

SWARM CURRICULA EVALUATION PRACTICES



Photo: NMBU/Håkon Sparre

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

University of Nis



Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management
for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders

PROJECT INFO

Project title	Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders
Project acronym	SWARM
Project reference number	597888-EPP-1-2018-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Funding scheme	Erasmus+ Capacity building in the field of higher education
Web address	www.swarm.ni.ac.rs
Coordination institution	University of Nis
Project duration	15 November 2018 – 14 November 2021

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Work package	WP4 Implementation of developed master curricula and trainings
Ref. no and title of activity	A4.3 Self-evaluation of master curricula
Title of deliverable	SWARM curricula evaluation practices
Lead institution	Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU)
Author(s)	Zakhar Maletskyi, Harsha Ratnaweera, Michael Tritthart, Daniel Wildt, Charalampos Skoulikaris, Panagiotis Prinos, Milan Gocic, Emina Hadzic, Maja Djogo, Barbara Karleuša, Bojana Horvat, Maria Manuela Portela, Rodrigo Proenca de Oliveira
Document status	Final
Document version and date	v03
Dissemination level	Public

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision description	Partner responsible
v.01	15/02/2021	Creation of the document	NMBU, BOKU, AUTH
v.02	04/03/2021	Document revision	UNI, UNSA, UNS
v.03	18/03/2021	Document revision	UNIRIFCE, UL

Contents

List of abbreviations	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Overview of the curricula evaluation practices	4
Norway – Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU).....	4
Croatia – University of Rijeka, Faculty of Civil Engineering.....	11
Portugal – University of Lisbon.....	12
Recommended resources.....	15
Annex A – Evaluation forms	16
Norway – Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU).....	16
Greece – AUTH.....	23
Austria – BOKU.....	26
Croatia - UNIRIFCE.....	29
Annex B – Generic evaluation form	32

List of abbreviations

AUTh	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
BOKU	University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna
CBHE	Capacity Building in Higher Education
EACEA	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
HEI	Higher Education Institution
NMBU	Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Norway
PWMC VV	Public Water Management Company “Vode Vojvodine”
SWARM	Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders
UACEG	University of Architecture, Civil Engineering and Geodesy, Bulgaria
UNI	University of Nis, Serbia
UL	University of Lisbon, Portugal
UoM	University of Montenegro
UNIRIFCE	University of Rijeka, Croatia
UNMO	Dzemal Bijedic University of Mostar
UNS	University of Novi Sad
UNSA	University of Sarajevo
UPKM	University of Pristina in Kosovska Mitrovica
TCASU	Technical College of Applied Sciences Urosevac with temporary seat in Leposavic
WRM	Water Resources Management

1. Introduction

This document summarises curricula evaluation practices of the SWARM partner universities from the Program Countries. We developed this document to facilitate transfer of good practices of curricula evaluation to the Partner Countries.

This document contains four parts: (i) short overview of the practices in partner universities from the Program Countries; (ii) recommended resources about curricula evaluation practices; (iii) Annex A – Evaluation forms of the partner universities from the Program Countries; (iv) Annex B – Generic evaluation form recommended for the evaluation of SWARM courses.

The document has been jointly prepared by university staff members from Program and Partner Countries:

1. Partners from Program Countries compiled compendium of evaluation practices, recommended resources and evaluation forms available at their universities
2. Based on the information from the first step, partners from Partner Countries prepared a generic evaluation form for the evaluation of SWARM courses

2. Overview of the curricula evaluation practices

Norway – Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU)

To create and secure high academic quality at NMBU, we must evaluate our courses and study programs. Evaluation during and after the end of the course provides important feedback of what we do well, and what we can do better.

NMBU's course evaluation routine consists of **three steps**:

1. *Formative/continuous evaluation*

All courses are to be evaluated each time they run. The course responsible is free to choose the time and method of evaluation.

2. *Summative/final evaluation*

The Department of Academic Affairs (Studieavdelingen) will distribute a final evaluation shortly after the end of the course. This evaluation consists of only three questions, and function as a "thermometer".

3. *Periodic evaluation*

The course itself and as part of a study program, must be evaluated every 6th year. Both students and academic staff will take part in the evaluation.

Course report

The feedback from the course evaluation(s) must be presented in a course report, and potential measures/adjustments related to your course are to be included in the report.

Report is submitted directly on the NMBU website. The results from the summative evaluation will be available in your report approximately 3 weeks after the exam.

What do the course responsible need to do?

Every course must be evaluated each time it runs. As the course responsible, it is your responsibility to conduct at least one formative/continuous evaluation. The preferred method and timing is up to course responsible.

The feedback from the course evaluations are to be presented in the course report. It is up to you how you present the feedback and the potential adjustments in the course, but keep in mind that the report should be useful for both yourself, the students and the faculty.

The course reports are used in the study program evaluations that are carried out in cooperation with the faculty every 6th year at the minimum.

Evaluation methods at NMBU

Method 1. 5-minute notes

The 5-minute note is an easy method for collecting student feedback about your teaching. Students write their opinions on a note that the teacher then collects and processes. This gives the student a possibility to identify the strengths of the course and any changes that would improve their learning.

How to use the method:

- The evaluation should be conducted midterm so that students can make an assessment based on experience, and so that you can make improvements accordingly before the semester ends.
- Announce the evaluation beforehand so that students come prepared with recommendations.
- The evaluation should be conducted before or midway through the lecture, in order to get as many answers possible.
- Summarize the main points of the students' comments, and spend a couple of minutes at the beginning of the next class to discuss possible actions both you and your students can take in response to those.

