturers hold a positive opinion of the dissemination and implementation of the institutional internationalisation policy, academic and scientific cooperation actions, and lecturer mobility processes, respectively. However, 59.1%, 72.8%, and 36.3% do not share the same perception, in that order.

Students, for their part, hold a predominantly positive perception of the dissemination and implementation of the institutional internationalisation policy and the results of academic

and scientific cooperation actions. This is evidenced by 73.9%, 76.7%, and 65.8% who view these aspects as satisfactory.

Factor 8. Contributions of Research, Innovation, Technological Development, and Creative Work Associated with the Academic Programme

Based on the programme's culture of continuous improvement, it must adhere to philosophical, pedagogical, and organisational foundations that give identity to the academic community. This is achieved by fostering a research- and innovation-oriented mindset, with the aim of cultivating in students autonomous, critical, and ethical thinking within their field of knowledge, enabling them to identify and address problems with potential solutions. In this regard, 83.6% and 80.8% of students have a positive perception of technological competences applied to professional training, as well as of training in research and the development of critical, creative, and innovative thinking—the latter two variables showing the same percentage for each aspect.

Factor 9. Well-being of the Programme's Academic Community

The administrative programme offers institutional well-being programmes that are relevant and tailored to the needs of the academic community. As for the effectiveness of implementing well-being policies, programmes, and services, 77.3%, 68.2%, 77.3%, 68.2%, 63.7%, 68.2%, 86.4%, and 81.8% of lecturers view positively the following actions, respectively: Promotion of Comprehensive Health and Self-Care; Promotion of Physical Activity, Sport, and Recreation; Promotion of Comprehensive Health and Self-Care; Promotion of Physical Activity, Sport, and Recreation; Cultural and Artistic Expression; Socio-economic Support; Institutional and Civic Culture; and Institutional Inclusion.

According to the survey results, 76.7% and 43.8% of students state that they are familiar with university well-being policies, programmes, and services, and that they have used such programmes and services, respectively. However, 23.3% of students indicate that they are not aware of these policies, programmes, and services, and 56.2% have not used them. Thus, it can be said that while most students are familiar with the university's well-being offerings, a notable proportion have not made use of these services.

Factor 10. Educational Resources and Learning Environments

With regard to the pedagogical, technological, and support dynamics established by the programme to enhance lecturers' communicative and interactive skills with students, specific strategies have been implemented. Some 85.3%, 68.2%, 72.7%, and 86.4% of lecturers have a positive perception of: the availability of strategies within the academic programme; support resources to strengthen pedagogical, technological, and guidance strategies; the adequacy of resources for teaching, research, and outreach activities; and up-to-date bibliographic materials to support various academic activities.

According to the survey data, 67.1%, 75.3%, and 75.4% of students consider that the programme's support resources, as well as pedagogical and technological strategies, are valid and adequate for achieving the proposed objectives. Nonetheless, areas for improvement are identified regarding the relevance and sufficiency of certain educational resources, which may require adjustments to fully meet students' needs and expectations.

Factor 11. Organisation, Administration, and Financing of the Academic Programme

The academic programme has an administrative structure and management processes that support teaching, research, and innovation activities. The data collected reveal that 95.4%, 95.4%, and 90.9% of lecturers, respectively, agree that lecturer participation in the programme's governing bodies: influences decision-making and the improvement of the academic programme; contributes effectively to the fulfilment of objectives; and contributes efficiently to resource management. These results indicate strong support for the positive influence of lecturer participation in the programme's continuous improvement.

The data also show that 86.3% and 77.2% are satisfied with the sufficiency of documentation and physical spaces, as well as technological and bibliographic resources, respectively.

According to these perceptions, 72.7%, 90.9%, 59.1%, and 50% of lecturers display clear scepticism about the availability of human resources; physical infrastructure; technical and technological resources; and financial resources. However, for the latter two aspects, 22.7% and 36.4% expressed disapproval.

Based on the data provided on students' perceptions regarding the participation of different bodies in committees and councils, and their contribution to improving the academic programme, 78.1%, 82.2%, and 74% of students have a positive perception of: the participation of different groups in committees and councils; their contribution to programme improvement; and participation that contributes effectively and efficiently to achieving the stated objectives.

