

Public Universities And Academic Bodies Functions In Mexico

José L. V. Arcos^{1*}, Fabiola Ramiro M.², Oscar Gilbon Rosete³

^{1*}Instituto de Ingeniería,
Universidad Autónoma de Baja California,
México.

²Facultad de Ciencias Humanas,
Universidad Autónoma de Baja California,
México.

³Tesorero de la BUAP,
Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla,
México.

Accepted 27 November, 2015

ABSTRACT

A study with quantitative design, non-experimental, transverse and correlational and which aims to describe the significant relationships between indicators of academic bodies of the State Public Universities in Mexico and indicators of programs, educational processes and outcomes is presented. Information from 44 institutions of higher education in state order, which submitted its Integral Program for Institutional Strengthening (PIFI) in 2013 with the Ministry of Education was considered; the indicators were analyzed by processing programs in the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS); correlation coefficients of the variables of consolidated academic bodies, consolidation and training and program variables, educational processes and outcomes were obtained. Based on the results it is concluded that the academic bodies, more than a decade after the implementation of the PIFI as a strategy to improve the quality of higher education, still shows no significant relationship with the good quality of the offered educational programs.

Keywords: academic bodies, educational programs, PIFI, higher education, public university.

1. Introduction

Public Universities in Mexico, in particular the State level (UPE's), during the last two federal administrations and still in the present, have been driven to improve the educational quality that they offer, mainly to compete for extra resources for performance improvement. The Mexican Federal Government, as part of its education sector programs has prompted the formulation of Integral Programs for Institutional Strengthening (PIFI, acronym in Spanish) as the main tool to induce change in the public system of higher education, which is now integrated into the program called Strengthening Program of Quality in Educational Institutions (PROFOCIE, acronym in Spanish). Under this reference, the study analyzes indicators of academic bodies and their relationship with program indicators, processes and educational outcomes of UPE's who submitted their PIFI projects to the Ministry of Higher Education (SES, acronym in Spanish) of the Ministry of Education (SEP, acronym in Spanish) in 2013. The goal is to know, from the analysis of the indicators, the significant relationships of these indicators and their impact on the quality of the offered educational programs.

In Mexico, policies in education since 2001 have marked the direction towards ensuring the quality of academic programs through evaluation and accreditation processes, so that the research question has been raised based on the question: What are the significant relationships between indicators of academic bodies programs and indicators of educational programs, processes and outcomes of the State Public Universities in Mexico in the year 2013? And the general objective to describe the relationship of these indicators and their impact on the quality of education degree programs offered. The study was carried out based on the review of

federal policies issued by the Ministry of Education through its educational sector programs: PRONAE 2001-2006, PSE 2007-2012 and PSE 2013-2018, the PIFI, Program of Teachers Improvement (PROMEP, acronym in Spanish); strategic documents that set guidelines in higher education by agencies such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (COPAES, acronym in Spanish); and finally, authors who have addressed this subject like Loria (2002), Rodríguez (2002), Navarro (2005), López and Casillas (2005), Kent (2005), Rubio (2006), Lopez and Escobar (2006), Hernández (2006) and Chehaibar, *et al.* (2007), Comas, *et al.* (2008), Díaz (2008), Sevilla *et al.* (2008), López (2012), Ramiro *et al.* (2012), Arcos *et al.* (2013).

2. Higher education and strategies to raise standards

Higher education has been in the task of transforming to meet the great challenges and difficulties faced in terms of financing, equity, improved academic staff, improvement of the quality of teaching, research and services offered, appropriateness of the study plans, among others; so it is necessary to promote actions when we observe a large demand for higher education and diversification of the same, as well as increased awareness of their importance to the sociocultural and economic development of communities, and to build the future. It must address both the challenges posed by new opportunities relating to technologies that improve the way we produce, organize, disseminate, manage, and access knowledge. With the intention of finding solutions to these challenges and to launch a process of profound remodeling of higher education, UNESCO (1998) proclaims as missions of higher education, especially the quality assessment.

