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

As in the previous semesters, in the second semester of the 2023/2024 academic year the University of Miskolc provided students with the opportunity to evaluate their instructors' courses according to various criteria, based on the faculties' sampling plans.

In order to increase the willingness to respond, a Neptun message with the intent to inform the students was sent out before the start of the data collection period.

The data collection took place between 7 July 2024 and 3 September 2024, and the survey resulted in high response rates in several cases. A total of 1,033 course evaluation surveys were launched using the Evasys system, with a total of 6,358 responses, ensuring anonymity. The following table summarises the number of courses launched, the number of unanswered surveys and the average response rates for the faculties and institutions. At institutional level, a response rate of over 20% was achieved.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Faculty** | **Number of course evaluation surveys launched (pcs)** | **Number of unanswered surveys (pcs)** | **Average response rate (%)** |
| **Faculty of Law** | 89 | 2 | 17% |
| **Faculty of Materials and Chemical Engineering** | 74 | 0 | 34% |
| **Bartók Béla Faculty of Music** | 4 | 0 | 29% |
| **Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences** | 176 | 19 | 26% |
| **Faculty of Health Sciences** | 112 | 10 | 32% |
| **Faculty of Economics** | 146 | 8 | 25% |
| **Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Informatics** | 126 | 4 | 25% |
| **Faculty of Earth and Environmental Sciences and Engineering** | 306 | 96 | 37% |
| *Total* | *1033* | *129* | *28%* |

*Table 1: Summary data from course evaluation surveys*

***The remaining tasks are to reduce and eliminate the number of unanswered surveys and to increase student activity and the willingness to respond. We have found that the majority of students are still uninterested in completing surveys, but those who do complete one survey 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 group, which were due to the fact that the setting of course data is also not yet uniform across institutions.***

The Teacher Work Student Feedback (OMHV) survey was divided into 5 question blocks. In the first block we asked students about general questions, in the second we asked questions about the courses, in the third they were asked about the instructors, in the fourth we asked questions about the examination system, and lastly the fifth block contained questions about dual training.

Faculty willingness to respond relative to the sampling design is shown in Table 1. According to the summarised institutional report, the highest response rates were from students in Master's programmes (33.3%), further education (33.3%) and from correspondence courses (50.6%).

In the first question of the courses block, we asked what type of course the respondent had been taught by the instructor featured in the survey. This question was answered by 6,260 respondents, of which 70.1% were taught in lectures and 29.9% were taught in practical/seminar courses by the instructor. The students were then asked whether they had attended at least 50% of the lessons given by the instructor. 6276 students replied, of which 93.4% answered yes. Those who answered no were mainly unable to attend at least 50% of the classes due to work, health reasons or other reasons.

The number of hours needed to learn the subject was considered sufficient by 74.9%, insufficient by 21.5% and too many by 3.5%. ~74% of respondents working from home for the equivalent of a credit added the credit to the course.

The correspondence between the number of hours of the course and the amount of material and its mastery was rated on average 4.7 on a six-point scale, while the contribution of the practice to the mastery of the material was rated slightly better, 4.9.

In the case of the block of questions on teachers, the answers given on the different aspects show that respondents are generally satisfied with the teachers of the institution, with no question rated worse than 5 on a six-point scale. An average rating of 5.2 was given to the instructor's logical, clear and comprehensible communication, explanations and the provision of consultation during the semester outside contact hours. The highest rating within the group of questions was given to the question on lesson discipline with an average rating of 5.6.

Regarding the examination system, students were asked the question *"How fair and in line with the knowledge acquired was the examination?"* to which 6244 answers were received. 65.1% said that it was completely fair and in line with the examination, 4.2% said not at all.

The survey also included a block of questions on dual training, which showed that only 4.4% of respondents were involved in that form 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. 54.7% of the respondents answered that they had been able to make full use of the practical skills acquired in the company, while 4.9% had not been able to make any use 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 234 students in dual training. 51.7% of the respondents were able to apply the knowledge acquired in their workplace, while 5.1% 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.