However, 20.5% of students do not fully agree that there are sufficient lecturers to serve the number of enrolled students, suggesting a potential area for improvement in terms of human resources within the academic programme.

Factor 12. Physical and Technological Resources

With regard to factor 12—which explores whether the administrative programme has the resources required to fulfil its educational project in line with its objectives—63.7% and 59.1% consider both relevance and quality to be adequate, although a noteworthy proportion rate them as somewhat inadequate or neutral. Likewise, most respondents consider both the accuracy and timeliness of information to be adequate or very adequate, at 50% and 86.4% respectively. However, 31.8% remain neutral with respect to accuracy.

Some 81.8% and 91% of lecturers, respectively, consider the programme's IT and communication resources to be viable. According to needs, 86.4% and 59.1% of lecturers view the programme's IT and communication resources positively.

Regarding perceptions of the technological resources available for academic and research activities, the data reveal that 59.1%, 63.7%, 72.7%, 72.7%, 54.5%, 72%, and 72.7% of lecturers hold a positive perception of classrooms, computer rooms, digital intermediation tools, and aspects related to teaching, research, social outreach, and internationalisation, respectively.

The data on students' perceptions of the sufficiency and relevance of resources across various aspects of the academic programme indicate that 65.7%, 68.5%, 60.2%, and 57.5% of students have a positive view of the sufficiency and relevance of technical and technological resources, bibliographic resources, financial resources, and physical and technological infrastructure, respectively.

However, there are areas where perceptions are less positive, which may indicate aspects requiring improvement or greater attention by the institution. Likewise, 76.8%,

60.3%, and 84.9% of students perceive classrooms, computer rooms, and tools available at the university as adequate. Nevertheless, 38.4% and 27.4% indicate a less positive perception of computer rooms and the language laboratory. This may point to areas that could require enhancements or additional institutional attention.

Conclusions

The diagnosis of the Technological Administrative programme reveals a predominantly positive perception among students and lecturers across various aspects of the educational environment. Favourable assessments stand out regarding artistic, cultural, and sports activities; research projects and seedbeds; and a shared appreciation of teaching quality, lecturer–student interaction, and the relevance of the lecturer evaluation process.

However, the findings also identify areas for improvement. Chief among these is the need to strengthen institutional communication channels, particularly concerning the incentives and support offered by the Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca. Some students express a lack of awareness or dissatisfaction with certain benefits, indicating a gap between institutional provision and its perception or reach. Likewise, opportunities are identified to enhance pedagogical methodologies, promoting more holistic, contextualised, and student-centred training.

Regarding the Students factor, there is consensus between students and lecturers on the value of extracurricular activities and research processes. However, contrasts arise in perceptions of the relevance of the student regulations. A direct relationship is also evident between the level of awareness of institutional support and its uptake, underscoring the need for more effective dissemination strategies.

From the Lecturers factor, there is agreement on recruitment, hiring, and professional development processes. Most consider that their methodologies are oriented towards students' holistic development, although some recognise the potential to strengthen implementation. The use of pedagogical and technological tools that promote communicative and interactive skills is also positively valued.

With respect to the academic factor and learning outcomes, lecturers and students alike express a positive perception of curricular flexibility, interdisciplinarity, and the relevance of the pedagogical strategies implemented. There is active participation by the academic community in evaluation processes, as well as an orientation towards critical analysis and decision-making. These perceptions suggest a dynamic pedagogical environment consistent with the demands of professional technical training.

In relation to the Retention and Graduation factor, the results show that lecturers perceive evaluation and self-regulation mechanisms as effective in fostering student retention. Students, for their part, demonstrate awareness of institutional policies, which is key to autonomy and academic decision-making.

For the Interaction with the National and International Environment factor, some lecturers expressed reservations about the effectiveness of the dissemination and implementation of the institutional internationalisation policy, as well as in the management of lecturer mobility and academic and scientific cooperation. In contrast, students view both the dissemination of the policy and the programme's outcomes in mobility and academic cooperation more favourably, revealing a perception gap that should be addressed institutionally.