In Mexico, according to the above guidelines, the above mentioned is to comply with one of its main national goals "Mexico with quality education" (López, 2012). Through the Education Sector Program 2013-2018 the federal government established as one of its main objectives "Strengthening the quality and appropriateness of education [...] higher [...], so that it contributes to the development of Mexico" (López, 2012). Thus, Mexico through its Education Sector Program, maintains the enlargement and impulse to improve the quality of education, recognizing at the level of higher education that the extraordinary resources, additional to the regularized budget, have been a very valuable mechanism for the formation and improvement of teaching, correcting structural problems of universities, support the development of institutions, strengthen academic work, and encourage the growth of supply in priority areas for the development of the country (López, 2012).

The federal government through the Ministry of Education, using PIFI tool has helped to extend and solidify a culture of planning, evaluation, and continuous improvement in the quality of education in HEI, both public and private, to encourage improvement in the quality of education by implementing the evaluation of higher education. The evaluation of results (López & Escobar, 2006), was a relevant measure adopted by most countries to deal with the contraction of public spending in educational higher level, in the framework of the global economic crisis of the eighties, becoming the main policy tool for university education, made by multilateral agencies like the World Bank (WB), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and UNESCO; who agree on identifying an indissoluble association between quality improvement, outcome evaluation, and differential funding. The evaluation policy refers to the set of procedures used to verify the extent to which academic subjects, programs, schools, areas or, where appropriate institutions conform to standards and parameters, in which are set the attributes assigned to education by the official circuits of power. Its adoption sets a new paradigm of regulation, based on the evaluation ratio established between them and governments, which resizes the category and subject of the evaluation.

The evaluation of higher education in Mexico (Rubio, 2006) is performed by a set of bodies and agencies. From 2001 to date, the Federal Government has worked with assessment bodies seeking their coordination within a National System of Evaluation and Accreditation. These are: Inter-institutional Committees for the Evaluation of Higher Education (CIEES, acronym in Spanish); National Center for Assessment in Higher Education (CENEVAL, acronym in Spanish) and COPAES. To evaluate the quality of graduate programs there are schemes and procedures of the National Register of Postgraduate Quality (PNPC, acronym in Spanish) of CONACYT and to grant the Recognition of Official Validity of Studies (RVOE, acronym in Spanish) to educational programs offered by private institutions. Since its founding in 1984, the National System of Researchers (SNI) has been the main instance of external evaluation of the quality of the work products from the research professors of HEI and researchers from research centers.

Procedures for evaluation at public universities in Mexico are performed (Rubio, 2006; López & Escobar, 2006) at the institutional level, educational programs and individual performance: students and academics. Between 1990 and 1992, the National Commission for the Evaluation of Higher

Education (CONAEVA, acronym in Spanish) drove in Mexican public universities what they called self-evaluating exercises, which were designed and jointly monitored by the Department of Higher Education and Scientific Research (SEIC, acronym in Spanish) (today, Department of Higher Education) and National Association of Universities and Higher Education Institutions (ANUIES, acronym in Spanish), taking root in most public institutions as part of their planning processes, formulation of their programs of institutional development, and external evaluation, allowing greater self-knowledge of universities while contributing to the formation of a system of basic information of the UPE subsystem.

At late 80's and during the 90's, the Mexican government used various programs for the allocation of resources to higher education institutions: Modernization Fund for Higher Education (FOMES, acronym in Spanish), Teacher Improvement Program (PROMEPE, acronym in Spanish), Multiple Contributions Fund (FAM, acronym in Spanish) for the expansion, modernization, maintenance, and equipment of physical spaces, Support Program University Development (PROADU, acronym in Spanish), Program for Administration Standardizing (PRONAD, acronym in Spanish). These programs had some original features regarding the forms of negotiation and allocation of resources to higher education institutions (HEI) and pursue a specific purpose, by assigning unique resources, that is not regularized and not part of the irreducible annual budget; function under operating rules established by the federation, which implies a mechanism for evaluation; and participate voluntarily (Sevilla *et al*, 2008; PRONAE, 2001; Rodríguez, 2002). The intent behind these programs has been to improve the quality of higher education, from resources, which although few and limited, can lead to institutional change. The resources are targeted, among others, to: improving performance and training career of professors of Institutions of Higher Education; modernize infrastructure and administrative services; support research and the construction and equipping of physical spaces (López & Casillas, 2005).

