# Guidelines for the Evaluation of Classes and the Use of their Results

## University of Prishtina – Hasan Prishtina

**By Gudrun FEUCHT and Roland HUMER (HERAS project)**

**Draft, Dec 16, 2017**

## 1. Evaluation Standards

This document specifies regulations stipulated in the mission, policies and strategies of the University ofPrishtina Hasan Prishtina (UPHP), most importantly the statute. It is fully in line with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015).

UPHP performs course evaluation in a standardised and transparent manner. These guidelines clearly regulate the collection and use of evaluation data. They apply to all members of academic staff, regardless of their rank or position.

First and foremost, evaluation results will help persons or units to improve. Only in rare cases in whichmemberslack the ability or will to improve, the university will impose sanctions.

## 2. Goals of Course Evaluation

The course evaluation aims to improve teaching activities at the University, in particular by providing

- a feedback instrument for teaching staff and
- a feedback and planning instrument for vice-deans of study, heads of study programs, and the university management

Course evaluations are an important part of creating a comprehensive culture of quality. Feedback from students about the quality of a course (on the instructions, the learning environment, etc.) gives teachers valuable insight into how students perceive both the teacher and his or her teaching.  The resulting data are intended to help teachers improve and further develop their course designs, where necessary.

## 3. Responsibilities

Quality culture means that all university teachers and managers consider themselves responsible for quality and participate in quality assurance in all parts of the institution. The following table presents the various stakeholders in this process and describes the distribution of tasks:

| Stakeholder | Responsibility |
| --- | --- |
| Rector | … |
| Vice-Rector for Quality Development | Responsibility for quality system (management task, reporting) |
| Central Commission for Quality Assurance | Revise questionnaires, approves guidelines |
| Senate | … |

| | |
|---|---|
| Academic Development Office (ADO) | initiates the evaluations, processes the data, forwards and publishes the results |
| Heads of study program | … |
| Deans | … |
| Vice-Deans of Studies | … |
| Chairman of study commission | … |
| Student Parliament | … |
| Member of Academic Staff | Responsibility for quality (academic task) Inform students about use of evaluation results |

*… to be filled in after clarification of process*

## 4. Processes of Evaluation

At UPHP, a set of questionnaires is in place. It has been developed within a European project, based on international best practice. The Central Committee for Quality Assurance revises thequestionnaires every five years.

ADO initiates the evaluations, processes the data, and forwards the results. The data management is fully digitalised.

Students fill in questionnaires in the second half of the semester, before the course ends. This enables teachers to adjust the course and to inform students how they will use evaluation results in the future.

There should be one questionnaire per course even if the course is taught by more than one person.

Currently, UPHP evaluates all courses offered. This might lead to a situation in which (1) return rates are low as students get over-burdened with filling-in questionnaires or (2) UPHP collects data but uses them only partly. Therefore, in 2020, the Vice-Rector for Quality Assurance should evaluate the system and adapt the frequency of evaluations if necessary.

If students report that an academic staff member has violated the law (e.g. sexual harassment, bribes), the Dean is required to inform the Vice-Rector for Quality Assurance to plan further steps.

## 5. Publication of Evaluation Results

The results are available to:

- The lecturers: Their own results
- The (Vice-)Dean of Studies: The results of any course of the faculty
- (Vice-)Deans and (Vice-)Heads of Centers: The results of the offered courses at the faculty/the center.
- (Vice-)Rectors: Any results

Results should be made available to all persons involved and concerned – including students. *All courses or only own courses? Aggregated / non aggregated data? Teachers have a possibility to comment results before publication? Teachers can publish / suppress publication?*

If fewer than five people have filled in the questionnaire, results should only go to the lecturer (lack of statistical validity).

To help users interpret the evaluation results, ADO provides the average and the median for each question and over all courses of the unit (benchmarking). Larger faculties can define sub-units to be the basis of calculation.

The top 10% results are made available to the general public through the faculty website. The top 10% results are defined as the 10% of courses of each faculty with the best average result for overall assessment (i.e. question *no. X of* the questionnaire).

## 6. Follow-up Measures

Not the bare evaluation, but the use of the evaluation results will lead to quality improvement. Follow-up measures refer either to single staff members or to the unit as such.

### Evaluation Report

Each year, each faculty produces an evaluation report. In this report, the faculty analyses course evaluation results, provides a documentation of quality assurance measures, and lists plans to improve the quality. The Vice-Rector for Quality Assurance provides a template.

### Internal Performance Review Meetings

After receipt of the Evaluation Report, the Vice-Rector for Quality Assurance and the respective Dean hold an Internal Performance Review Meeting. This meeting is to be held annually, participants are: *professors, vice-deans, ADO, …???*

### Recruitment of new Academic Staff

Job candidates with previous teaching experience in higher education have to present course evaluation results in their application.

New members of teaching staff are required to participate in teacher training during the first two years of employment(on-bording program). The University offers these courses free of charge.

### Promotion of Academic Staff

Results of course evaluation are a part of all promotion procedures (promotion to a higher academic rank, promotion to a tenured position, etc.). ADO provides the evaluation results to the respective promotion committee.

### Development of Academic Staff (Personnel Development)

Evaluation results are an essential part of all appraisal interviews. Employees and their supervisors can agree on improvement measures such aspedagogical trainings orpeer-to-peer counselling.

The chairman of study commission has to agree on improvement plans with those staff members whose courses had the bottom 10 % of evaluation results. The bottom 10% results are defined as the 10% of courses of each faculty with the lowest average result for overall assessment (i.e. question *no. X of* the questionnaire).

### Repeated Underperformance

If academic staff members are part of the bottom 10% of their faculty twice in three years, the Vice-Rector for Quality Assurance invites them for an appraisal interview and they agree on improvement measures. If the employee does not fulfil this agreement, or if the performance of the employee does not improve, the Vice-Rector for Quality Assurance initiates a meeting with the Rector. Possible consequences of this meeting are: further support measures, assignment of new tasks (less teaching, more other obligations).