The simplest way to conduct the 5-minute evaluation is to hand out a plain sheet of A4-paper. The student can divide the paper into a + (plus) column and a – (minus) column. They then write down the course's strengths in the plus-column and possible changes in the minus-column. Alternatively, you can also ask for a one sentence evaluation summarizing your teaching in the course so far, or with a grade on a scale from 1-6.

5 minute notes with short and few questions:

A slightly more advanced version of the 5-minute note is to develop a set of questions that the students must address. It is ideal to have as few questions as possible (maximum five) for each part you want students to evaluate.

Examples on open/general questions are:



-
- Continue with – do more of:
 - Improve – do less of:
 - I have learnt this/benefitted from:
 - This is something that lacks:

Examples of more specific/closed questions

- Do you see a correlation between learning aims and the teaching methods used?
- If yes, - is this a method we should continue to use?
- If no, - how can this correlation be improved?
- What has been the most productive learning experience within this unit?
- How do you assess the availability of practical information and help at the beginning of this course?

Method 2. Mailbox

One does not always have to consult the students directly when collecting feedback about their learning environment. In some instances, it can be sufficient enough to give students a chance to initiate the feedback themselves. Thereby, students can provide feedback without depending on an invitation and without being restricted by predefined categories.

Mailbox as a supplement to other evaluation methods When using a mailbox the responsibility to initiate teaching evaluation is transferred to the student. This method will therefore not be optimal for all student groups. In addition, this method can only be used by a small selection of students that provides more or less representative feedback. Thus, it can be necessary to use the mailbox evaluation as a supplement to other evaluation methods.

How to use the method

- The mailbox can be set up physically or electronically. Make the mailbox easily accessible for students or create an email account, for example mailbox@bus100.nmbu.no.
- Discuss with your students how the mailbox evaluation should function: What kind of topics could they comment on and how often; how should the feedback be addressed and discussed with the students, etc. It is important that everyone agrees on these premises.
- Inform the students about how they provide feedback and who their feedback will be read by.
- Ensure that students understand how the feedback is processed, and that the feedback is confidential.
- After agreeing on premises for using the mailbox, these should be put on the course webpage with a reference to the e-mail account if relevant.
- Avoid responding to feedback directed at one particular student. Rather summarize the feedback's main points in a document that is made available for the whole student group.

Method 3. Open evaluation rounds

Open rounds require that you allocate teaching time for each student to in turn comment on central elements of the course. This method can unveil several different perspectives within student groups. This method of oral student evaluation is meant to be informal and easy to conduct. It can be challenging to conduct this method on larger student groups, which makes it most suitable for small student groups.

Open rounds should only be used as a supplement to other forms of teaching evaluation. This is because students should be able to assess their course anonymously.

How to use this method

- Let the students take part in the planning of open rounds and in the formulation of questions.
- The evaluation should be conducted midway through the course so that students have had time to acquire a reasonable sense of how you teach.
- You should also make sure that there is time left to implement changes based on student feedback while the course is still in progress.
- Conduct the evaluation in a lesson where attendance is expected to be high. Avoid conducting open rounds at the end of or after the lesson.
- Announce the evaluation rounds beforehand, preferably together with an agenda, so that students can prepare feedback.
- Try to formulate in writing what you want the students to evaluate. This can make processing the feedback easier.
- Remember that general questions can produce vague answers. Make sure that your questions are clear and specific in order to receive concrete answers.
- The students should be allowed to abstain from participating in open rounds, and they should also have the opportunity to repeat comments that have already been presented. The participants should also feel free to provide feedback without response from others.
- Students that wish to abstain from participating in open rounds can deliver their feedback directly to their student representative or teacher.
- Summarize the comments received and make them available to the students. Comment on possible actions you plan to take in response to the feedback, or explain why certain suggested changes are not relevant for the course or cannot be implemented for other reasons.

Method 4. Interview

An interview will allow each student to articulate experiences from the course or study program. Conversations like these often provide detailed and nuanced descriptions, which might be less available through other methods. An interview is often useful to further explore issues from a previous evaluation.

How to use this method

- Avoid unmanageable quantities of data by limiting the number of interviews. The amount of interviews should be in proportion to the amount of students in your course.
- Plan in advance who you want to interview. Consider gender, full-time/part-time students who have participated or not participated in class, etc. If interviews are combined with other evaluation methods (i.e. a questionnaire) the interview sample can be based on existing data.
- Create an interview guide. Before you formulate questions consider carefully what areas you want feedback on, what you will do with the information you collect, and what your expectations are.
- The interviews should not last for more than an hour. Adjust the number of questions according to the expected length of the interview.
- Formulate open-ended questions so that students are encouraged to give analytical answers with depth and reasoning. Follow-up questions can be prepared in advance.



-
- It is recommended to get a peer to read through your questions and provide feedback before the interviews.
 - Before you begin asking questions, the student must be informed about why he or she is there, what the interview will focus on, and in what context the interviews are done.
 - Be patient during the interviews; give students time to think and elaborate.
 - Consider whether the interview should be audio recorded or if you should take written notes. Be aware that the student must agree to an audio recording of the interview, and that transcription is time-consuming. Taking notes will save you time, but this can disturb the interviewee.

Case example of interview Last semester students criticised the course for not covering topics in class that were included in the syllabus. We have in this semester tried to accommodate this complaint by including lecture seminars to cover more topics.

