

Regulations on Student Evaluation of Teaching Work at the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, University of Szeged

Preamble

The Faculty of Economics and Business Administration at the University of Szeged (referred to as SZTE GTK hereafter) is committed to quality education and continuous improvement. The Faculty Council of the SZTE GTK adopted a quality improvement policy during its meeting on September 29, 2022. According to this policy, the Faculty aims to provide high-quality education that meets the expectations of the domestic and international labour market, graduating professionals with the necessary professional competencies who conduct their activities ethically. The School of Economics and Business at the University of Szeged is dedicated to improving educational programs, the educational environment, educational technology, applied pedagogical methods, the preparedness of instructors, and obtaining feedback from partners and qualified students. To achieve these goals, the SZTE GTK operates a quality improvement system, which includes the Student Evaluation of Teaching Work (referred to as SETW or OMHV hereafter).

The basis for OMHV regulations at the SZTE GTK is the “Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching Work at the University of Szeged,” adopted by the Senate of the University of Szeged on January 30, 2023 (hereafter referred to as *the University Regulations*). According to Article 9 (3) of the University Regulations, the Faculty is obliged to substantially regulate all matters within its jurisdiction according to university standards. The University of Szeged’s School of Economics and Business outlines the faculty-level process and framework for student evaluation of teaching work in the Faculty Regulations.

Chapter I: GENERAL PROVISIONS

1 § Purpose of Evaluations

The purpose of the student evaluation of teaching performance is to:

- Enable students to regularly express their opinions regarding courses and teaching activities, and to provide instructors with feedback on their teaching practices.
- Collect and analyse information in alignment with the quality improvement efforts of the SZTE GTK to advance the quality of education, increase the efficiency of education at SZTE GTK, and identify areas for improvement related to teaching.

2 § Scope of Evaluation

(1) Evaluation covers all instructors of courses announced by SZTE GTK or any of its organizational units, with the following exceptions:

- a) courses announced without lectures (exam courses);
- b) courses related to thesis consultations;
- c) thesis seminars;
- d) internships;
- e) courses that have not started;
- f) language courses with X code;
- g) courses completed abroad;
- h) Coursera courses; and
- i) courses where the academic system lists the instructor as a “Technical Assistant.”

(2) SZTE GTK students are entitled to participate in the student evaluation of teaching work for each course and its instructors every semester, provided they are registered in the academic system for the course on the first day of the evaluation period.

(3) SZTE GTK allows students to evaluate teaching work in all its programs as specified in this faculty regulation.

3 § Organization of Evaluation

(1) The organization and execution of the student evaluation of teaching work, except at the doctoral level, are coordinated by the Deputy Dean for Education of SZTE GTK. The monitoring of the OMHV process and the exercise of supervisory rights are carried out by the Dean of SZTE GTK in collaboration with the Faculty's Students' Self-Government.

(2) In the case of doctoral education, the organization and execution of student evaluation of teaching work are the responsibility of the Doctoral School of Economics.

(3) Student evaluation of teaching work is an individual right arising from one's student status, which students can exercise within the framework of this regulation. Participation in the evaluation process is voluntary, and students shall not suffer any disadvantage for expressing their opinions or for not doing so.

(4) The administration, storage, and processing of responses shall be carried out in such a way that the identity of the evaluator is not traceable.

4 § General Rules for Evaluation

(1) The Student Evaluation of Teaching Work (SETW) questionnaire consists of two parts: one with common, university-defined questions included in the "Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching Work at the University of Szeged" (Appendix 1), and a school-specific section. The questions cover the evaluation of the content and methodology of instructors' teaching activities and the assessment of their attitudes toward students. The Dean of SZTE GTK, in consultation with the Faculty's Students' Self-Government and the Faculty Quality Assurance Committee, ensures the development of a professionally substantiated school-specific questionnaire. The following criteria must be met when designing a school-specific questionnaire:

- Partially or entirely scale-based questions should be used.
- Separate questionnaires should be implemented for courses recorded in the academic system as practice or seminars, as well as for courses recorded as lectures.
- The language of the questionnaire should be the language of the student's educational program (Hungarian or English).

Appendix 1 of these School's regulations includes the school-specific questionnaire. The school-specific questionnaire is approved by the Faculty Council along with this regulation. The Dean, in consultation with the Faculty Quality Assurance Committee and the Faculty/Student Self-Government, reviews the school-specific questionnaire at the end of each academic year. If there are proposed changes during the review, the Dean submits them to the Faculty Council at least two months before the next evaluation period. If there is no submission, the questionnaire from the previous period will be used in the upcoming evaluation period.

(2) The evaluation period takes place every semester from the first day of the 12th week of the semester until the last day of the 14th week of the semester. The Deputy Dean for Education

publishes the exact evaluation period for student evaluation of teaching work in the School calendar at the beginning of each semester.

