

UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED

**POLICY ON STUDENT EVALUATION
OF TEACHING**

**Szeged
30 January 2023**

S-IV/2022/2023.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 1 Objective

(1) The Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (hereinafter referred to as "Policy") regulates the process of student evaluation of teaching (hereinafter referred to as "SET") at the University of Szeged (hereinafter referred to as "University") in order to maintain and increase the quality of education and to ensure quality assurance. The Policy regulates the process of collecting, evaluating and using SET results for the purpose of educational quality development, in full compliance with the standards and guidelines of quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015).

(2) The purpose of SET is to ensure that the interpreted results, their communication, and the developments formulated and implemented as a result contribute to the operation of a coherent, institution-wide quality assurance system, to the achievement of strategic and educational objectives, and thus to the maintenance of quality teaching and student-centered learning, teaching and assessment. It is of primary importance that student feedback contributes to the quality development of the educational institution's work and directly supports the development of the teaching activities of the educators.

Section 2 Scope

(1) SET involves each educator in the teaching staff (full-time and invited lecturers and all educators performing any teaching activities), hereinafter collectively referred to as "evaluatees". SET shall cover all educators of courses available to students who have a student status at the University. With regard to teaching units outside the faculties and elective courses offered independently from the University, the tasks assigned to the faculties within the scope of this Policy shall be carried out by the Directorate for Academic Affairs, and the tasks assigned to the dean shall be carried out by the Director of Academic Affairs.

(2) SET includes the evaluation of the content and methodology of the work of the evaluatees, as well as the evaluation of their attitude towards the students.

(3) The students who have taken the given subject in the given semester are entitled to evaluate the evaluatees, in accordance with the rules of the faculty that has announced the teaching assignment, in such a way that only the evaluatee who actually teaches the subject can be evaluated. For each subject, an additional condition is that only those students are entitled to evaluate who are reasonably expected to meet the requirements of the given subject (in particular, but not limited to, concerning the required number of classes attended). The method and conditions of such evaluation shall be detailed in the faculty regulations, taking into account the specificities of the faculty, on the basis of this Policy.

(4) Each faculty will decide in their faculty regulations whether or not to include doctoral students, as well as courses related to internship, consulting hours and thesis seminars in the evaluation.

(5) Derogations from the provisions of paragraph (3) may be granted, in special circumstances, by the Vice-Rector for Education for a period of 4 semesters, subject to the approval, in whole or in part, of a reasoned proposal from the faculty.

Section 3 Organizing and supervising SET surveys

(1) As an integral part of university-level quality assurance and quality development, the University and the individual faculties are obliged to organize SET surveys. The dean, in cooperation with the Students' Union of the given faculty, is obliged to introduce, communicate and disseminate transparent regulations of the given faculty on SET as well as to organize, perform, manage, and monitor SET surveys, and as a result, process the results and develop an action plan on the basis of these results.

(2) SET is a subjective right arising from the student's status as a student, which the student may exercise within the framework of this Policy and the faculty regulations. Students cannot be subjected to negative discrimination or disadvantage for expressing an opinion or choosing not to express an opinion in a SET survey by the educators, the institute/department of the faculty, or the organizational units of the faculty. The faculty shall ensure that the student is clearly informed of the above. If a student or a student group suffers any disadvantage or discrimination for expressing an opinion or choosing not to express an opinion in a SET survey, the student or student group may lodge a complaint with the dean of the faculty and the relevant student appeal procedure shall apply.

(3) SET surveys are carried out at the level of the faculties. SET must be carried out at least once a semester, between the 11th and 14th weeks of each semester. The specific period of the evaluation is determined and published by the vice-dean for educational affairs of each faculty in the 9th week of the semester, and its length may not be shorter than 14 consecutive calendar days and may not be longer than 21 calendar days.

(4) The Vice-Rector for Education may authorize a derogation from the provisions of paragraph (3) for a period of 4 semesters, subject to the approval, in whole or in part, of a reasoned proposal from the faculty in question.

(5) The aim of SET is quality assurance; and the Directorate of Education, under the professional guidance of the Vice-Rector for Education, in cooperation with the University's Students' Union, is responsible for the professional supervision of SET. The Directorate of Strategic Management, under the professional guidance of the Vice-Rector for Education, is responsible for the strategic supervision of SET.

Section 4 Developing the rules in detail

- (1) The faculties are obliged to lay down the detailed rules and procedures for SET in the faculty regulations, by taking into account this Policy and the local specificities. This Policy forms an integral part of the faculty regulations, and it is the responsibility of the faculty to publish this Policy at the same time as the faculty regulations, in the same way and on the same platform.
- (2) The faculty regulations must be submitted by each faculty to the Vice-Rector for Education of the University for approval within 60 days of the entry into force of this Policy.
- (3) In the development of SET, in whole or in part, quantitative indicators should be used.