The federal government in the administrative period 2001-2006, through the National Education Program (PRONAE, acronym in Spanish), raised the issue of the evaluation and the need for strengthening it (Rubio, 2006; López & Escobar, 2006), leading to public universities to deliver self-evaluating reports to access additional resources, such as those granted by the Modernization Fund for Higher Education (FOMES, acronym in Spanish), PROMEP, the Investment Fund of State Public Universities Evaluation of the National Association of Universities and Institutions on Higher Education-ANUIES (FIUPEA, acronym in Spanish) and more recently, the Integral Programs for Institutional Strengthening (PIFI). PRONAE associated quality with a set of indicators (Navarro, 2005; Chehaibar *et al*, 2007; Comas *et al*, 2008; PRONAE, 2001; SEP, 2006) which formed the basis for the design and operation of specific programs aimed at public higher education institutions (HEI). The central policy was the formulation of PIFI in universities, to harmonize all or most of the institutional actions, in order to drive continuous improvement and quality assurance programs and educational services offered by HEI, as well as its academic and administrative management; constituting PIFI in the main policy instrument of the SEP to induce change in a broad segment of the public higher education system. The central axes of the PIFI (SEP, 2006; SEP, 2015) are the concepts of academic ability and academic competitiveness, so the planning processes of each of the universities have been made

since the guidelines and criteria derived from them. The support obtained from this program is channeled to State Public Universities of Support (UPEAS, acronym in Spanish) through comprehensive projects that are formulated from a Strategic Planning exercise that integrates the institutional level of the Branches of Higher Education (DES, acronym in Spanish), and Institutional Management. Nowadays, the federal government continues with the strategy of the past two administrations, adding in its Sector Development Program 2013-2018 the review of structure and extra funds to ensure they are instruments for strengthening higher education. Starting in 2013, the PIFI is framed within the Program of Quality Promotion in Educational Institutions (PROFOCIE, acronym in Spanish).

To continue with the development of mechanisms for ensuring the quality of programs and institutions of higher education, the Education Sector Program 2013-2018 notes the creation of a national system of evaluation and accreditation of academic programs and institutions of higher education (SEP, 2013). As part of the objective of improving the quality of higher education, the current federal government continues to stimulate the accreditation of educational programs, supported by the Council for Accreditation of Higher Education (COPAES, acronym in Spanish), created in 2000 with the main purpose of regulating the work of accrediting agencies, becoming the only body authorized by the federal government to give recognition to organizations whose purpose is to accredit academic programs of higher education in public or private institutions. COPAES [19] states that the accreditation of a higher-level academic program is the public recognition given by an accrediting, nongovernmental agency, officially recognized by the COPAES, in the sense that it meets certain criteria, indicators, and parameters when it comes to quality in its structure, organization, operation, inputs, teaching processes, services, and outcomes. It also means that the program has social relevance. The main purpose of accreditation is to recognize the quality of the program and encourage improvement. To date, the COPAES has given recognition to 28 accreditation bodies of higher education in Mexico (COPAES, 2015).

The Faculty Improvement Program (Promep) of SEP in Mexico has as a general objective to improve the training, dedication, and performance of the academic bodies of educational institutions as a mean to increase the quality of high education. Its purpose is to support the best training of students and for this reason, the solid qualifications of teachers and their integration in academic institutions committed to their bodies and linked to national and international media Innovative generation and application of knowledge is planted as a principle.

PROMEP considers two aspects, individual and collective; the first wants to create full time teachers, the second is the momentum and consolidation of the academic bodies. Points out that to improve the quality of higher education, teachers should form an inner active articulated academic body actively united with the outside to develop modern academic habits and values, support effective planning of institutional development, make original contributions to universal knowledge, as well ensure the proper compliance with the university functions (Hernández *et al*, 2010).