(3) The Deputy Dean for Education and the Faculty's Students' Self-Government ensure that both Hungarian and international students are informed about the possibility and procedure of evaluation, as well as the timing of the evaluation period for each semester.

(4) Student evaluation of teaching work is conducted electronically through the academic system, with using the questionnaire accepted according to in 4 § (1). Each student can complete the questionnaire for a specific course only once.

(5) If an instructor teaches multiple courses, the evaluation of the instructor's work should be conducted separately for each course. If multiple instructors teach a single course, the evaluation of each instructor's work should be conducted separately.

(6) If only one student is eligible to evaluate an instructor's work, the student should be informed before filling out the questionnaire that their opinion will not be anonymous.

5 § Evaluation of Opinions, Data Processing, and Documentation of Results

(1) Evaluation for a specific course, instructor, or question is considered valid if at least 20 percent of eligible students, but a minimum of 3 students, have provided their responses (validity threshold). Invalid evaluations should not be considered or processed.

(2) Data summarization and processing will also occur electronically.

(3) The evaluation of instructors for each course is displayed on an evaluation form in the academic system. The evaluation form must include information about the fulfilment of the validity threshold, the distribution of answers to individual questions, the average for scale-based questions, and textual comments, regardless of how many classes the evaluating student attended.

(4) The evaluation data forms are prepared by the University of Szeged's Directorate of Education within two weeks after the evaluation period. The Directorate of Education informs the relevant instructor of the completion of the evaluation form via electronic mail sent to the registered address in the academic system.

(5) Within two weeks following the evaluation period, the Directorate of Education provides the School's Deputy Dean for Education with tables. These tables must include at least the following information:

- a) the name, position, and code used in the academic system of the instructor;
- b) the title of the course;
- c) the number of students enrolled in the academic system for the course during the given semester;
- d) the number and percentage of students who participated in the evaluation; and
- e) the results of student evaluations.

Invalid evaluations must be removed from these tables and should not be retained.

(6) According to the Annex 3 I/A of the Law of National Higher Education (hereafter NFTV), the results of OMHV are considered public data for students and those in an employment relationship with higher education institutions. In this context, faculty (teacher)-specific tables containing quantitative (closed questions) results are made public on Coospace within 90 days following the end of the evaluation period by the Deputy Dean for Education. However,

instructors may request that OMHV results for them remain confidential, within one week from the publication of the evaluation forms.

(7) Valid evaluation results (both closed and open-ended questions) are accessible to the Dean of SZTE GTK, the Deputy Deans, the Chair of the Faculty Quality Assurance Committee, the President of the Faculty's Students' Self-Government, the head of the department/institute/program offering the course, and the responsible program coordinator. The head of the department/institute/program offering the course is entitled to individually discuss valid evaluation results with the respective instructors and set individual development goals if necessary.

(8) To prepare faculty-level analyses, the Dean may involve students and individuals in an employment relationship with higher education institutions.

(9) Instructors have the option to make the results of student evaluations for their courses public at their discretion.

(10) Instructors subject to evaluation must be provided with access to all student evaluations on the evaluation form, and they can provide written comments on them.

(11) Within 15 days after the preparation of the evaluation form, the evaluated instructor may submit written opinions (objections) regarding the evaluation and its results, which must be submitted to the Dean. The Deputy Dean for Education informs instructors about this opportunity at the same time as the availability of the results.

(12) For continuous quality assurance activities, the results of evaluations should be made accessible to the parties involved without time limitations. The specific parties involved are defined collectively by this regulation and other relevant university and legal regulations.

6 § Utilization of Opinions

(1) For two consecutive semesters, instructors with the best results based on student evaluations will be recognized by the Dean of SZTE GTK.

(2) If within two academic years, an instructor receives evaluations for a specific course in which the results of valid answers to 3 or more scale-based questions do not reach an average of 2.5 or higher, the Dean of SZTE GTK, in collaboration with the head of the organizational unit, will obligate the instructor to improve the course or enhance their pedagogical knowledge. The head of the organizational unit will inform the Dean in writing about the improvement plan within 4 weeks. If the improvement is not implemented or the average result for the same course falls below 2.5 again within one year, the Dean, in collaboration with the head of the organizational unit, will impose further obligations regarding course improvement and organization.

(3) Aggregated summaries at departmental, institute, and faculty levels are prepared from the closed questions on valid evaluation forms, including the distribution of answers for each closed question, and the average for scale-based questions. These summarized tables are public for students and individuals in an employment relationship with higher education institutions.