Section 5 General rules of SET

- (4) Every semester, the work of the educators teaching the courses in the given semester must be evaluated.
- (5) If an educator teaches several courses, the educator's work must be evaluated separately for each course; in the case of subjects lasting several semesters, the evaluation must be carried out at the end of the given semester or academic year, as specified in the faculty regulations. If a course is taught by more than one educator, the work of each educator teaching the course must be evaluated separately. SET surveys must therefore be identifiable: they have to indicate exactly which subject or course taught by which educator they refer to. If this is not guaranteed and provided for by the faculty, the evaluation may be cancelled at the educator's request.
- (6) Only the students who have been taught by the educator in the given semester shall be entitled to comment on the teaching work of the educator, as detailed in paragraph (3) of Section 2.
- (7) SET surveys are carried out electronically within the Neptun System.
- (8) The faculty administration and the Students' Union of the faculty shall ensure that students are familiar with the possibility, procedure and purpose of SET and are motivated to complete it. When providing this information, it should be emphasized that the responses students provide in the survey are processed anonymously and that logging in and completing the survey form in Neptun are necessary only for the purposes of IT validation. The evaluatees of the SET surveys are informed about those results which have relevance to them, and they may comment on the responses concerning themselves, as provided for in the faculty regulations, but, by means of

administrative and IT tools it must be expressly ensured that the identity of the student expressing the opinion is not revealed in the process. If only one student is registered in the system for the course in question, the student must be made aware that his/her evaluation is not anonymous for the above reason. The faculties may use specific individual methods to ensure anonymous recording of student evaluations, the process of which must be laid down in their faculty regulations.

(9) SET is composed of two parts: a set of questions defined by the University, centrally, for each faculty, and a questionnaire specific to the faculty, which may have been used in the past.

(10) The first part of SET surveys examines the students' attendance habits, and the subsequent questions enquire what students think about the educator's preparedness, attitude, classroom behavior and activities as well as about the course. The set of questions defined by the University is reviewed by the University before the current evaluation period. This central set of questions is attached as *Annex 1* to this Policy.

(11) In designing the faculty-specific questions and measurement criteria for the assessment, the faculties shall bear in mind the objectives of this Policy, the University's educational guidelines and shall aim for efficiency and rationality in determining the number of questions. Each faculty reviews the set of faculty-specific questions in light of the questions defined centrally by the University prior to the current evaluation period.

(12) Concurrently with the faculty's SET survey, the Directorate of Education conducts a survey focusing on central education data, in line with the objectives of this Policy. Central education data are those pieces of information that can be identified for a given educator, per course, retrieved from Neptun. These data typically involve the number of teaching hours, the distribution of grades, the publication of the topics to be covered in the course and course descriptions prepared on the basis of the Learning Outcomes approach. The Directorate of Education makes the retrieved data available to the faculties and, in order to ensure and maintain the quality of education, the Directorate of Education proposes action plans to the heads of faculties in relation to those educators and courses in case of which the Learning Outcomes approach and student-centered teaching and assessment are not fully implemented.

Section 6 Evaluation of SET

(1) The evaluation of the data, as well as the data entry, are carried out within the Neptun system, and the detailed procedures and methods of the evaluation of SET are defined and coordinated by the regulations of the individual faculties.

(2) The results of the evaluation of SET shall be documented in a report. The report shall indicate the name of the evaluatee; his/her academic status; the title of his/her lecture/seminar/practice course and, if relevant, the number of the group in question, the number of students who registered for the given lecture/seminar/practice course in Neptun in the given semester; the number and percentage of students who completed the survey; the method of evaluating the responses in the survey; and the summarizing, quantitative result of the survey. *Annex 3* to this Policy serves as a template for documenting the above.

(3) The report shall be drawn up by the dean's office of the given faculty or by the coordinator who is assigned by the dean and is responsible for the quality assurance of the faculty and for conducting SET surveys. The report shall be drawn up by the date specified in the faculty's regulations, but no later than 31 days after the end of the period during which the SET survey can be completed by the respondents.

(4) Keeping in mind the ESG guideline and the University's policy on educational development as set out in its Institutional Development Plan, the lowest scoring educators (hereinafter referred to as "educators provided with an out-of-schedule educational support opportunity") on the basis of the results of the SET report (as per the average of the educator's evaluable ratings) and after discussing the results of the SET report, are encouraged to participate in the further development of general or subject-specific teaching methodology skills, with a focus on the course(s) evaluated. In addition to the available national and international subject-specific events, training in teaching methodology are provided by the Directorate of Education to educators provided with an out-of-schedule educational support opportunity. It is the responsibility of the dean to encourage educators, in particular those provided with an out-of-schedule educational support opportunity, to undertake further training in teaching methodology in order to ensure and improve the quality of teaching.