3. Methodological development

To achieve the objective of this analysis, correlational research was carried out with non-experimental research design of transversal type (Hernández *et al*, 2010), data from 44 State Public Universities which had their Integral Programs for Institutional Strengthening (PIFI) under evaluation were analyzed in 2013 at the Department of Higher Education of the SEP. The analysis performed was of the PIFI indicators, processing data in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), the result was the correlation coefficient showing significant relationships (r) of indicators. Each of the indicators of academic ability with meaningful academic competitiveness indicators for relationships was correlated. In Mexico, the PIFI is one of the main tools used by the federal government to promote the quality of higher education by providing special funding channeling resources to the UPE, and other educational institutions. The central axes of the PIFI are academic ability and competitiveness (SEP, 2006; SEP, 2015), it is considered to analyze the total number of indicators of the 44 UPE. The academic ability is determined by indicators linked to the degree of empowerment of its full-time faculty (PTC) and the level of consolidation of its academic bodies. For the study, analysis variables were considered as indicators of academic ability of the institution considering the academic bodies.

The Academic Bodies (CA) are groups of teachers - researchers who develop one or more lines of generation of knowledge, applied research and technological development and innovation in disciplinary or multidisciplinary topics; They share a set of objectives and academic goals; and attend educational programs related to their specialty. They are classified into:

- Consolidated academic bodies (CAC, acronym in Spanish),
- In consolidation (CAEC, acronym in Spanish), and
- In formation (CAEF, acronym in Spanish)

Academic bodies must meet a series of indicators according to their level, seeking to cover most of the indicators to achieve its consolidation, among them: that its members possess the highest academic qualification (doctorate), and achieve secondment distinction of the National Research System (SNI); have extensive experience in teaching activities and use of human resources; obtain recognition of a desirable profile of a college professor by the Ministry of Education; its members work together and their academic activities be evidence of this; have a high commitment to the institution to which they belong and carry out an intense collegiate life; also demonstrate an important academic activity manifested in the organization and / or attendance at conferences, seminars, workshops and tables, and so on; actively participate in collaborative networks or academic exchanges with other academic bodies, as well as domestic and foreign organizations and institutions. The maximum level is consolidated (CAC) (SEP, 2015).

Also it is considered as indicators of academic variables of competitiveness. The academic competitiveness is closely related to the academic ability and accounts directly on the quality of services offered by the institution; and it is determined from a set of indicators [23]. For purposes of this study these are considered as:

Educational programs:

- Updated in the past five years,
- Evaluated by the inter-institutional committees for the evaluation of higher education (CIEES) and
- University programs and vocational upper technical Associated (TSU/PA) and accredited degree;

Educational processes:

- Scholarships to students,
- Students receiving tutoring,
- Educational programs with higher qualification rate of 70%,
- Educational programs with retention rate from 1st to 2nd year above 70%, and
- Index of student satisfaction; and

Educational outcomes:

- Efficiency terminal degree,
- Graduates during the first year following graduation from undergraduate
- Educational programs: applying the general exam of degree exit (egel, acronym in Spanish) to students/graduates,
- Educational programs in which they monitor graduates,
- Educational programs that incorporate social service in the curriculum,
- Educational programs implementing collegiate learning assessment processes,

- Educational programs in which 80% or more of its graduates found employment within six months after graduation,
- Educational programs in which 80% or more of its graduates did some kind of work activity during the first year after graduation that coincided or was related to their studies,
- Opinion of society on the results of the branches of higher education (des, acronym in Spanish),
- Satisfaction rate of graduates, and satisfaction index of the employers about the performance of graduates.