(4) Designated program coordinators, departments, institutes, organizational units, individual instructors, and faculty-level entities may set goals and make suggestions for the development of programs, courses, and teaching work at the individual, unit, and School levels, taking into account the results of student evaluations. Within 60 days after the OMHV evaluation period, departmental meetings can provide comments and suggestions regarding the OMHV results, the process, and the development of courses and teaching work. The heads of the organizational

units forward the summaries of these to the Deputy Dean for Education within the same 60-day period. The Deputy Dean for Education compiles the suggestions received from the organizational units and sends them to the organizations specified in Section 6 § (5) of the university regulation within 8 days after its completion.

(5) The Deputy Dean for Education shall report to the Faculty Council during the annual evaluation of teaching activities on the results and experiences of student evaluation of teaching work, including development suggestions and goals.

(6) If interventions are required based on responses to the questionnaire's questions related to equality and diversity (discrimination against a protected class), the head of the organizational unit and/or the Dean and/or the Deputy Deans must involve the Faculty's Committee for Equality and Diversity.

7 § Preservation and Protection of Documents, Databases, and Information Produced During the Evaluation

(1) The management and preservation of all documents (minutes) and databases (hereinafter: data) containing aggregated data related to student evaluations of teaching work are to be carried out by the Dean's Office of SZTE GTK.

(2) Instructors are entitled to make observations and lodge complaints with the Dean of SZTE GTK regarding the conduct/administration of student evaluations.

(3) Evaluation forms generated or collected during the evaluation process must be retained for five years.

Chapter II: Transitional and Final Provisions

(1) In the case of courses offered by other faculties for SZTE GTK, the questionnaire and regulations of the school making the offer shall apply.

(2) The provisions of this regulation shall come into effect on the date of the decision of the Faculty Council—October 6, 2023.

(3) The regulation and questionnaire for student evaluation of teaching work at SZTE GTK can be accessed at the following link: <http://eco.u-szeged.hu/karrol/szabalyzatok/szabalyzatok> The university's regulation for student evaluation of teaching work can be accessed at the following link: <http://www.u-szeged.hu/szabalyzatok>

Szeged, October 5, 2023.

Dr. Péter Kovács

Associate Professor, Dean

I. Annex - Questionnaire

Applicable: from autumn semester 2023/2024

English version of the text	
CENTRAL ISSUES	
What proportion of the lessons did you attend?	1: I have not missed a single one 2: I did not attend only one or two classes 3: I attended more than half of the classes 4: I attended less than half of the classes 5: I attended only one or two classes 6: I have not attended any of the class 7: It was entirely a Webuni course
In your opinion, to what extent did the course develop the skills and knowledge described in the course description?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
To what extent do the available support materials (e.g., book, video, ppt, etc.) support the learning of the course?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
How prepared was the instructor? If it was entirely a Webuni course, please skip this question.	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
How helpful was the instructor during the course?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
How understandable was the lesson, the way the instructor presented it? If it was entirely a Webuni course, please skip this question.	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
Overall, how satisfied are you with the instructor's work?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
ADDITIONAL FACULTY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE LECTURES	
In your opinion, how clear was the purpose of the course?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
In your opinion, how clear were the requirements for completing the course?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
Do you think that attending the lectures helped you to learn the material and to understand it in depth?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: fully 0: can't! not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: fully 0: I cannot judge
In your opinion, how much new knowledge did the course provide?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
How useful do you think the course was?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
In your opinion, how well structured is the course?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
How up-to-date do you think the course was?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
What did you find best about the course?	
What would you suggest to change/improve about the course?	
What other courses would you propose to introduce in the context of this course?	
Did you encounter any form of discrimination (negative discrimination) during the course? If yes, please explain!	Yes / No
To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the course? I felt free to express my opinion. The course provided a safe learning environment.	1= strongly disagree 5=strongly agree
ADDITIONAL FACULTY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SEMINARS	
In your opinion, how clear was the purpose of the course?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge

In your opinion, how clear were the requirements for completing the course?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
In your opinion, how interactive did the instructor make the course sessions?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: can't say
In your opinion, how much did the course assignments (classwork or homework) contribute to your understanding of the material?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
To what extent do you think you have received personalised feedback that has helped your development?	1: I did not get a full assessment 5: I got a full assessment; 0: I cannot judge
Do you think that participating in the seminars helped you to learn the material and to understand it in depth?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: fully 0: can't judge
In your opinion, how much new knowledge did the course provide?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
How useful do you think the course was?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
In your opinion, how well structured is the course?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
How up-to-date do you think the course was?	1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge
What would you suggest to change/improve about the course?	
What other course/subject area would you suggest to introduce in the context of the course?	
Did you encounter any form of discrimination (negative discrimination) during the course? If yes, please explain!	Yes / No
To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the course? I felt free to express my opinion. The course provided a safe learning environment.	1= strongly disagree 5=strongly agree