- Do you think the seminar options this semester have been good? Have you missed anything?
- Do you find some seminars or lectures more rewarding than others? (If so, why? Is there anything you haven't participated in? If so, why not?).
- How do you assess your own study effort this semester? Can you elaborate on the study methods you use?

Method 5. Student evaluation using reference groups

Reference groups may be organized at course level, for example in the form of a group with three to four students who act as representatives for the other students on the same course. A reference group meets with the course coordinator and discusses the instructional activities in that particular course in order to identify areas for improvement.

Reference groups can make it easier for students to voice opinions on teaching strategies while the course is in progress. The use of reference groups at course level should supplement other forms of evaluation.

If reference groups are used as the only evaluation of a course it is recommended that the group and course coordinators meet on a regular basis, and that the reference group is responsible for collecting feedback from all the students in that course. A summary of the course evaluations that includes all feedback collected during the course should preferably be done towards the end of term.

How to use the method

- Consider how many students you wish to include in the reference group. The number of participants should be based on the amount of students on the course, how the teaching is organized, and the intention of the evaluation.
- Consider what areas of responsibility each participant should have. It is important that students are aware of what is expected of them.
- The selection should be done at the beginning of term.
- A meeting schedule should be established at the beginning of term. Consider the frequency of meetings and whether others than the course or study coordinator should participate. The meeting agenda should be made available for all students.
- When the reference group is established, a meeting should be held to discuss how to organize the evaluation and what areas to focus on. It is important for student representatives to know if they need to actively collect course feedback from the other students, or if the other students must deliver feedback to student representatives.

- The meetings should focus on student feedback, both positive and negative comments.
- Make sure that detailed meeting minutes are taken, which include both the student feedback and the response from the course coordinator. Minutes should be made available for the rest of the students soon after.
- If you are evaluating a course that runs through several semesters it could be rewarding to replace the group's members with new students half way through. This will give you the opportunity to make direct contact with more students, and students will take turns being student representatives. However, make sure that this does not affect the continuity of the evaluation. It is recommended that the group meets three to four times before it is replaced by a new group.

Method 6. Questionnaire

A questionnaire as an evaluation method makes it easier to compare different courses or study programs over a long period of time. However, a standardised questionnaire can be perceived as an imposed routine, and the students might therefore lose interest and provide less constructive feedback. Fewer questionnaires with purposeful questions should be prioritized over more frequent questionnaires that includes short but many questions. Always keep in mind that the motivation to participate in such evaluations depends on to what degree the institution utilizes the feedback.

Standard questionnaire

It is recommended that the course responsible and student coordinators collaborate to prepare a standardised questionnaire that includes several courses in combination with the study program. This is particularly applicable to study programs in which students have the same expected progress.

Different ways to collect information

There are several methods to conduct a questionnaire. Here are some examples:

- Distribute online questionnaires via e-mail.
- Publish online questionnaires on the course or study program web-site.
- Allocate time in class for students to answer the electronic or printed questionnaires.

It can be beneficial to use online rather than printed questionnaires. Online questionnaires are time efficient and easier to process; students can answer the questionnaire in their own time, which can encourage detailed answers where possible; and, it will be easier to analyse.

How to use this method

- It takes time to formulate and process questionnaires. Carefully consider the areas you want feedback on and how you plan to apply the information you collect.
- Conduct the evaluation when students have had time to acquire a reasonable sense of the course or study program.
- Announce the evaluation in advance so that students can be prepared.
- Explain to the students the importance of their feedback and how the feedback is processed and used.
- Check that the address list is updated if you plan to distribute the questionnaire directly to students via e-mail. The e-mail that complements the questionnaire should be short, precise and informative.
- You probably need to send out a reminder about the questionnaire, but try to limit this to one time as it might just cause annoyance. This in turn might provoke the student to submit an



answer just to avoid more reminders, and the information collected might be misleading and incomplete.

How to formulate multiple-choice questions

Well-formulated questions and multiple choice answers are the key to a useful questionnaire. Begin by identifying and prioritizing what areas you wish to evaluate. Then you draft questions that cover these areas. Below are advice and recommendations on how to formulate useful multiple choice questions and possible answers:

- Only ask questions that provide information that is applicable according to your intentions.
- Formulate questions that only require one answer. For example: “To what extent does the lecturer manage to engage the students and encourage discussion in class?”. Alternatively: “To what extent does the lecturer manage to engage the students?”.
- Avoid leading questions, emotional language and prestige bias. Remember that the order in which questions are presented can affect the way students respond.
- Vary between simple and general questions (for example variables like gender and age), claims (agree/disagree) and rankings (strongly/somewhat, satisfied/unsatisfied). When presenting a claim consider the use of positive and negative formulations.
- Keep the amount of open-ended questions to a minimal. Such questions require more effort from the students to answer than multiple choice-questions do. It might be difficult to predefine multiple choice categories, but the extra effort can be rewarding. In some cases, it might be best to exclude predefined answer categories, such as in instances like this: “Do you have concrete suggestions to how the teaching can be improved?”.
- Make sure that the multiple choice-answers are comprehensive and useful for the whole group of participants. Unnecessary annoyance can be caused by predefined categories that students do not relate to. This might diminish their motivation and produce random answers, which compromises the evaluation.
- The multiple choice-answers should be mutually exclusive. This might prove difficult, in which case it should be possible to choose more than one answer, indicated in the question.
- Strive for a logical structure in the questionnaire. Group related questions, and if necessary use headings to make the questionnaire clear and concise. Excessive use of follow-up questions like “If no/If yes” might complicate the questionnaire and make it seem disorganized. Spend some time to design the layout and proof read the text. A messy and unfinished questionnaire is often disregarded resulting in low response and decreased validity.
- It might be wise to get feedback on your questionnaire before distributing it. This might reveal that certain concepts might be interpreted differently and that questions might lack answer categories.

