

**REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY
THE STUDENTS**

Person responsible for professional aspects:	Dániel Pálvölgyi	Quality Enhancement Team Leader
Professional aspects checked by:	Réka Franciska Vas	Vice-Rector for Education
Legal aspects checked by:	Barbara Bíró	Head of Legal Affairs
Decision maker:	Senate	
Person responsible for editing and publishing the text:	Anikó Erős	
		Higher Education Expert

Version number	Publication date	Effective date	Version tracking
00	06.12.2022	06.12.2022	Publication Resolution No. SZ-15/2022/2023 (5 December)


	<p>OTHER REGULATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE ORGANISATIONAL AND OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES</p>	<p>Version number: 00 Effective from: 6 December 2022 Reference number: JISZ-SZ/10/2022.</p>
<p>REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY THE STUDENTS</p>		

Table of Contents

The purpose of the Regulation	3
Scope of the Regulation	3
Definitions	4
Key principles of the evaluation	4
Students, lecturers and subjects covered by the evaluation.....	5
Tasks and powers of those involved in the evaluation	5
Conduct of the evaluation.....	6
Calculation of evaluation results	6
Publication of evaluation results	6
Document management and data retention period	9
Assessment and use of evaluation results	9
Transitional and final provisions	10
Annex.....	11
Questionnaire in the single online student evaluation system	11

**REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY
THE STUDENTS**

Pursuant to Subparagraph (p) of Paragraph (2) of Section 7 of the Organisational and Operational Procedures, the Senate, in agreement with the Student Union and the PhD Student Union, shall lay down the following rules for the evaluation of the lecturers' work by the students (hereinafter: Regulation).

The purpose of the Regulation**1. §**

- (1) The primary aim of the evaluation of the lecturers' work by the students is to provide lecturers with such substantial and constructive feedback on their teaching work, which supports them in their development, in raising the quality of teaching and pedagogy, and in developing forms of teaching and learning that better meet the needs of the students.
- (2) Other aims of the evaluation are:
 - a) to give lecturers feedback on how their work is perceived by students,
 - b) to facilitate the evaluation of lecturer performance,
 - c) to facilitate students' free choice of subjects and courses,
 - d) to contribute to the development of the University's programmes and its teaching and pedagogical activities,
 - e) to ensure that students can give feedback of the same quality on the subjects delivered during the University's intensive-week, trimestrial and semestrial subjects with particular attention to standardising the time between the last teaching session of the subject and the time of feedback.

Scope of the Regulation**2. §**

- (1) The personal scope of this Regulation shall cover all teaching staff of the University, including employed lecturers and external lecturers (hereinafter: lecturers), and to all students of the University, irrespective of the academic level, the mode of study, the form of financing and the language of the studies. The scope of the Regulation also covers guest students and students participating in trainings with the purpose of acquiring specialised knowledge as well as students participating in preparatory courses.
- (2) The material scope of this Regulation covers the evaluation of the teaching activities of lecturers within the context of this Regulation, the definition of responsibilities, the timing, content and methodology of the evaluation, the processing and evaluation of the questionnaires, the publication and storage of the results, and possible solutions to address shortcomings.
- (3) The material scope of the Regulation covers the courses of both compulsory and free elective subjects, except
 - a) subjects that are exam courses,
 - b) subjects associated with compulsory practice periods,

**REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY
THE STUDENTS**

- c) subjects taken by the student for credit recognition and therefore not attended by the student.

Definitions**3. §**

- (1) The definitions used in this Regulation shall have the meanings given in the Study and Examination Regulations, which form Part 3 of the Student Requirements.