4. Results of correlations between variables of academic bodies and indicators of programs, educational processes and outcomes of the State Public Universities (UPE's) in Mexico in 2013

The results of the correlation between the variables of academic bodies and programs, educational processes and outcomes of the State Public Universities (UPE's) in Mexico in 2013 show the following relationships:

In the correlation of *indicators of educational programs and indicators of academic bodies*, the indicators show a significant relationship of 0.8, that is the relation of the number of updated programs in the past five years with the number of academic bodies in consolidation-CAEC (0.840) and the number of Consolidated Academic Bodies-CAC (0.803) programs; the number of Community Colleges and Professional Associate-TSU/PA programs and BA credited with the number of academic bodies being consolidated-CAEC (0.801). (See Table 1)

Table 1. Relationship between Educational Programs indicators and Academic Bodies indicators of UPE'S in Mexico in 2013.

Indicators of PIFI Academic Bodies***

Indicators of PIFI Educational Programs***	r	Indicators of PIFI Academic Bodies***		
		Number of CAC and registered	Number of CAEC and registered	Number of CAEF and registered
Number of programs updated in the past five years		0.803**	0.840**	0.797**
Number of programs evaluated by the CIEES1		0.775**	0.825**	0.824**
Number of programs evaluated by the CIEES2		0.338*	0.381**	0.366**
Number of programs evaluated by the CIEES3		0.068	0.027	0.026
Number of TSU/PA programs and Bachelor's degree accredited		0.768**	0.801**	0.782**

*** PIFI, integral programs for institutional strengthening; PE, educational programs; TSU, community college; PA, APO; bachelor's degree. CIEES (Interagency Committees for the Evaluation of Higher Education) provides three levels of evaluation: Level 1 is the highest level. PTC, full-time faculty; SNI, the National System of Researchers, Dr, PhD; PROMEP, Teacher Improvement Program; GLCA, lines of generation and application of knowledge; CAC, consolidated academic bodies; CAEC, consolidating academic bodies; ACFE, academic training bodies.

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In the correlation of indicators of educational processes and indicators of academic bodies, the data show relationships higher between indicators: Number of educational programs with retention rate from 1st to 2nd year, more than 70% in the academic bodies in training-CAEF with a number of 0.706 and consolidated academic bodies-CAEC with a number of 0.703 and a number of scholarships granted to students with 0.649

CAC, and with 0.645 of CAEC. The number of students receiving tutoring in education programs in community colleges and professional associate-TSU/PA and Bachelor's degree with academic bodies being consolidated-CAEC of -0.019; so is it in the number of educational programs with higher qualification rate of 70%, the satisfaction rate of the student is shown below of 0.6 (See Table 2).

Table 2. Relationship between Educational Processes indicators and Academic Bodies indicators of UPE'S in Mexico in 2013.

Indicators of Educational Processes of PIF ***	Indicators of PIFI Academic Bodies***		
	Number of CAC and registered	Number of CAEC and registered	Number of CAEF and registered
Number of scholarships awarded to students	0.649**	0.645**	0.565**
Number of students receiving tutoring in PE of TSU/PA AND BACH DEG	0.019	0.032	-0.023
Number of educational programs with a graduate rate above 70%	0.058	-0.055	-0.042
Number of educational programs with retention rate from 1 st to 2 nd year above 70%	0.686**	0.703**	0.706**
Index of student satisfaction	0.574**	0.532**	0.588**

*** PIFI, integral programs for institutional strengthening; PE, educational programs; TSU, community college; PA, APO; bachelor's degree. CIEES (Interagency Committees for the Evaluation of Higher Education) provides three levels of evaluation: Level 1 is the highest level. PTC, full-time faculty; SNI, the National System of Researchers, Dr, PhD; PROMEP, Teacher Improvement Program; GLCA, lines of generation and application of knowledge; CAC, consolidated academic bodies; CAEC, consolidating academic bodies; ACFE, academic training bodies.