(5) It is up to the individual faculties to draw conclusions from the findings of the SET surveys. Following the evaluation, simultaneously with preparing the report, the faculties draw up an action plan for the improvement of teaching. The *action plan* together with *a summary of the results* and the *SET report* shall be sent to the organizational units responsible for the professional and strategic supervision of SET surveys and to the Vice-Rector for Education within eight days of the report being drawn up, so that the feedback can help to guide the University in the necessary steps to be taken in the area of student-centered learning, teaching and assessment. The above-mentioned documentation (*action plan, summary of the results, SET report*) generated by the SET survey in the given semester is sent, unless otherwise instructed by the Vice-Rector for Education, in the form and with the content deemed relevant by the faculty, through a dedicated Coospace platform, which is accessible by the faculty as well.

(6) After processing of the documentation submitted by the faculties, the Directorate of Education provides information on the aggregated results and statistics to the faculties and the University's Student's Union at the board meeting of the Education Committee.

Section 7 Retention and protection of documents, databases and information generated in the course of SET surveys

(1) The assigned dean of the faculty is responsible for the management and safekeeping of documents, databases and electronic files containing aggregated data generated in the course of and as a result of SET surveys (hereinafter referred to as “data”).

(2) Participants involved in the processing of SET results shall not disclose the data they have obtained or the electronically stored data to unauthorized parties and may only use them in the context of discussions initiated by the Directorate of Education or the faculty management for the purpose of educational development. If the parties involved in the processing wish to hold a discussion on the received data in a forum closely related to the teaching work, the educator or the subject, the person involved in the processing who is in possession of the data may, if the faculty management deems it appropriate, present the data in addition to presenting the case. In such cases, the evaluatee concerned shall be informed and shall be invited and given the opportunity to comment on the substance of the matter. The dean’s office of the faculty and those responsible for the process shall ensure the protection of data stored by computerized means.

(3) The evaluatees shall be given the opportunity to see all the student responses (evaluations) that apply to them. The evaluatees (educators) shall have the right to make comments and complaints to the head of the faculty about SET surveys and its conduct, the procedure and details of which are specified in the faculty regulations, together with the educators’ rights. When the results of SET are communicated, the dean expressly draws the educators’ attention to the possibility of providing written comments to the results of SET.

(4) The educators’ written comments must be kept together with their SET results, so that the educators’ comments shall form an integral part of the reports, but these shall be forwarded to the supervisory units if the educator in question is in the bottom 10% of the evaluation.

(5) The data generated during the SET survey must be handled, processed and stored in such a way that the personal rights of the evaluatees are not violated. If the educator concerned expressly consents to the disclosure of the results concerning him/her, the results concerning him/her may also be disclosed to other persons (other educators, staff, and students of the faculty, subject to the faculty regulations).

(6) Access to the data generated during the SET surveys is only possible with the consent of the educator (evaluatee) who has been evaluated, or if the person wishing to access the documents/data is a member of the professional or strategic unit supervising the evaluation process and their access to the data is essential for the quality assurance processes. Data are also available to the head and administrative staff of the training

provided by the Directorate of Education in order to develop an effective and even personalized methodology for educational development. The dean of the faculty, the vice-dean for educational affairs of the faculty, the head of the institute/department that has registered the course concerned, the faculty coordinator responsible for the conduct of SET, and the Vice-Rector for Education of the University are entitled to have access to the data generated during the evaluation.

(7) The faculty will report on each SET to the faculty's Students' Union, as specified in the faculty's regulations. The Chairman of the Students' Union shall have the opportunity to inspect the report. Further elements of publicity may be specified in the faculty regulations.

(8) Data generated during SET surveys shall be kept for at least 5 years. The dean's offices of the faculties and, in the case of documentation relating to teaching units outside the faculty, the Directorate of Education shall ensure safe storage of such data. The faculty concerned / the Directorate of Education must provide the evaluatee concerned with access to his/her own SET results until the end of the 5th year after the data was collected.

Section 8 Use of the responses

(1) At the end of the SET survey period, the head of the faculty invites the heads of the units to convene an institute/departmental SET meeting to evaluate and summarize the student feedback on the courses they coordinate, in order to outline the directions for potentially necessary course development. If the unit has a course development objective for which methodological guidance is required, they may make their needs known to the Directorate of Education through the head of faculty.

(2) Regular student feedback concerning the educators (provided in SET) may be taken into account by the employer when making decisions on personnel matters in relation to the educators (e.g., appointment, promotion, distinction, reward, etc.).