Key principles of the evaluation**4. §**

- (1) The University establishes a questionnaire-based evaluation system for the evaluation of the lecturers' work. Students evaluate the work of lecturers by filling in a questionnaire.
- (2) The subject is the basic unit of evaluation.
- (3) The evaluation covers:
- a) the extent to which the requirements of the subject can be met,
 - b) satisfaction with the subject,
 - c) the teaching competences (organisation, objectivity, competence, development, motivation, level of academic sophistication, relevance and mindset shaping) of the lecturer of the course related to the subject, as defined in the Corvinus Teaching Excellence (CTE) system,
 - d) parts of the subject requirements and learning material.
- (4) Volunteering: Completion of the questionnaire is voluntary, and the questionnaire shall provide the option of skipping the response in each response box, so that the questionnaire will be evaluated even if the respondent only answers part of the questions.
- (5) Regularity: Evaluations are carried out every semester, every trimester or at the end of project weeks.
- (6) Digitisation: Keeping in mind the principles of extensive consultation and economy, the evaluation shall be carried out through an online system based on a single questionnaire.
- (7) Language: The language of evaluation is Hungarian for subjects taught in Hungarian and English for subjects taught in English and German.
- (8) Protection of moral rights: To protect moral rights, evaluations may only cover issues directly related to the lecturer's teaching of the subject.
- (9) GDPR compliance: Data protection rules shall be fully complied with during the evaluation.
- (10) Anonymity: Full anonymity of students shall be guaranteed during the evaluation.
- (11) Inclusion: The evaluation shall be as inclusive as possible, and the scope of this Regulation shall be extended to the entire student community of the University.
- (12) Efficiency: Economy and speed are the basic principles for the evaluation.

**REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY
THE STUDENTS**

- (13) Fairness: To protect the assessment, the data shall be collected and processed in a way that is correct in terms of methodology and excludes the possibility of misuse.
- (14) Feedback and continuous improvement: The evaluation system shall be developed in such a manner that the results can be easily comprehended and interpreted.

Students, lecturers and subjects covered by the evaluation**5. §**

- (1) A student who has not suspended his or her student status in the semester to which the evaluation relates (active student) may participate in the evaluation.
- (2) The evaluation shall be extended to all lecturers, it being understood that no evaluation shall be required for lecturers who have contributed less than 15% of the teaching time to the course.

Tasks and powers of those involved in the evaluation**6. §**

- (1) The Vice-Rector for Education is in charge of the operation of the system of the evaluation of the lecturers' work by the students. In this context, he or she shall
- order the evaluation every semester and set its schedule,
 - decide on the content of the questionnaire, be responsible for the content requirements,
 - decide on individual requests from individual lecturers,
 - decide on any complaints from students and/or lecturers received in connection with the review,
 - inform the Presidential Committee, the Education Committee and the Senate of the aggregate results of the evaluation, as required, but at least once a year,
 - propose possible solutions to address shortcomings within the framework of this Regulation,
 - be responsible for the continuous improvement of the evaluation,
 - decide on the administrators who will process the results of the evaluation, be responsible for ensuring that the necessary data protection requirements are complied with,
 - decide on the allocation of authorisations, subject to data protection requirements,
 - be responsible for compliance with data protection requirements.
- (2) The Centre for Educational and Quality Enhancement Methodology (hereinafter: CEQEM) is responsible for the operation of the online evaluation system within the framework defined by the Vice-Rector for Education, the coordination of the development of its content and the full implementation of the individual evaluations. Where necessary, working closely with the Digital and Innovation team of Student Services to make the necessary technological improvements.

**REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY
THE STUDENTS**

- (3) The results of the evaluation are processed by the dedicated administrators, whose role, duties, powers and responsibilities are set out in this Regulation.

Conduct of the evaluation**7. §**

- (1) The evaluation is carried out using the MyView online program, which processes the responses for both lecturers and courses.
- (2) The period available for evaluation is the period between the 7th calendar day prior to the last teaching session of the course as set out in the timetable and the 7th calendar day following the last teaching session, but no later than the first day of the examination period. The start time shall be set in hours. Consequently, subjects offered in intensive-week programmes, trimestrial and semestrial programmes have different evaluation periods.
- (3) Invitations and reminders shall be sent to students and lecturers involved in the online evaluation of the start of the evaluation periods of the semester in question and the opportunity to view the results via the University's mail system. Student Services, the Student Union and the PhD Student Union are involved in informing lecturers and students, as defined by the CEQEM.
- (4) The online commenting system will allow lecturers, for a limited period, to submit their own question(s), which are not part of the central question bank.