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In the correlation of *educational outcomes indicators and academic bodies' indicators*, the data shows significant relationship of the terminal Efficiency in bachelor's degree indicators (by generational cohort) along with the Number of consolidated academic bodies- CAC show relations of 0.701. Educational programs that are conducted for graduates

monitoring show relationship with CAC of 0.792 and with CAEC of 0.781. Educational programs that incorporate social service in the curriculum are related the CAEC of 0.727. And the indicator alumni satisfaction index has relation with CAC of 0.720 and the CAEC of 0.703. (See Table 3)

Table 3. List of Educational Outcomes indicators and Academic Bodies indicators of UPE'S in Mexico in 2013.

Educational Result Indicators of PIFI***	Indicators of PIFI Academic Bodies***		
	Number of CAC and registered	Number of CAEC and registered	Number of CAEF and registered
Number of terminal efficiency in bachelor's degree (by generational cohort)	0.701**	0.655**	0.585**
Number of terminal efficiency in bachelor's degree (by generational cohort)	0.697**	0.670**	0.593**
Number of PE applying the EGEL to students/graduates	0.344*	0.423**	0.366**
Number of PE in which graduates monitoring is made	0.792**	0.781**	0.685**
Number of PE incorporating social service in the curriculum	0.673**	0.727**	0.643**
Number of PE that apply collegiate learning assessment processes	0.356*	0.439**	0.356*
Number of programs where 80% or more of its graduates found employment within six months after graduation	0.592**	0.571**	0.547**
Number of programs where 80% or more of its graduates got employed during the first year after graduation in an area that coincided or was related to their studies	0.615**	0.603**	0.573**
Number of a representative sample of society who have a favorable view of the results	0.482**	0.406**	0.359*
Satisfaction rate of graduates	0.720**	0.703**	0.659**
Satisfaction Index of employers on the performance of graduates	0.582**	0.637**	0.648**

*** PIFI, integral programs for institutional strengthening; PE, educational programs; TSU, community college; PA, APO; bachelor's degree. CIEES (Interagency Committees for the Evaluation of Higher Education) provides three levels of evaluation: Level 1 is the highest level. PTC, full-time faculty; SNI, the National System of Researchers, Dr, PhD; PROMEP, Teacher Improvement Program; GLCA, lines of generation and application of knowledge; CAC, consolidated academic bodies; CAEC, consolidating academic bodies; ACFE, academic training bodies.

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

5. Conclusions

According to the results, in 2013, academic bodies' indicators and their relation to programs, processes and, outcomes indicators of the State Public Universities in Mexico show few significant relationships in some of its indicators. The results showed significant relationships between consolidated academic bodies and *academic bodies* being consolidated with updated *educational programs*.

The results showed significant relationships between consolidated academic bodies and academic bodies being consolidated with updated educational programs (table 1), specifically between consolidated academic bodies on consolidation with updated educative programs (0.803 and 0.840). However, the relation between consolidated academic bodies and educational programs evaluated by the Interagency Committee for the Evaluation of Higher Education-CIEES at level 1 is lower (0.775) than the one shown by the academic bodies being consolidated (0.825) and academic bodies in training (0.824). Also, academic bodies being consolidated showed significant relationship with educational programs for community college and professional associate-TSU/PA and accredited Bachelor's degree (0.801), unlike the consolidated academic bodies (0.768). The consolidated academic bodies showed no significant relationships of 0.8 with the programs evaluated by Level 1 of CIEES, and neither with accredited programs, these two indicators are highly relevant to the evaluation of educational programs of higher education established by the accrediting agencies assigned to the Committee for accreditation of higher education - COPAES, the only entity in Mexico for the accreditation of undergraduate degree programs. Also is relevant to the granting of extraordinary economic resources from the Ministry of Education, through the Comprehensive Institutional Building Program - PIFI indicator.

As indicators of Educational Processes and their relationship to academic bodies, there is no significant relationship of consolidated academic bodies and academic bodies being consolidated with educational programs with a retention rate of over 70% in the first two (0.686 and 0.703). In other indicators: scholarships, tutoring, student satisfaction rate, and, especially, graduation rate, there aren't significant relationships shown.

