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**Unipoll system – pilot**

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 this semester, we also piloted course and instructor evaluation surveys in the Unipoll system with the help of the Neptun team.

During the pilot implementation of the Unipoll system, we launched 27 course evaluation requests in the system. The faculty distribution of these were: 4 from faculties of Law, 3 from faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences, 15 from faculties of Mechanical Engineering and Informatics, 4 from faculties of Economics and 1 from faculty of Materials and Chemical Engineering (The other faculties did not participate in the pilot survey due to the later sending of the sampling plan. For all faculties, most of the Teacher Work Student Feedback (OMHV) surveys were launched and data collected in the Evasys system, which was evaluated separately.) Data collection took place between 27 June 2024 and 25 July 2024, and the survey showed a high response rate in several cases. A total of 811 requests for completion and survey responses were received in the Unipoll system, of which 554 were returned partially completed and 436 fully completed. These surveys, broken down by number of items, are shown in the graph below.

**Completed / Partially Completed / Incomplete surveys per faculty**

Using the data from the previous graph, we have aggregated the summary data on willingness to respond by comparing the surveys sent out and those that were not completed in the following table.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Faculty | Number of surveys launched (pcs) | Number of unanswered surveys (pcs) | Willingness to reply in average (%) |
| Faculty of Law | 58 | 6 | 44.82% |
| Faculty of Materials and Chemical Engineering | 13 | 1 | 53.84% |
| Faculty of Humanities nad Social Sciences | 54 | 9 | 42.59% |
| Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Informatics | 401 | 88 | 77.05% |
| Faculty of Economics | 285 | 13 | 24.91% |
| *Total* | *811* | *436* | *53.76%* |

In terms of results, it can be said that a response rate of over 20% was achieved at both institutional and faculty level. In addition, the average number of course completions per faculty was 87 and the standard deviation per faculty was 113.

In the first question block, which was in connection to the courses, we asked what type of course the respondent had been taught by the instructor featured in the survey. This question was answered by 508 respondents, of which 79.13% were taught in lectures, 9.44% in practicals and 11.41% in seminars. Students were then asked whether they had attended at least 50% of the classes taught by the instructor. 466 students responded, 95.27% of whom answered yes. Those who answered no were mainly unable to attend at least 50% of the classes due to class conflicts, other reasons or work. The number of hours needed to learn the subject was considered sufficient by 75.38%, insufficient by 22.65% and too many by 1.96%. 68.70% 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 4.63 on a six-point scale, while the contribution of the practice to the mastery of the material was rated slightly better, 4.74. In a block of questions on the instructor, the responses to the different aspects of the survey generally indicate that respondents are satisfied with the instructors at the institutions, with an average score of 5.15 for the different questions on the six-point scale. The highest rating within the set of questions was given to the question on the instructor's teaching (communication, logic, comprehensibility, followability) with an average score of 5.47.

Regarding the examination system, students were asked the question *"How fair and in line with the knowledge provided was the examination?*" to which 497 answers were received. 63.38% said it was completely fair and consistent, 4.62% said not at all. The survey also included a block of questions on dual training, which showed that only 10.56% of respondents were involved in that form of training. In response to the question *"To what extent have you been able to use the practical skills acquired in the company during your training/course?"* 48 respondents replied: 12.5% of the respondents answered that they had been able to make full use of the practical skills acquired in the company, while 10.41% had not been able to make any use of them at all. The question *"To what extent were you able to apply the knowledge acquired in the course to your work in the company?"* was answered by 47 students in dual training. 12.76% of the respondents were able to apply the knowledge acquired in their company to a full extent and 10.63% 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 conclusions can be drawn from their aggregation at institutional level.

Experience from the pilot survey:

- The launch of surveys is much faster, however:

- If a change is needed in the survey or questionnaire, the survey must be stopped and data can only be collected again after the amendments, which is then treated as a separate survey by the system.

- Automatic scheduled messaging, survey reminders cannot be sent.

- The number of surveys started, but not completed or unanswered is high.

- The evaluation is based on an excel file.

This analysis was made by Bence Máté Csabai, amended and approved by Éva Ligetvári.