Lecturers may submit individual questions after the finalisation of the subject registration. Lecturers shall be allowed at least seven (7) calendar days to submit individual questions, with the deadline for submitting individual questions being the end of the calendar day before the opening of the questionnaire. For intensive-week subjects, where the last course session is before the finalisation of course registration, individual questions may be submitted after seven (7) days from the end of course registration.

- (5) Lecturers will receive a message via the University's mailing system informing them of the starting date for submitting questions.
- (6) The results of the evaluation are processed by dedicated administrators.

Calculation of evaluation results**8. §**

- (1) The rules for calculating assessments shall be published on MyView. The Education Committee proposes the rules to the Presidential Committee and the Senate. The Senate will make the decision.

Publication of evaluation results**9. §**

- (1) Of the results of the student evaluation, the following may be made public to the employees, students and external lecturers of the University (hereinafter: internal public):
- a) Numerical aggregated results on subject requirements and learning materials,

**REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY
THE STUDENTS**

- b) The quantitative results achieved by a lecturer for a given subject if:
1. the number of students taking the subject is over 5, and
 2. at least 30% of the students eligible to submit an evaluation in the subject in question have evaluated the lecturer.
- c) The lecturer's aggregated quantitative result (including all evaluations), provided that at least 5 persons have given their evaluation of the lecturer. Aggregate quantitative lecturer results are only shown for subjects and their courses for which all the conditions in paragraph (b) are met,
- d) Tables showing the detailed breakdown of responses.
- (2) For the internal public:
- a) Disclosable quantifiable evaluations should be published for the lecturer, broken down by subject and course, as well as in an aggregated form,
 - b) The results shall be presented in no order of value,
 - c) The results for the lecturers shall be given in alphabetical order, by organisational unit or in some other order independent of the result of the assessment,
 - d) In all cases, the completion rates shall be provided with the results.
- (3) The scope of restricted data is as follows:
- a) textual comments on the subjects,
 - b) textual comments on the lecturers,
 - c) quantifiable results for the lecturer that are not available under Paragraphs (1) and (2),
 - d) a ranking of lecturers based on the aggregated results of the evaluation,
 - e) the results of the individual questions submitted by the lecturers.
- (4) Persons authorised to view restricted data:
- a) without any restriction, the lecturer concerned may view:
 - textual comments on the subjects he or she teaches,
 - text comments concerning him or her,
 - the tables showing a more detailed breakdown of responses,
 - the results of the questions submitted by him or her,
 - b) the subject leader may, without any restriction, during his or her term as subject leader and for the purpose of professional quality assurance of the subject, view:
 - the textual comments received on the subjects he or she leads,
 - textual comments on the lecturers of the subject,
 - the tables showing a more detailed breakdown of the quantitative assessments for the subjects he or she leads and their lecturers,
 - c) the study programme leader may, without any restriction, during his or her term as study programme leader and for the purpose of professional quality assurance of the programme, view:

**REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY
THE STUDENTS**

- textual comments on the subjects of the study programme,
textual comments on the lecturers of the subjects,
the tables showing a more detailed breakdown of the quantitative assessments for the subjects of the study programme he or she leads and their lecturers,
- d) without any restriction, staff members of the CEQEM responsible for student evaluation and the administrators
- (5) In the cases specified in Paragraph (6) of Section 9 of this Regulation:
- a) heads of institutes may, during their terms as heads of institutes, view:
textual comments on the lecturers of their respective institutes,
textual comments on the subjects of their respective institutes,
- b) the Head of the Doctoral School may, during his or her term as Head of the Doctoral School, view:
textual comments on the lecturers of the Doctoral School,
textual comments on the subjects of the Doctoral School,
- c) the Dean may, during his or her term as Dean, view:
textual comments on the lecturers of the relevant academic level,
textual comments on the subjects of the relevant academic level,
- d) the President, the Rector, the General Vice-Rector and the Vice-Rector for Education may, during their respective terms, view:
textual comments on subjects,
textual comments on lecturers.
- (6) Access to data not accessible on the basis of the above may be requested in the following exceptional cases by written request to the Vice-Rector for Education:
- a) disciplinary, ethical, police and other official matters,
b) if it is necessary for the lecturer to organise the Dean's class visit based on the student's evaluation,
c) where significant data are needed to support an employer's decision concerning a lecturer,
d) in the event of a dispute between a student (or the Student Union) and a lecturer, to decide on the matter.
- (7) MyView results can be viewed in two systems for different purposes:
- a) students, lecturers, subject leaders, study programme leaders, heads of institutes, heads of doctoral schools, deans, the Vice-Rector for Education, the General Vice-Rector and the Rector can view the quantified results in MyView,
b) in addition to the MyView interface, study programme leaders, heads of institutes, heads of doctoral schools, deans, the Vice-Rector for Education, the General Vice-Rector, the Rector and the President can view the data for higher-level aggregated

**REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY
THE STUDENTS**

decision-making and development through an external business intelligence interface for data-driven decision-making.

- (8) On request, the Vice-Rector for Education decides on ad hoc access, subject to data protection requirements.
- (9) All authorised persons may process and use all data in strict compliance with the rules on data processing only with due care, for a specific purpose and solely in the context of the duties and responsibilities of their jobs.
- (10) The CEQEM shall keep up-to-date records of all authorisations, including the name, department and authorisation level of the authorised person.


Document management and data retention period**10. §**

- (1) All data concerning the evaluation results shall be kept for 80 years.

Assessment and use of evaluation results**11. §**

- (1) The results of Module 3 of the MyView questionnaires (questions on lecturers) shall be used and included in the lecturer performance assessment according to the Corvinus Teaching Excellence programme.
- (2) Study programme leaders shall prepare an annual assessment of the results of the evaluation of the lecturers' work by the students and submit it to the responsible study programme development committee and the responsible dean. The responsible study programme development committee shall discuss the assessment. The annual report submitted to the responsible dean shall include the recommendations of the study programme development committee on subjects and lecturers.
- (3) The subject leader shall prepare an assessment of the results of the evaluation of the lecturers' work by the students every semester. The assessment shall include strengths and opportunities for improvement identified on the basis of the major findings of student evaluations. The subject leader shall send the assessment to the head of the institute hosting the subject.
- (4) The CEQEM shall prepare an assessment template and make it available to study programme leaders and subject leaders.
- (5) Education Management shall disclose assessments in a form that is accessible to students as well.
- (6) For lecturers
 - a) whose three (3) successive assessments have resulted in a cumulative score of less than 3.3 (on a scale converted to a scale of 5),
 - b) whose overall response rate exceeds 30% in each semester,

the CEQEM staff member proposes a personalised action plan and forwards it to the General Vice-Rector and the Vice-Rector for Education, who decide on the next steps to be taken,

 BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM	OTHER REGULATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE ORGANISATIONAL AND OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES	Version number: 00 Effective from: 6 December 2022 Reference number: JISZ-SZ/10/2022.
REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY THE STUDENTS		

the CEQEM, with the assistance of the subject leader and the study programme leaders and on the basis of the Dean's opinion, proposes a personalised action plan and sends it to the Vice-Rector for Education and the General Vice-Rector for further action. The vice-rectors decide on the action plan (e.g. organising a class visit) on the basis of the proposal, with the assistance of the head of the institute concerned. The head of the institute shall report on the measures and their results to the General Vice-Rector and the Vice-Rector for Education.