Educational Outcomes indicators and their relationship to academic bodies. Except for the academic bodies being consolidated that showed significant relationship with the terminal efficiency in bachelor's degree indicator in the cycle A (0.831), which was not maintained in the cycle B (0.655), there is no other significant relation with indicators of educational outcomes; especially with relevant indicators as terminal efficiency, qualifications, and job placement of graduates, as well as indicators for employers and students satisfaction.

It is important to note that the consolidated academic bodies (CAC) and the ones being consolidated (CAEC), are formed by full-time professors with distinction from the National System of Researchers, with recognition of the Promep profile (high recognition as teachers) and PhD studies preferably, among other indicators of academic production and creation of resources. The results show no significant relationships with the programs, processes, and learning outcomes.

Based on the results, it can be considered correct the assumption that the relationship between variables indicators of academic bodies and programs variables, educational processes and outcomes in undergraduate educational programs offered by the State Public Universities in Mexico, do not show results of significant impact on the quality of the educational programs.

More than a decade after the introduction of PIFI as a strategy to achieve the quality of higher education in Mexico and supporting the consolidation of Academic Bodies in said country, it is noteworthy that there is still no significant evidence among its indicators, so the challenge the UPE's in Mexico are facing is to establish new strategies in order to achieve greater partnership between academic bodies and improve the quality of educational programs and to make greater partnership in education and a considerable impact on education results. When the results shown are low (below 0.8) in the significant relations capacity indicators and Academic Competitiveness, the impact on the quality of higher education is low.

It is recommended to proceed with analysis where relationships of indicators of academic bodies and indicators of programs, educational processes and outcomes in the quality of training of students and their insertion in the labor market is evaluated, as well as the contents of the study plans. On the other hand, it is emphasized that even when public education policy changed in this administration, in terms of support for higher education institutions, the support programs just changed their name and the strategy of methodological format did not change, it has remained the same for more than ten years.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Loria, D. E. (2002). La competitividad de las universidades públicas mexicanas. Unapropuesta de evaluación. México: Plaza y Valdés Editores.
- Rodríguez, R. (2002). Continuidad y cambio en las políticas de educación superior. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa*, vol. 7, núm.14. Available in <http://www.comie.org.mx>
- Navarro, M.A. (2005). El PIFI: acotar la planeación, acotar el future. En Díaz B. A. y Mendoza R. J. (Coords.). *Educación Superior y Programa Nacional de Educación 2001-2006. Aportes para una discusión*, Colección Biblioteca de la Educación Superior. México: ANUIES, pp.75-86.
- López, R. y Casillas, M.A. (2005). El PIFI. Notas sobre su diseño e instrumentación. En A. Díaz y J. Mendoza (Coords.), *Educación Superior y Programa Nacional de Educación 2001-2006. Aportes para una discusión*. México: ANUIES, pp.37-74
- Kent, R. (2005). Recepción de las políticas públicas de educación superior. El PIFI y el PIFOP. México: ANUIES.
- Rubio, O. J. (2006). *La Política Educativa y Educación Superior en México*. 1995-2006: balance. México: SEP-FCE. Available in <http://www.ses.sep.gob.mx>
- López, C.A. y Escobar, Ch. A. L. (2006). La evaluación superior en México: entre la mejora y el control, en Jorge Guillermo Cano (coord.), *Política y Educación en México*. Temas emergentes en el nivel superior. Barcelona-México: Ediciones Pomares.
- Hernández, Y. M. L. (2006). El PIFI 2000-2003 en la Universidad de Guadalajara: un estudio de caso. *Red de Investigadores sobre Educación Superior (RISEU)*. Available in <http://www.riseu.unam.mx>