[The University of Idaho has made a list of menu items that can be helpful to decide on topics to focus on in a questionnaire for students.](#)

Analyse the results

After all responses to the questionnaire are submitted you have to compile the information. Because the questionnaire often consists of both multiple choice-answers and elaborations, it provides both qualitative and quantitative information. Remember that the feedback from students reflects each students’ subjective experience. The results therefore indicate how something are perceived, not how things are.

- Omit obvious unreliable answers before you analyse the results.
- It is important to treat the student responses in light of possible contextual factors that may influence the feedback. Sick leave, new employees, reforms, reconstruction of buildings, change in routines etc., may both indirectly and directly serve as such an influence.
- Be aware of what the data actually reflects and what it does not reflect. For example, 43 percent of a student group with 250 students may have responded that they strongly agree with the claim “I am satisfied with my own efforts this semester”. However, this only means that almost half of the class is satisfied, not anything else.
- Be careful not to jump to conclusions about causes and effects. Bad feedback to a course might not be because of the teaching. It might be explained by variables such as a difficult topic and/or that few students actually are engaged in the specific topic of the course.
- A high response rate is always good, but if the rate is lower than expected you should attempt to find out why this is the case, and consider what consequences this might have for your conclusions. A systematic bias in respondents will lead to a false impression of what the total student mass really thinks.

Croatia – University of Rijeka, Faculty of Civil Engineering

The procedure and the questionnaire for course evaluation is developed on the University level and it is used by faculties and university departments. Both are defined in the University of Rijeka Manual for the Quality of Studying (https://uniri.hr/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/PRIRU%C4%8CNIK_za_kvalitet_-_studiranja_2016.pdf). The questionnaire structure in English language is added to this short explanation of the procedure.

According to the procedure, at the Faculty of Civil Engineering all courses and all teachers that teach within each course are evaluated each year/semester if the course is enrolled by students.

Filling the questionnaire is not obligatory for students and is anonymous. Students fill the questionnaires online (using the application STUDOMAT) on PC or smartphone.

Students can fill the questionnaire at the end of the lecture by smartphone application (at the end of the semester – last lecture, the teacher leaves the classroom 10-15 min before the end of the lecture so this gives them time to fill it) or students can fill the questionnaire (on PC or smartphone) anytime within the period that the questionnaire is open (usually it is opened two weeks before the end of lectures and must be closed before the start of the new academic year or semester).

When the period of filling questionnaires expires then all questionnaires are analysed automatically by SRCE (Sveučilišni Računski Centar (Sveučilište u Zagrebu) / University (of Zagreb) Computing Centre) and the results are available to each teacher for their own courses (within the ISVU application (Informacijski sustav visokih učilišta / Information System of Higher Education Institutions)), to the Vice-dean for quality assurance and development and members of the Faculty Quality Assurance and Improvement Committee (to be discussed during the meeting on this topic) and also sent to the head of each department within the Faculty for all teachers and courses within the unit.

For each course students fill one questionnaire for each teacher that teaches that course, including assistants that held exercises and seminars. Each teacher can see only his/her own quantitative grades but can see all written additional comments regarding that course.

In some cases, the questionnaires are filled on paper in the classroom at the beginning of the lecture, before the teacher arrives. The filling of questionnaires is done in presence of students' representative that is in charge of handing out the questionnaires, collecting them and delivering them to the Vice-dean for quality assurance and development. These questionnaires are analysed on the Faculty level or on University level (by the University Quality Assurance and Improvement Center).

Beside this official questionnaire teachers are encouraged to prepare and use their own questionnaires (on-line or in paper) on certain aspects of teaching within their courses to have specific and quicker feedback from students.

Portugal – University of Lisbon

At the National level: the Agência de Avaliação e Acreditação do Ensino Superior" (Agency for Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Education - A3ES)

In Portugal, the evaluation and accreditation of curricula is done by the "Agência de Avaliação e Acreditação do Ensino Superior" (Agency for Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Education - A3ES) (<https://www.a3es.pt/en>), which is a private law foundation, established for an indeterminate period of time, with legal status and recognised as being of public utility.

A3S aims at contributing to improving the quality of Portuguese higher education, through the assessment and accreditation of higher education institutions and their study programmes, and to ensure the integration of Portugal in the European quality assurance system of higher education.

Specific objectives towards the overall objective of A3S are:

- To develop the quality assessment of the performance of higher education institutions and their study programmes;
- To determine the accreditation criteria in order to translate their results into qualitative appreciations, as well as to define the consequences of assessment for the operation of study programmes and institutions;
- To promote the accreditation of study programmes and institutions, for the purpose of ensuring the fulfilment of the legal requirements for their recognition;
- To provide society with information on the quality of the performance of higher education institutions;
- To promote the internationalisation of the assessment process.

The main activities of A3ES in developing its mission are:

- To define and enforce the quality standards of the HE system;
- To assess and accredit study programmes and higher education institutions, as well as to audit and certify the internal quality assurance systems of institutions;
- To promote the public disclosure of the assessment and accreditation results;
- To promote the internationalisation of the Portuguese higher education system.
- The Agency also performs the following additional activities:
- To provide the Portuguese State with expertise in matters of higher education quality assurance;
- To elaborate studies and expert reports on its own initiative or in answer to State demands;
- To participate in the European Quality Assurance Register - EQAR;

- To coordinate assessment and accreditation activities in Portugal with international institutions and mechanisms.