Transitional and final provisions

12. §

- (1) As a general rule, for the first semester of the academic year 2022/23, the opportunity to fill in the questionnaire shall be provided from 12 December 2022 to 22 December 2022. For subjects offered in the first trimester, the questionnaire may be filled in between the last session of the course and 22 December 2022.
- (2) The present Regulations were adopted by the Senate through online voting, under Resolution No. SZ-15/2022/2023 (5.12.2022). They shall enter into force on 6 December 2022. Upon entry into force, the previous regulation on the subject will be repealed.
- (3) These Regulations shall be reviewed within one year of their entry into force and, if necessary, a proposal for their improvement shall be submitted to the Senate.

**REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY
THE STUDENTS****Annex****Questionnaire in the single online student evaluation system**

In the MyView system, questionnaires are generated based on the student's choice of subjects and lecturers, based on the data in the Neptun system. Therefore, the specific questionnaire is not provided here, but only the questions and answer options in MyView, with the corresponding comments on a grey background.

The questionnaire contains different questions for the following types of subjects:


- Professional subjects
- Language subjects
- Physical education subjects
- Thesis seminar subjects

All questionnaires have three main modules.

- Questions on the requirements of the subject: questions on students' opinion of the workload of the subject are assessed here
- Questions on the content of the subject: questions on the students' opinion of the subject content are assessed here
- Questions about the lecturer: questions about the students' opinion of the lecturer are asked here. These questions are in line with the lecturer competences identified in the Corvinus Teaching Excellence programme.

The data stored about the student who filled in the questionnaire (these are the data that are automatically stored about the student who filled in the questionnaire when the MyView database is created, based on the Neptun database, which can be used to perform queries such as the opinion of a student in a particular study programme on a particular subject):

- the study programme of the student,
- the student's course code and course type in the Neptun system.

 BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM	OTHER REGULATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE ORGANISATIONAL AND OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES	Version number: 00 Effective from: 6 December 2022 Reference number: JISZ-SZ/10/2022
REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY THE STUDENTS		

1. Module: Questions on subject requirements (same for all four subject types above)


How much do you agree with the following statements?

Questions	I don't know	I do not agree at all				I fully agree
I was able to meet the requirements of the subject.	IDK	1	2	3	4	
The expected student effort was in line with the credit values of the subject.	IDK	1	2	3	4	
The effort involved in completing the subject was spread evenly over the trimester/semester.	IDK	1	2	3	4	
I was happy to work on the subject over and above what was required.	IDK	1	2	3	4	
What percentage of classes did you attend?	IDK	1	2	3	4	
How many working hours have you invested in the subject (where 100% is 30 times the credit value of the subject, e.g. 180 working hours for a 6-credit subject)?	IDK	0- 25%	26- 50%	51- 75%	76- 100%	
		1	2	3	4	
		0- 25%	26- 50%	51- 75%	76- 100%	
		1	2	3	4	

2. Module: Questions on the content of the subject

2.1: For professional subjects and thesis seminar subjects

Questions	I don't know	I do not agree at all			I fully agree
The assessment was in line with what was told at the beginning of the subject.	IDK	1	2	3	4
The subject gave me the opportunity to develop my professional competences.	IDK	1	2	3	4

 BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM	OTHER REGULATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE ORGANISATIONAL AND OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES	Version number: 00 Effective from: 6 December 2022 Reference number: JISZ-SZ/10/2022
REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY THE STUDENTS		

The learning materials and aids used in the subject assisted me in studying.	IDK	1	2	3	4
The activities in this subject assisted me in studying.	IDK	1	2	3	4

What did you like about the subject and why? Please describe briefly.

.....
.....


What would you change to make the subject better? Please describe briefly.

.....
.....