9. Chehaibar, N. L.M., Díaz, B. A., Mendoza, R. J. (2007). Los programas integrales de fortalecimiento institucional. Apuntes para una evaluación desde las universidades. *Perfiles Educativos*. UNAM: México, 117, pp. 41-67.
10. Comas, R., O., Fresán, O., M. M., Buendía, E., A., Gómez, Morales, I. (2008). La Universidad Mexicana y el PIFI: Una mirada desde la economía institucional. *1er. Foro de Educación, UAM*, 31 julio - 1 agosto. Publicado en Memorias del Foro. Available in <http://desinuam.org/desin/fronteras/comas.pdf>
11. Díaz, B. A. (2008). El Programa Integral de Fortalecimiento Institucional (PIFI) y su impacto en la dinámica de las Instituciones de Educación Superior, en A. Díaz, B. (Coord.). *Impacto de la evaluación en la educación superior mexicana. Un estudio en las universidades públicas mexicanas*. México: ANUIES, Plaza y Valdés, UNAM, pp. 39-118.
12. Sevilla, J. J., Galaz, J.F., Arcos, J.L. (2008). La participación del académico en procesos de planeación y su relación con su visión institucional. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa*. UABC: México, núm.10, vol. 2. Available in <http://redie.uabc.mx/vol10no2/contenido-sevilla.html>
13. López, Z. R. (2012). ¿Es el Programa Integral de Fortalecimiento Institucional (PIFI) una moda?. *Revista de la Educación Superior*, vol. 41, núm.163, pp. 91-114. Available in <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=60425380006>
14. Ramiro, M. F.; Arcos, V.J.L; Corrales, B. V. (2012). *Capacidad y Competitividad Académica de las Dependencias de Educación Superior de Ingeniería de las Universidades Públicas Estatales en México*. México: UAS/UABC.
15. Arcos, V. J. L., Ramiro, M.F., Corrales, B.V.A. (2013). "Cuerpos Académicos y su relación con indicadores de procesos y resultados en las DES de Ingeniería de las UPE en México"(Ponencia). *V Congreso Internacional de Educación, II Congreso Latinoamericano de Ciencias de la Educación y IV Coloquio "Prácticas docentes con apoyo de las TIC". Inclusión, colaboración y transdisciplinariedad como potenciadores de saberes*". UABC, México.
16. UNESCO (1998). Declaración mundial sobre la educación superior en el siglo XXI: Visión y acción. Available in <http://www.unesco.org/>
17. Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2013-2018 (2013). Gobierno de la República, México. Available in <http://pnd.gob.mx/>
18. Programa Sectorial de Educación 2013-2018. México: SEP. 2013. Available in http://www.sep.gob.mx/work/models/sep1/Resource/4479/4/images/PROGRAMA_SECTORIAL_DE_EDUCACION_2013_2018_WEB.pdf
19. Consejo para la Acreditación de la Educación Superior, A. C. (COPAES) (2015). Marco general para los procesos de Acreditación. México. Available in <http://www.copaes.org.mx>
20. Programa Nacional de Educación (PRONAE) 2001-2006. Diagnóstico del sistema de educación superior. México: SEP. 2001. Available in http://redescolar.ilce.edu.mx/redescolar/servicios/plan/plan_sep.pdf
21. Secretaría de Educación Pública (SEP) (2006), Subsecretaría de Educación Superior. *La mejora de la calidad de las universidades públicas en el periodo 2001-2006. La formulación, desarrollo y actualización de los Programas Integrales de Fortalecimiento Institucional: un primer recuento de sus impactos*. México. Available in <http://www.ses.sep.gob.mx>
22. Programa Sectorial de Educación 2007-2012. México: SEP. 2007. Available in <http://www.ses.sep.gob.mx>
23. Secretaria de Educación Pública (SEP) (2015). Reglas de operación del Programa de Fortalecimiento de la Calidad en Instituciones Educativas (PROFOCIE). Available in http://pifi.sep.gob.mx/profocie/reglas/2015/ro_profocie_2015.pdf
24. Hernández, S. R.; Fernández, C. C. y Baptista, L. P. S (2010). *Metodología de la Investigación*. McGrawHill: México.
25. Secretaría de Educación Pública (SEP, 2006), Programa de Mejoramiento del Profesorado (PROMEP). Un primer análisis de su operación e impactos en el proceso de fortalecimiento académico de las universidades públicas. México. Available in <http://ses.sep.gob.mx/pe/promep/PROMEpanalisis1.pdf>