Through its Office of Research and Analysis, A3ES is responsible for conducting studies and analyses within the area of quality assurance of higher education. Some of the projects undertaken by A3ES as part of the process of monitoring the quality of the teaching in Portuguese EHIs are (1) Implementation of internal quality assurance systems in higher education in Portugal and (2) Academics in the Portuguese higher education system.

Project (1) aims to assess the degree of implementation of the standards for certification of internal quality assurance systems in higher education institutions in Portugal. The results of this study inform not only A3ES concerning its performance in this area, but also provide useful information for institutions, which may receive a diagnosis of their situation and may compare themselves with other similar institutions. The study employs a quantitative methodology, using a questionnaire addressed to all higher education teachers in Portugal. The intention is to discover how far teachers agree with the principles of the quality standards and their perceptions of how well the various norms have been implemented in their organic unit and/or higher education institution. Customized reports are prepared for each organic unit and each higher education institution, as well as a global report. This report analyses the data by groups: university vs. polytechnic, public vs. private, areas of education and training, scientific areas, professional category of the respondent, the respondent's involvement in management and involvement of the respondent in quality management activities.

As for project (2) it aims to characterise the teaching staff of Portuguese higher education institutions, including a regional distribution by subsystem (university/polytechnic, public/private), by subject area (with particular reference to the strengths and weaknesses) and by gender, and it also characterises their areas of activity. The analysis is based on building a database of teachers in the different subsystems (public/private, university/polytechnic). These teachers are characterised according to information in their CVs (A3ES database) and to the contents of the cover page of each quality assessment process for each one of the organic units.

Other two projects related to Erasmus+ project should also be mentioned: the KA 3 Database of External Quality Assurance Reports (DEQAR), coordinated by EQAR (<https://www.eqar.eu/about/projects/deqar-project/about-deqar/>) and the KA 2 Strategic Partnerships for Higher Education, “MEHR – Modernity, Education and Human Rights”, coordinated by the Swedish Agency UKÄ (2016/18) (report at https://www.a3es.pt/sites/default/files/MEHR_COuntryReport_PT.pdf).

Some of the documents on A3ES's Quality Policy and international assessment include a Quality Policy Statement (<https://www.a3es.pt/en/about-a3es/quality-policy/quality-policy-statement>); a Quality Manual (https://www.a3es.pt/sites/default/files/Quality%20Manual_V1.1.pdf) and a Code of Ethics (<https://www.a3es.pt/sites/default/files/Code%20of%20Ethics.pdf>).

The A3ES also provides several Guidelines and Procedures, on (1) Prior Accreditation of New Study Programmes (<https://www.a3es.pt/en/accreditation-and-audit/guidelines/prior-accreditation-new-study-programmes>); (2) Assessment/Accreditation of Study Programmes in Operation (<https://www.a3es.pt/en/accreditation-and-audit/guidelines/assessment/accreditation-study-programmes-operation>), and (3) Audit of Internal Systems of Quality Assurance (<https://www.a3es.pt/en/accreditation-and-audit/guidelines/audit-internal-systems-quality-assurance>).

Finally, it is worth mentioning a Handbook on the assessment of study programmes (<https://www.a3es.pt/en/accreditation-and-audit/assessment-handbook>).

Portugal- At the University level

Some universities also developed instruments of internal control and quality assessment of education. This is the case of the Portuguese partner of SWARM Project, the Instituto Superior Técnico (IST) from the Lisbon University, which, over the years, developed actions towards the institutionalization of a culture of quality.

In 2019 IST presented the “Instituto Superior Técnico Integrated Quality Management System” (SIQuIST), sharing practices and the identification of improvement opportunities (https://aepq.tecnico.ulisboa.pt/files/sites/22/20190423enquadramentosiquistrefa3esv12_english_version.pdf).

Recommended resources

Read about the project Enhancing student learning through effective formative feedback at the Higher Education Academy. The project was conducted to develop a resource for practitioners wishing to improve their feedback practice to students or get some new ideas on how to enhance their current practice

https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/resources/id353_senlef_guide.pdf

The Eberly Center at Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh offers useful resources when assessing teaching and learning <http://www.cmu.edu/teaching/assessment/index.html>

The report Engaging Students with Assessment Feedback by the Oxford Brookes University presents the findings of a research project which investigated student engagement with formative feedback leading to practical guidelines for academic staff as well as policy recommendations at institutional level

https://www.brookes.ac.uk/aske/documents/FDTL_FeedbackProjectReportApril2009.pdf

Examples of summative assessment methods used by the University of Manchester http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/studyskills/assessment_evaluation/assessment/summative.html

Self- and Peer-Assessment. Guidance on practice in the biosciences is a guide published by The Higher Education Academy which presents practical examples through case studies <https://kennslumidstod.hi.is/index.php/um-okkur/skrar/category/13-sjalfs-og-jafningjamat?download=26:orsmond-p-2004-self-and-peerassessmentguidance-on-practice-in-the-biosciences>

NOKUT Studiebarometer is a national student survey that measures the quality of education in study programs at Norwegian colleges and universities. Here you can find inspiration on how to formulate questions <http://www.studiebarometeret.no/en/>

Harvey, J. (Ed.) (1998): Evaluation Cookbook. Learning Technology Dissemination Initiative, Institute for Computer Based Learning, Herio-Watt University, Edinburgh