2.2. For language subjects

Questions	I don't know	I do not agree at all			I fully agree
The subject helped me to prepare for effective communication in my field of study in a foreign language.	IDK	1	2	3	4
The subject helped me to develop my written (reading and writing) language skills.	IDK	1	2	3	4
The subject helped me to develop my oral (speaking and listening comprehension) language skills.	IDK	1	2	3	4
The atmosphere in the classes was supportive and stimulating.	IDK	1	2	3	4

2.3. For physical education subjects


 BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM	OTHER REGULATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE ORGANISATIONAL AND OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES	Version number: 00 Effective from: 6 December 2022 Reference number: JISZ-SZ/10/2022
REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY THE STUDENTS		

Questions	I don't know	I do not agree at all		I fully agree
The physical activity in the physical education subject contributes to health maintenance.	IDK	1	2 3	4
I got to know and mastered the movement contents of the sport and its correct execution, so that I can practice it independently in the future.	IDK	1	2 3	4

3. Module: Questions concerning lecturers

3.1 For professional subjects and language subjects

Questions	I don't know	I do not agree at all		I fully agree
I consider the lecturer to be a highly knowledgeable specialist.	IDK	1	2 3	4
I find the lecturer an inspiring person.	IDK	1	2 3	4
The lecturer made it clear to me how each topic related to the discipline as a whole.	IDK	1	2 3	4
The lecturer was punctual and managed time well during the classes and the semester.	IDK	1	2 3	4
The lecturer made sure that I had access to the necessary learning materials.	IDK	1	2 3	4
I feel that I have acquired up-to-date knowledge.	IDK	1	2 3	4
The lecturer's expectations regarding the course were clear to me (purpose of the assignments, amount of preparation expected and/or the method and timing of the progress check).	IDK	1	2 3	4
The lecturer treated me and my fellow students fairly.	IDK	1	2 3	4
I received sufficient support from the lecturer to complete the course	IDK	1	2 3	4

 BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM	OTHER REGULATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE ORGANISATIONAL AND OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES	Version number: 00 Effective from: 6 December 2022 Reference number: JISZ-SZ/10/2022
REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY THE STUDENTS		

(availability and readiness to respond).

The lecturer encouraged individual initiative and the development of our own approach.	IDK	1	2	3	4
--	-----	---	---	---	---

The lecturer challenged me intellectually.	IDK	1	2	3	4
--	-----	---	---	---	---

I had the opportunity to participate in a variety of learning activities throughout the course (e.g. group work, quizzes, case solving, independent research, short presentations, class assignments, etc.).	IDK	1	2	3	4
--	-----	---	---	---	---

I find the lecturer an inspiring person.	IDK	1	2	3	4
--	-----	---	---	---	---

For subjects taught in a foreign language:	IDK	1	2	3	4
--	-----	---	---	---	---

The lecturer delivered the classes in a foreign language in an understandable manner.

What should the lecturer continue to do? What was/were the area(s) in which you improved during the course? What was the best moment during the subject?


.....
.....

What should the lecturer do differently to teach the students more experience-based (easier to follow, more attention-grabbing, etc.) classes?

.....
.....

3.2. For physical education subjects

Questions	I don't know	I do not agree at all			I fully agree
The lecturer was helpful, attentive and inspiring during PE classes.	IDK	1	2	3	4
During the course, the lecturer helped with technical, tactical and lifestyle advice.	IDK	1	2	3	4
The lecturer helped me in class by	IDK	1	2	3	4

 BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM	OTHER REGULATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE ORGANISATIONAL AND OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES	Version number: 00 Effective from: 6 December 2022 Reference number: JISZ-SZ/10/2022
REGULATIONS ON THE EVALUATION OF THE LECTURERS' WORK BY THE STUDENTS		

providing tailored exercises according to
my level of preparation.

I find the lecturer an inspiring person. IDK 1 2 3 4

3.3 For thesis seminar subjects

Questions	I don't know	I do not agree at all	I fully agree		
The supervisor clearly informed me about the framework of the thesis seminar (e.g. frequency of meetings, tasks to be completed).	IDK	1	2	3	4
The supervisor gave me the right professional support in writing my thesis.	IDK	1	2	3	4
I could consult with the supervisor on the development of my thesis as much as I needed to.	IDK	1	2	3	4
The supervisor gave substantive feedback on the paper and informed me about the next steps.	IDK	1	2	3	4
I find the supervisor an inspiring person.	IDK	1	2	3	4