Regarding the Contributions of Research, Innovation, Technological Development, and Creative Work factor, students value positively the training received in critical thinking, creativity, innovation, and technological competences applied to the professional context. These results suggest that the programme is fulfilling its purpose of fostering a culture of continuous improvement, promoting a professional profile capable of meeting current challenges in academic and labour settings.

As for the Well-being factor, both lecturers and students consider the programme's policies, initiatives, and services to be appropriate. Activities related to comprehensive health, self-care, physical activity, sport, recreation, and cultural and artistic expression were rated as effective and of good quality. Similarly, areas such as institutional culture, educational guidance, and inclusion were well evaluated, although there is a need to improve the dissemination of these services to ensure equitable access and a positive impact on the university experience.

Regarding Educational Resources and Learning Environments, there is a predominantly favourable perception of the pedagogical, technological, and support strategies implemented. Lecturers value the resources available to foster communicative and interactive skills, as well as the programme's commitment to continuous improvement and access to up-to-date bibliographic materials. Students, for their part, appreciate the use of educational resources and technological strategies; nonetheless, they point to opportunities for improvement in the relevance and sufficiency of certain resources, which requires institutional attention to guarantee a high-quality formative experience.

With regard to Organisation, Administration, and Financing, lecturers recognise the effectiveness of their participation in the programme's governance bodies and its influence on decision-making. However, some report that the tools for developing theoretical–practical components are insufficient. Students also value their participation in committees and councils, although they express concern about the ratio of lecturers to enrolled students, indicating a need to review teaching staff allocation.

For the Physical and Technological Resources factor, positive perceptions are identified among both lecturers and students. Information and communication systems are favourably evaluated by lecturers in terms of quality, relevance, and timeliness, although some aspects are rated neutral or somewhat inadequate. Most consider the IT resources available for teaching and research to be adequate. Students likewise value technical, technological, bibliographic, and financial resources; however, they express dissatisfaction with the provision in computer rooms and the language laboratory, which poses a challenge for improving infrastructure and strengthening the educational experience.

Discussion

From the perspective of Páez et al. (2024), educational quality can be understood along multiple dimensions, including transformation, consistency, and fitness for purpose. In this study, the results suggest that the technological administrative programme has made relevant progress in the transformational dimension, insofar as students and lecturers recognise research training, the development of critical thinking, and the acquisition of technological competences as elements that promote students' academic and professional growth. Likewise, in terms of fitness for purpose, the programme appears to fulfil its mission of training professionals with capabilities pertinent to the productive and social environment, in line with the guidelines of the Institutional Educational Project (PEI) and the Institutional

Development Plan (PDI). Nevertheless, variability in perceptions of the sufficiency of resources—especially regarding the teaching body and certain technological infrastructure—suggests that the consistency dimension still faces challenges, particularly with respect to equity and the sustainability of learning conditions.

Moreover, differences in perceptions of the programme's internationalisation and the scope of academic cooperation reflect the need to strengthen the component of institutional visibility and communication. While students view these strategies positively, some lecturers perceive limitations in their implementation, which may relate to insufficient dissemination or gaps in participation opportunities. This aligns with the quality-as-continuous-improvement approach, which posits that quality should not be conceived as a static condition but as a dynamic process requiring constant evaluation, active participation of institutional stakeholders, and adaptation to environmental changes. Consequently, it is recommended to reinforce spaces for dialogue among students, lecturers, and academic management teams to consolidate an institutional culture that prioritises well-being, inclusion, innovation, and academic excellence as cross-cutting principles of the formative process.