Sorenson, D. & Johnson, T. (Ed.) (2003): Online Student Ratings of Instruction. JOSSEY-BASS, San Francisco

Annex A – Evaluation forms

Norway – Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU)

Teaching

	Disagree					Agree
The teacher is engaging.	1	2	3	4	5	6
The teacher makes complex theory understandable.						
The teacher makes complex theory relevant and contextual						
The lectures cover the course's curriculum						
The syllabus is relevant for my study program						
The syllabus is relevant and up-to- date in relation to work life						
The syllabus has an appropriate level of difficulty						
The pace and progression of the lectures is adequate						
The course workload is adequate						

Teaching and working methods

<i>To what extent do the following teaching and working methods contribute to learning in the course?</i>	To a small extent					To a large extent
Lecture	1	2	3	4	5	6
Seminar						

Group work/discussion without a teacher						
Written work for submission						
Project work						
Fieldwork/own data collection						
Laboratory exercises						
Other practical exercises						
Case work						
Simulation/role play						
Internships/practical placements						
Digital working methods						
Collaboration with students						

<i>How satisfied are you with:</i>	Unsatisfied					Very satisfied
Variations of teaching methods/forms in the course						
Variation of working methods/forms in the course						
The use of digital tools in teaching						

The student can choose between alternatives 1 (Disagree) to 6 (Agree) in the following statements:

- I find the format of this class (lecture, discussion, problem-solving) helpful to the way that I learn.
- I feel that the class format engages my interest.
- I feel comfortable speaking in class.
- I learn better when the instructor summarizes key ideas from a class session.
- I find the comments on exams or other written work helpful to my understanding of the class content.
- I feel comfortable approaching the instructor with questions or comments.

- I think that I would learn better if a different format were used for this class (suggested below).

Group discussions/problem-solving

- The problems worked on in class help me in working with other problems on my own.
- The problems worked on in class help me in learning core content and ideas for this class.
- I find class discussions help me understand the readings.
- I find class discussions help me understand key ideas in the course.
- I learn more if class discussions are more structured.
- I feel that class discussions are dominated by one or a few people.
- I learn better when I have more opportunities to speak.
- I learn more from discussions when I am given a question to think about first.
- I learn more from discussions when I am given a question to write about first.

Group work

- I learn more when I work with a group.
- My group works well together
- I need more guidance when doing group work.
- Working in a group confuses me.
- I find it helpful if the instructor summarizes the results of my groups work.
- I find it helpful to get feedback from my group on my own performance in the group.
- I think that groups work better when each group member has an assigned role.

About the teacher/instructor

<i>The teacher/lecturer/instructor:</i>	Disagree					Agree
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Is knowledgeable and updated on his/her academic field						
Responds to and clarifies questions from students						
Is easy to contact outside lectures						
Seems prepared for the lectures/teaching						
Presents course material clearly and in a logical order						

Effectively directs and stimulates discussion.						
Shows genuine interest in students						
Is tolerant of different opinions expressed in class						
Adjusts the lecture pace to the students' level of understanding						

❓ What are the instructor's greatest strengths?

❓ What suggestions do you have to improve the instructor's teaching?

Feedback

<i>How satisfied are you with:</i>	To a small extent					To a large extent
The opportunity to get feedback on your work	1	2	3	4	5	6
The academic follow-up						
The possibility for academic follow-up						
Feedback on your written work						

Study- and learning environment

<i>How satisfied are you with:</i>	To a small extent					To a large extent
The contact between you and the academic teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6
The availability of academic guidance (mentoring)						
Teaching locations/facilities/classrooms						
The learning environment outside the classroom						
Academic/course discussion and cooperation with other students outside the classroom						
Collaboration with fellow students/peers						
Information/presentation of research relevant to your subject/course						

Information about events on campus (disputations, lectures, etc.) that are relevant to your subject/course						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

My learning outcome

<i>How satisfied are you with own learning outcomes in terms of:</i>	To a small extent					To a large extent
Theoretical knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	6
Practical application of acquired knowledge						
Knowledge of relevant research (areas)						
Ability to reflect and think critically						
Ability to work independently						
Ability to collaborate with others						

Expectations

<i>What were your expectations of:</i>	No expectations					High expectations
The teaching	1	2	3	4	5	6
The academic feedback and supervision						
The academic environment						
The social environment						
The course in general						

The student's own effort

Which grade did you aim to achieve in this course?	A	B	C	D	E
How frequently have you participated in class?	0-20%	20-40%	40-60%	60-80%	80-100%
How frequently did you prepare before the class?	0-20%	20-40%	40-60%	60-80%	80-100%
Have you participated in colloquium/discussion groups related to the course?	Yes	No			

Text responses

In your opinion, what worked best in the course?	
Are there elements that did not work?	
Do you have suggestions to improve the course?	

What can the teacher do better?	
Do you have any suggestions for teaching tools/methods that can better facilitate learning?	
Which learning experiences taught you the most in the subject/course?	