(3) If the majority of the students have negative feedback on the work of the educator in three semesters, as defined in the faculty regulations, the head of the faculty should initiate an investigation to clarify the situation, inviting the educator to submit a written opinion. The results of the investigation procedure regulated at faculty-level should be communicated to the educator concerned (the evaluatee), the faculty's Students' Union and the supervisory units of the SET survey. In the above procedure, the head of the faculty should seek to resolve the situation with a view to improving education (e.g., requesting additional, specific, individual training in teaching methodology, recommending additional training, prescribing a developmental session, etc.) rather than imposing sanctions.

(4) The work of the evaluatee(s) who have achieved outstanding results during the semester may be recognized by the head of the faculty in the manner specified in the faculty regulations. The faculties are free to recognize the most outstanding educators of various fields. The educators who have achieved outstanding results during the semester and the related awards may be indicated by the faculties in the reports in accordance with the provisions of the faculty regulations.

(5) The findings of SET reports may be used only and exclusively for the purposes of ensuring and developing the quality of teaching and the University's student-centered learning, teaching and assessment in compliance with the ESG guideline.

(6) The method and the detailed rules of using students' opinion about the evaluatees are set out in the faculty regulations.

TRANSITIONAL AND FINAL PROVISIONS

Section 9

(1) This Policy has been prepared on the basis of Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education, the Organizational and Operational Regulations of the University of Szeged, Act CXII of 2011 on the right to informational self-determination and on the freedom of information, and the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015), taking into account the above.

(2) The faculty regulations containing the detailed rules for SET surveys form an integral part of this Policy. For any faculty-specific areas not covered by this Policy, the faculties may make provisions in their own faculty regulations. In the case of doctoral studies, the faculty may dispense with the list of questions in the Annex.

(3) The faculties shall, within 90 days of its entry into force, regulate the substance of all matters which the present Policy refers to the competence of the faculty [Section 2 (3), (4); Section 3 (1), (3); Section 4 (1); Section 5 (8); Section 6 (1), (2), (3), (5); Section 7 (3), (5), (7); Section 8 (2), (3), (4), (6); and Section 9 (2), (3)].

(4) This Policy contains 3 Annexes:

Annex 1: Central set of questions for the SET survey

Annex 2: Measurement criteria for the SET survey

Annex 3: Report on SET survey

(5) This Policy shall enter into force on 1st February 2023. This policy is available on a permanent basis at the following link: <http://www.u-szeged.hu/szabalyzatok>

(6) The present Policy was adopted by the Senate in its Resolution No. SZ-91-IV/2022/2023 (I.30.) on 30th January 2023, and at the same time the Regulations for the Student Evaluation of Educators adopted by the University Council in its Resolution No. 219/2004 dated 25th October 2004 shall be repealed with the entry into force of this Policy.

Szeged, 30th January 2023

Prof. Dr. László Rovó
Rector

*Annex 1***Central set of questions for the SET survey**

Attendance habits	<p>What proportion of the classes did you attend?</p> <p>1: Never missed a class 2: Missed 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 one or two classes 6: I have not attended a single class</p>
Course	<p>In your opinion, to what extent did the course develop the skills and knowledge described in the course description?</p> <p>1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge</p> <p>To what extent do the available supplementary materials (e.g., books, videos, ppts, etc.) support the learning for the course?</p> <p>1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge</p>
Educator's preparedness	<p>How prepared was the educator?</p> <p>1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge</p>
Educator's attitude	<p>How helpful was the educator during the course?</p> <p>1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge</p>
Educator's classroom activities	<p>To what extent was the educator easy to follow?</p> <p>1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge</p>
General	<p>Overall, how satisfied are you with the educator's teaching work?</p> <p>1: not at all, 2, 3, 4, 5: absolutely 0: I cannot judge</p>

Annex 2

Measurement criteria for the SET survey

What do we measure in terms of teaching performance?
<input type="checkbox"/> Quality of teaching
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Fulfilment of the educator's obligations</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ How many classes were held?○ How many classes were cancelled?○ Did the classes start on time?○ Did the educator hold the class till the scheduled time?○
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>The educator's teaching performance</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Is the educator a good performer?○ Is the educator prepared?○ Is the educator's speech clear and easy to follow?○ To what extent has the educator shown themselves to be prepared on the subject?○
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Impact on the student (atmosphere, human attitude)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ How fair was the class felt by the students?○ To what extent did the educator try to involve the students?○ Would you recommend the educator to other students?○

Annex 3

Report on SET survey
 at the Faculty of
 Academic Year....., semester

	Faculty	Dept. / Institute	Course title, group number	Course type	Educator name	Educator position	Educator Neptun code	No. of students admitted / No. of students completing SET	Educator's evaluation score	Other comments
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										

Szeged,