References

Acuerdo 02. (2020). Consejo Nacional de Acreditación. https://www.cna.gov.co/1779/articles-402848_documento.pdf

Berardi, L. (2015). La investigación cuantitativa. En L. Abero, L. Berardi, A. Capocasale, M.S. García, y S.R. Roja, *Investigación educativa. Abriendo puertas al conocimiento* (pp. 48-80). Clacso. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12799/4519

Bonett, K., Morales, Y., Osorio, J. y Manzanero, G. (2024). Implementación del modelo de autoevaluación y autorregulación para la obtención de la acreditación institucional: estudio de caso Universidad de la Costa. *Formación universitaria, 17*. 117-128. https://hdl.handle.net/11323/14275

Calderón-Arregui, D.A. (2022). Análisis de la Ley de Educación Superior, LES 24 521, de Argentina: Reflexiones y propuestas de cambio para su reforma. *Revista Killkana Sociales, 6*(2), 35–48. https://doi.org/10.26871/killkanasocial.v6i2.1005

Cano, J.A., Vásquez, J.A., Palacios, L.M. (2017). Una metodología novedosa de autoevaluación para la acreditación de programas universitarios. *Espacios, 38*(50), 20-40. https://www.revistaespacios.com/a17v38n50/a17v38n50p20.pdf

Cancino, V., & Schmal, R. (2014). Sistema de acreditación universitaria en Chile:¿ Cuánto hemos avanzado?. Estudios pedagógicos (Valdivia), 40(1), 41-60.

Comisión Nacional de Acreditación. (2015). *Manual de acreditación institucional para universidades*. Comisión Nacional de Acreditación. https://www.cnachile.cl

Consejo Nacional de Acreditación. (2013). *Lineamientos para la Acreditación de Programas Académicos de Pregrado*. Ministerio de educación Nacional, Colombia. https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1759/articles-341938_archivo_pdf.pdf

Cruz-Acosta, R., y Cassungo-Cruz, R. B. C. (2024). Relación entre la investigación, la docencia, la extensión y el entorno empresarial de un Instituto Superior Politécnico de Angola. Revista de Investigación, Desarrollo e Innovación, 14 (2), 63-80. https://doi.org/10.19053/uptc.20278306.v14.n2.2024.17813

Dueñas-Peña, A., Cuéllar-Sánchez, D.M. & Velosa-Lancheros, C. (2023b). Management and Correspondence between Shared Value, Innovation, Clusters, and Value Chain. *Migration Letters*, *20*(S2), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.59670/ml.v20iS2.3660

Forni, P. y Grande, P. (2020). Triangulación y métodos mixtos en las ciencias sociales contemporáneas. *Revista mexicana de sociología*, *82*(1), 159-189. https://doi.org/10.22201/iis.01882503p.2020.1.58064

Guevara, J., Ballesteros, J., Cárdenas, G. y Serrano, S. (2011). Metodología para autoevaluación de programas académicos con fines de acreditación en instituciones de educación superior. *Gerencia tecnológica informática*, *10*(27), 23 – 33. https://biblat.unam.mx/hevila/Gerenciatecnologicainformatica/2011/vol10/no27/2.pdf

Huaman, E.J., Anicama, E.A., González, E.L., Félix, H.L., y Chu, W.E. (2022). *Metodología de la investigación científica: Guía práctica para la elección, diseño y desarrollo de la investigación*. Universidad Autónoma de Ica SAC. Fondo Editorial. https://repositorio.autonomadeica.edu.pe/bitstream/20.500.14441/2558/2/METODOLOGIA%20DE%20LA%20INVESTIGACI%C3%93N%20CIENTIFICA.pdf

Koh, E.T. & Owen, W.L. (2000). *Descriptive Research and Qualitative Research. Introduction to Nutrition and Health Research*. En *Introduction to Nutrition and Health Research* (pp. 219-248). Springer. https://doi. org/10.1007/978-1-4615-1401-5_12

Ley 30. (1992, 28 diciembre). Congreso de la República. Fundamentos de la educación superior. DO. 40700. https://normograma.info/men/docs/pdf/ley_0030_1992.pdf

Martín-Sabina, E., y Villavicencio, M.V. (2015). La responsabilidad social de las universidades: Retos y perspectivas. En E. A. Hernández (Ed.), *La responsabilidad social de las universidades: Implicaciones para América Latina y el Caribe*. UNESCO-IESALC.

Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Consejo Nacional de Acreditación y Comisión Nacional Intersectorial de Aseguramiento de la Calidad de la Educación Superior. (2022). *Una mirada a los resultados de aprendizaje* (C. A. Camacho Sanabria & I. E. Ramos Calderón, Eds.). https://www.mineducacion.gov.co

Ministerio de Educación Nacional. (2019, 25 de julio). *Decreto 1330 de 2019, por el cual se sustituye el Capítulo 2 y se suprime el Capítulo 7 del Título 3 de la Parte 2 del Libro 2 del Decreto 1075 de 2015 - Único Reglamentario del Sector Educación*. Diario Oficial No. 51.026. https://www.funcionpublica.gov.co/eva/gestornormativo/norma.php?i=96285

Ministerio de Educación Nacional. (2018, 8 de agosto). *La calidad: esencia de la educación en las aulas de clase*. https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/portal/salaprensa/Noticias/373629:La-calidad-esencia-de-la-educacion-en-las-aulas-de-clase

Ministerio de Educación Superior de la República de Cuba. (2014, 7 de marzo). *Sistema de Evaluación y Acreditación de Instituciones de Educación Superior (SEA-IES). Resolución No. 24/14*. https://instituciones.sld.cu/cedas/files/2016/06/4.pdf

Páez, D., Camargo, D. y Muriel-Perea, Y. (2021). Calidad de las instituciones de educación superior desde la perspectiva de América Latina y el Caribe. *SIGNOS-Investigación en Sistemas de Gestión*, *13*(1), 1-29. https://www.redalyc.org/journal/5604/560468679013/html/#redalyc_560468679013_ref9

Páez, F.J., Peñata, A.E., y Argel, L.M. (2024). Globalización y Calidad Educativa en Colombia. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar*, *8*(3), 5119-5130. https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v8i3.11713

Parada, L. (2016). Sistema de evaluación docente, instituciones de educación superior tecnológica: lineamientos de calidad. *Praxis & Saber*, 7(13), 177198. https://doi.org/10.19053/22160159.4171.

Portocarrero, L., Restrepo, J., y Arias, J. (2020). Evaluación del impacto de la acreditación de alta calidad en las instituciones públicas de educación superior de Colombia. *Formación Universitaria*, *13*(6), 37-50. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-50062020000600037.

Rosas, J. y Sánchez, A. (2017). La evaluación de las políticas públicas en Jalisco. Una aproximación desde la metaevaluación. *Política y cultura*, (47), 201-223. http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0188-77422017000100201&lng=es&tlng=es.

Toro, A. y Peláez, L. (2018). Validación de un modelo para el aseguramiento de la calidad del software en mipymes que desarrollan software en el Eje Cafetero. *Entre Ciencia e Ingeniería*, *12*(23), 84-92. http://dx.doi.org/10.31908/19098367.3707.

UNESCO. (2020a). *IESALC lanza estudio sobre calidad y acreditación en la educación superior*. https://www.iesalc.unesco.org/2020/06/03/iesalc-lanza-estudio-sobre-calidad-y-acreditacion-en-la-educacion-superior/

UNESCO. (2020b). Aseguramiento de la calidad en la educación superior: orientaciones para América Latina. Oficina Regional de Educación para América Latina y el Caribe (OREALC/UNESCO Santiago). https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000374655

UNESCO (2016). Educación para transformar metas, opciones de estrategia e indicadores. Disponible en http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002452/245278S.pdf

Vaillant, D., y Rodríguez, E. (2018). Perspectivas de UNESCO y la OEI sobre la calidad de la educación (*Capítulo VI*). En *Calidad de la educación en Iberoamérica: discursos, políticas y prácticas* (pp. 136–154). Universidad ORT Uruguay. https://ie.ort.edu.uy/innovaportal/file/73018/I/perspectivas-de-unesco-y-oei-vaillant-rodriguez.pdf

Vargas, H., Rodríguez, C., Sosa, J. y Azuz, I. (2010). *La Educación superior en el contexto mundial: Retos y perspectivas.* CETYS Universidad. https://www.cervantesvirtual.com/descargaPdf/la-educacion-superior-en-el-contexto-mundial-retos-y-perspectivas-986643/

Weber, S. (2014). Human capital depreciation and education level. *International Journal of Manpower*, *35*(5), 613-642. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-05-2014-0122