Teaching videos

<i>How satisfied are you with:</i>	Unsatisfied						Very satisfied
The video/videos' length							
Speed and presentation of theory							
Narrative voice/clarity in language							

Streaming

Is streaming of lectures useful for learning?	Yes	No	Unsure			
Should NMBU continue to stream lectures?	Yes	No	Unsure			
Which lecture format do you prefer most?	Attend lecture in classroom/lecture hall	Follow stream	Attend lecture and use the stream for clarification after class			
How useful are video streams for clarification of concepts?	Not useful					Very useful
When do you watch and work with the streamed lectures?	After class	Throughout the semester	Before the exam			

How do you view and use lecture streams?	On my own	On my own and together with other students	With other students			
--	-----------	--	---------------------	--	--	--

LAB

The student can choose between alternatives 1 (Disagree) to 6 (Agree) in the following statements:

- Laboratory lectures are helpful to understand the purpose of the experiment.
- I find the instructor's comments during laboratory help my understanding of key steps in the experiment.
- Instructor's comments on my written laboratory reports are helpful to understand the experiment.
- I learn more from laboratory experiments when I am given questions to think about first.
- I learn more from the laboratory experiments when I am given questions to write about first.
- I feel safe when working in the laboratory.
- The safety is ensured in the laboratory.

Greece – AUTH

Course Title XXXX (ECTS: XXX)

Questions related to the course

1. Were the learning outcomes clear?
 - a) No
 - b) Slightly
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Yes
 - e) Very much
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer

2. Did the covered material correspond to the learning outcomes?
 - a) No
 - b) Slightly
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Yes
 - e) Very much
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer

3. Did the requests of the course were covered with the use of the library of the Department/University?
 - a) No
 - b) Slightly
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Yes
 - e) Very much
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer

4. Was there information on the way the course would be examined as well as on the grading criteria?
 - a) Too little
 - b) Little
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Yes
 - e) Very much
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer

5. How do you judge the ECTS of the course in comparison with the respective work load?
 - a) Too little
 - b) Little
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Yes
 - e) Very much
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer

Questions related to the teaching staff

-
6. Do the teaching staff properly organize the presentation of the course material?
- a) No
 - b) Slightly
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Yes
 - e) Very much
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer
7. Do the teaching staff manage to stimulate the students' interest on the subject of the course?
- a) No
 - b) Slightly
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Yes
 - e) Very much
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer
8. Was the teaching staff consistent with his/her obligations (e.g. communication hours with students, timely corrections of students' tasks etc)
- a) No
 - b) Slightly
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Yes
 - e) Very much
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer
9. Is the teaching staff accessible to the students?
- a) No
 - b) Slightly
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Yes
 - e) Very much
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer

Questions related to the students

10. Did I attend the courses?
- a) No
 - b) Less than half
 - c) Half
 - d) More than half
 - e) All of them
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer
11. How many hours do I spend per week for studying the specific course?
- a) 0-2 hours
 - b) 2-4 hours
 - c) 4-6 hours

- d) 6-8 hours
- e) 8+ hours
- f) I do not know/I don't answer

Summarized questions

12. Overall, which is your opinion about the course?

- a) Bad
- b) Not good
- c) Moderate
- d) Good
- e) Very good
- f) I do not know/I don't answer

13. Overall, which is your opinion for the teaching stuff?

- a) Bad
- b) Not good
- c) Moderate
- d) Good
- e) Very good
- f) I do not know/I don't answer

14. Comments about the course:

(here the student can write his/her answers)

15. Comments about the teaching stuff:

(here the student can write his/her answers)

Austria – BOKU

1. Standard, university-wide part:

- 1.1. I attended the course...
 - a) (nearly always)
 - b) 50% of the time
 - c) rarely
- 1.2. The lecturer is friendly, respectful and cooperative towards her/his students
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
- 1.3. The lecturer explains the teaching content in a clear und understandable way
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
- 1.4. The lecturer encourages the students to ask questions and comment in a critical way
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
- 1.5. In this course, there is sufficient information about the assessment criteria before/at the beginning
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
- 1.6. In this course, there are very good learning materials available (books, course packets, copies of presentations, new media, etc.)
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
- 1.7. In this course, students are encouraged to participate actively in class (e.g., through group work, as well as self-regulated, problem-oriented learning)
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
- 1.8. In this course, the infrastructure (size and condition of the room, technical equipment) is very good
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)



-
- e) strongly disagree (5)
 - 1.9. In this course, the students contribute to a productive working atmosphere
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
 - 1.10. In this course the requirements in terms of content are ...
 - a) Too low (1)
 - b) low (2)
 - c) suitable (3)
 - d) high (4)
 - e) too high (5)
 - 1.11. In this course the amount of time required is ...
 - a) Much lower than the ECTS credits stated (1)
 - b) Lower than the ECTS credits stated (2)
 - c) commensurate with/appropriate to the ECTS credits state (3)
 - d) Higher than the ECTS credits stated (4)
 - e) Much higher than the ECTS credits stated (5)
 - 1.12. The subjects dealt with in this course are often discussed in relationship to practical examples (relevance to practice)
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
 - 1.13. The subjects dealt with in this course are often discussed in relationship to other disciplines (interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinarity)
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
 - 1.14. The subjects dealt with in this course are often discussed in relationship to research at BOKU
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)

2. Specific questions to the type of course - lecture/exercise

- 2.1. All in all I am well taken care of and well supported in this course
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
- 2.2. The exercises (tasks) are described in a clear and comprehensible way
 - a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)

- c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
- 2.3. Practical courses (UE) and accompanying courses complement one another well
- a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)

3. General

- 3.1. The number of participants is appropriate to the type and requirements of this course
- a) Number of participants could be higher (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) Number of participants is appropriate (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) Number of participants is too high (5)
- 3.2. Overall, this course is based on learning outcomes defined in advance
- a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
- 3.3. Overall, this course fosters very strongly my content knowledge in this subject
- a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
- 3.4. Overall, this course fosters very strongly my interest in this subject
- a) strongly agree (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) strongly disagree (5)
- 3.5. Overall, this course should be rated, in my opinion, as ...
- a) Excellent (1)
 - b) (2)
 - c) (3)
 - d) (4)
 - e) Insufficient (5)

4. Open questions:

- 4.1. What I especially like about the course:
- 4.2. What could be improved in the course:
- 4.3. My comments regarding the questions/the evaluation:

Croatia - UNIRIFCE

Dear student,

Please fill out the questionnaire to provide feedback on the course and in this way help improve the quality of instruction and identify potential shortcomings and difficulties. Your opinion is valuable to us so please rate each statement honestly by marking the most appropriate number on the scale. If you cannot respond to a statement, or if it is not applicable to a particular teacher, please mark "Don't know".

