

Student Evaluation of Teaching Work – Report

First semester of the 2025/26 academic year

1. Survey Response Data

1.1. Number of completed surveys

As part of the Student Evaluation of Teaching Work (OMHV) survey, a total of **102,830** questionnaires were distributed across all faculties of the University of Miskolc during the first semester of the 2025/26 academic year. Of these, **1,080 lecturer evaluation forms** and **21,420 course evaluation forms** were completed and returned. In that semester, the OMHV was conducted using the **UniPoll** system. To increase student participation, completing the surveys was incentivized with a prize draw.

A total of **968 lecturers** received student feedback during the surveys. A total of **1,044 evaluations** were generated through the lecturer evaluation process. A total of **34,853 course-level evaluations** were completed as part of the course evaluation process. On average, each lecturer received **37 evaluations**; the lecturer who received the most evaluations had **562**, while at the other end of the scale – typically for small-group or one-on-one courses – there were **1–2 evaluations**.

1.2. Percentage of completed surveys by faculties

The evaluations covered all faculties of the institution. The table below shows the number of evaluations and the average scores for faculty lecturers, broken down by faculty, according to the faculty to which the evaluated faculty lecturers belong.

1. Table – Number of evaluations and average instructor rating by faculty

Faculty	Number of responses (pcs)	Lecturer average
Faculty of Mechanical Engineering	10 134	5,26
Faculty of Law	6 451	5,56
Faculty of Health Sciences	5 668	5,58
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences	4 537	5,70
Faculty of Economics	4 128	5,43
Faculty of Materials and Chemical Engineering	1 921	5,46
Faculty of Earth and Environmental Sciences and Engineering	1 690	5,61
Confucius Institute	868	5,50
Béla Bartók Faculty of Music	277	5,85

Total / Institutional average	35 897	5,49
--------------------------------------	---------------	-------------

The highest number of evaluations was received by **Faculty of Mechanical Engineering** (10,134), followed by **Faculty of Law** (6,451) and **Faculty of Health Sciences** (5,668). The highest faculty average was achieved by **Béla Bartók Faculty of Music** (5.85), followed by **Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences** (5.70) and **Faculty of Earth and Environmental Sciences and Engineering** (5.61). The institutional average is 5.49.

1.3. Breakdown of completed surveys by educational level and work schedule

Of the **21,797 individual respondents**, 63.1% are enrolled in a bachelor's program (BA/BSc), 11.1% in an undivided degree program, and 10.5% in a master's program (MA/MSc). The remaining 15.3% are distributed as follows: postgraduate specialist training course (3.3%), university education (2.4%), higher vocational education (1.1%), doctoral programs (1.0%), and college education (0.7%).

According to their study schedule, 47.2% of respondents are enrolled in a correspondence program, while 44.6% are enrolled in a full-time program. In addition, distance learning (0.5%) and evening classes (0.3%) are also represented among the respondents.

1.4. Class attendance

96.1% of respondents attended at least 50% of the classes taught by the lecturer being evaluated. This percentage is exceptionally high and contributes significantly to the reliability and relevance of the evaluations.

2. Analysis of Scores

2.1. Lecturer evaluations – average scores

Respondents rated the lecturers on a scale from **1 to 6**. The global index – calculated as the average of the five main teaching dimensions (Preparedness, Availability, Helpfulness, Communication, and Clarity of Lectures) – is 5.49 points at the institutional level, which can be considered an exceptionally good result.

2. Table – Institutional averages for faculty evaluation dimensions

Evaluation dimension	Average (1–6)
Instructor Evaluation – The 5 Dimensions of AVG	
Preparedness	5,59
Availability	5,52
Helpfulness	5,52
Communication	5,46
Clarity and comprehensibility of lessons	5,36
Global Index (average of 5 dimensions)	5,49
Other instructor evaluations	
Class Schedule	5,73

Making course materials available	5,49
Mastery of Course Material (Course)	5,31
Satisfaction with the number of course hours	5,30

According to the data, respondents were most satisfied with the **conduct of classes (5.73)** and the **availability of course materials (5.49)**. Within the five main dimensions, **preparedness** received the highest average score (5.59), while the **clarity and comprehensibility of lectures** received the lowest (5.36) – though even this score indicates a high level of satisfaction.

Satisfaction with the number of course hours scored the lowest (5.30); based on respondents’ feedback, there is generally a demand for **more contact hours** relative to the amount of course material.

2.2. Curriculum evaluations – average scores

In the course evaluation surveys, respondents also assessed the quality of the courses and the course materials. The course syllabus **was available to 95.0% of respondents from the beginning of the semester**.

3. Table – Institutional averages for curriculum evaluation dimensions

Curriculum Assessment Dimension	Average (1–6)
Up-to-date	5,37
Modernity	5,31
Accuracy of the knowledge imparted and assessment	5,31
Availability of teaching materials	5,23
Practical focus	5,19
Learnability	5,18

The **curriculum’s up-to-date nature (5.37)** and the **fairness of assessments (5.31)** received the highest average scores. The lowest averages were recorded for **learnability (5.18)** and **practical orientation (5.19)**, which **indicate potential areas for further improvement**.

2.3. Experiences with dual training

In **1,851** responses, respondents indicated that they were participating in a dual training program – presumably, some of those studying while working also answered “yes” to this question – and their feedback was as follows:

4. Table – Evaluation Results of Dual Training

Dimension	Average (1–6)
Applying business knowledge in training	4,67
Applying Training Knowledge in the Workplace	4,82

Respondents in the dual track program gave lower average ratings than the general faculty ratings in both dimensions, suggesting that strengthening the link between theoretical and practical knowledge presents an opportunity for improvement and may also reflect **differing expectations**.

3. Recognition of Excellence

A total of **205 lecturers** achieved an **overall rating of 6.0**, representing 21.2% of all lecturers evaluated (968 in total). This outstanding percentage indicates that nearly one-fifth of the lecturers elicited the **highest possible level of satisfaction** among students.

4. Areas for improvement (overall averages below 4.0)

Of the lecturers evaluated, only 15 (1.5% of the total) had an **overall average below 4.0** at the institutional level, which reflects the **generally high standard of teaching**.

Based on the numerical results and the written feedback received in response to the question *“Please share any other comments or suggestions you may have,”* the weaker results are primarily due to **organizational and methodological factors** rather than **professional ones**. The most frequently cited areas for improvement are as follows:

- **Learnability:** In the evaluation of the curriculum, this dimension received the lowest average score (5.18). Respondents frequently noted a lack of a clearer, more gradual structure, as well as a need for more deliberate support for the learning process.
- **Practical focus (5.19):** Based on the feedback, students would like to see more practical, real-world examples.

Summary

The OMHV evaluation for the first semester of the 2025/26 academic year presents an **overall exceptionally positive** picture of the teaching work at the University of Miskolc. The institution’s overall index is **5.49 points**; nearly **one-fifth** of the evaluated faculty members achieved the maximum average (**6.0**), and only 15 lecturers scored **below 4.0**.

Respondents are particularly satisfied with the instructors’ **expertise, availability, and helpfulness**. Based on the feedback, future development efforts should primarily focus on **improving the accessibility of the curriculum and strengthening its practical orientation**.

The report was prepared by Dávid Zsudel and reviewed by Éva Ligetvári.