University of Miskolc
Quality Assurance Centre

Review of Teacher Work Student Feedback of the first semester of the 2023-2024 academic year.

As in the previous semesters, in the first semester of the 2023/2024 academic year the University of Miskolc provided an opportunity for its students to give feedback about their teachers and courses (based on the sampling plan of faculties) according to several criteria.

In order to increase the willingness to respond, a Neptun message was sent out to lecturers and students before the start of the data collection period, asking for their cooperation in informing students, while also announcing a lottery among the students, in which we drew sweatshirts with the logo of the University of Miskolc. In addition, MEN passes were also drawn, one per faculty, offered by the ME-Student Council.

This semester, both the questionnaire and the policy related to it have been revised and amended. The collection of the data took place between 4 March 2024 and 10 April 2024 using surveys, resulting in a high response rate in several cases. A total of 754 course evaluation surveys were launched using the Evasys system, with a total of 6419 responses, ensuring anonymity. The table below summarises the number of courses launched, the number of unanswered questions, and the average response rates for faculty and institutions. At institutional level, a response rate of over 20% was achieved.

Faculty	Course evaluation survey launched number (pcs)	Unanswered questionnaires number (pcs)	Willingness to reply average in %
Faculty of Law	91	3	19%
Faculty of Materials and Chemical Engineering	62	22	20%
Bartók Béla Faculty of Music	12	0	34%
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences	117	25	22%
Faculty of Health Sciences	68	1	32%
Faculty of Economics	156	13	30%
Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Informatics	153	2	18%
Faculty of Earth and Environmental Sciences and Engineering	95	21	14%
Total	754	87	24%

The remaining tasks are to reduce and eliminate the number of unanswered questionnaire, and to increase student activity and willingness to respond. We have found that the majority of students are still uninterested in completing questionnaires, but those who do complete one questionnaire are more likely to complete further ones, although we must be careful not to set too high expectations. In addition, there were discrepancies in the faculty sampling plans and the screenings received from the Neptune team, which were due to the fact that the setting of course data is also not yet uniform across institutions.

The new Teacher Work Student Feedback (OMHV) questionnaire is divided into 5 question blocks. In the first block we asked students about general questions, in the second we asked questions about the course, in the third they were asked questions about the instructor, in the fourth we asked questions about the examination system, and the fifth contained questions about dual training.

Faculty willingness to respond relative to the sampling design is shown in Table 1. We encountered a problem in the data collection for the faculty and department choice questions, which we were able to overcome in the process, but made completion difficult and prevented submission. This mainly affected students of humanities and law. According to the Institutional Summary Report, the majority of completions were from undergraduate (62.3%) and full-time (62.2%) students.

In the first question of the course question block, we asked what type of course the respondent had been taught by the instructor in the survey. This question was answered by 6305 respondents, of which 70.8% were taught in lectures and 29.2% in practical/seminar courses. The students were then asked whether they had attended at least 50% of the lessons given by the lecturer. A total of 6315 students replied, of which 94% answered yes. Those who answered no were mainly unable to attend at least 50% of the classes due to work, family or other reasons. The number of hours needed to learn the subject was considered sufficient by 74.9%, insufficient by 20.8% and too many by 4.3% of the respondents. ~70% of respondents working from home for the equivalent of a credit added the credit to the course.

The consistency between the number of hours of the course and the amount and mastery of the material was rated on average 4.6 on a six-point scale, while the contribution of the practice to the mastery of the material was rated slightly better at 4.8.

In the case of the block of questions on the lecturers, the answers given for the different aspects show, that in general, the respondents are satisfied with the instructors of the institution, with no question being rated worse than 5 on a six-point scale. The highest rating within the group of questions was given to the question on lesson discipline with an average rating of 5.7. Regarding the examination system, students were asked the question *"How fair and in line with the knowledge acquired was the examination?"* to which 6297 answers were received. 61.3% said that it was completely fair and in line with the examination, 5.5% said not at all.

The questionnaire also included a block of questions on dual training, which showed that only 4.4% of respondents were involved in that type of training. In response to the question *"5.1 To what extent were you able to use the practical skills acquired in the company during your training/course?"* 245 respondents replied. 47.3% of the respondents answered that they had

been able to make full use of the practical skills acquired in the company and 7.3% that they had not been able to make any use of them at all. The question *"5.2 To what extent were you able to apply the knowledge acquired in the course to your work in the company?"* was answered by 239 students in dual training. 47.7% of the respondents were able to apply the knowledge acquired in their workplace, while 6.3% were not able to apply it at all.

The processing of the text responses received is part of the faculty and instructor evaluations, and no relevant findings can be drawn from their institutional aggregation.

The evaluation was prepared by Barbara Hancsák-Vass and Éva Ligetvári