Your answers are completely anonymous and confidential, and your name will not appear on the evaluation form.

Teacher code: XXX

Course code: XXX

A) General information about the student

1. How interested were you in the course content at the beginning of the semester?

- a) not very interested
- b) somewhat interested
- c) very interested

2. On average, how many hours per week do you spend preparing for this course?

- a) up to half an hour
- b) 1-3 hours
- c) more than 3 hours

3) What grade do you expect to achieve in this course?

- a) 2 (lowest passing grade)
- b) 3
- c) 4
- d) 5 (highest grade)

4. I attended or logged into the online sessions regularly

a) Yes

b) No

B) Assessment of the course teacher

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements (this applies to B and C – for each statement).

- a) 1 - Strongly disagree
- b) 2 - ...
- c) 3 - ...
- d) 4 - ..
- e) 5 - Strongly agree
- f) 0 - Don't know - If you cannot rate a statement, please choose this option

1. The teacher covered the topics on the syllabus.
2. I am clearly and thoroughly informed about the aims of the course, class assignments and evaluation criteria.
3. The teacher points out the connection between the course content and other courses, as well as its practical application.
4. The teacher presents the course content in a clear and comprehensible manner, appropriate to the level of study and modes of delivery.
5. New and unfamiliar concepts are clearly explained with examples.
6. I am encouraged to actively participate in class (discuss, ask/answer questions), to be independent in my work and to develop critical thinking skills.
7. The teacher is motivated and enthusiastic about teaching this course.
8. The teacher treats me with respect.
9. The teacher is regularly available for communication and provides useful feedback about my work.
10. The teacher encourages interaction and collaboration among students.
11. My coursework throughout the semester is assessed regularly in accordance with the syllabus requirements (midterm exams, projects, assignments, seminar papers).
12. The teacher adapted his/her teaching to the online environment.
13. I am generally satisfied with this teacher.

C) Overall course assessment

1. The teaching is aligned with the learning outcomes
2. Study materials are available to students (teaching material, readers, course books, etc.)

3. Course workload is aligned with ECTS credits.
4. I am generally satisfied with this course.

D Additional comments and suggestions

Please take the time to provide constructive comments about strengths and weaknesses of the course/teacher. Focus on what was useful and on behaviours that can be improved (particularly aspects not covered in this questionnaire). Comments such as “the teacher is great” or “this course was a waste of time” are not useful.

This evaluation form is anonymous and your comments cannot be traced back to you.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this form. Your feedback is important to us and will help us improve the quality of teaching and learning.

Annex B – Generic evaluation form

Course Title: XXXX (ECTS: XXX)

Questions related to the course

1. How do you judge the ECTS of the course in comparison with the respective work load?

- a) strongly agree (1)
- b) (2)
- c) (3)
- d) (4)
- e) strongly disagree (5)

2. In this course, are students encouraged to participate actively in class (e.g., through group work, as well as self-regulated, problem-oriented learning)?

- a) strongly agree (1)
- b) (2)
- c) (3)
- d) (4)
- e) strongly disagree (5)

3. In this course, is the infrastructure (size and condition of the room, technical equipment) is very good?

- a) strongly agree (1)
- b) (2)
- c) (3)
- d) (4)
- e) strongly disagree (5)

4. Are the subjects dealt with in this course often discussed in relationship to practical examples (relevance to practice)?

- a) strongly agree (1)
- b) (2)
- c) (3)
- d) (4)
- e) strongly disagree (5)

5. Overall, this course fosters very strongly my interest in this subject

- a) strongly agree (1)
- b) (2)
- c) (3)
- d) (4)
- e) strongly disagree (5)

6. I attended the course...

- a) (nearly always)
- b) 50% of the time
- c) rarely

Questions related to the teaching staff

1. Does the teacher make complex theory understandable?
 - a) No
 - b) Slightly
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Yes
 - e) Very much
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer

2. Does the teaching staff properly organize the presentation of the course material?
 - g) No
 - h) Slightly
 - i) Moderate
 - j) Yes
 - k) Very much
 - l) I do not know/I don't answer

3. Does the lecturer encourage the students to ask questions and comment in a critical way?
 - a) No
 - b) Slightly
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Yes
 - e) Very much
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer

4. Is the teaching staff accessible to the students?
 - a) No
 - b) Slightly
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Yes
 - e) Very much
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer

Summarized questions

1. Overall, which is your opinion about the course?
 - a) Bad
 - b) Not good
 - c) Moderate
 - d) Good
 - e) Very good
 - f) I do not know/I don't answer

2. Overall, which is your opinion for the teaching staff?
 - a) Bad
 - b) Not good

- c) Moderate
- d) Good
- e) Very good
- f) I do not know/I don't answer

Additional comments

1. What I especially like about the course?
2. What could be improved in the course?
3. My comments regarding the questions/the evaluation: