



*Date: June 27, 2019*

*Place: Banja Luka*

# Knowledge **FO**r Resilient so**CI**Ety

## Evaluation Methodology

*Miriam Ndini*  
*Epoka University*



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



*The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

# Student enrolment

*The competition for student enrolment in the new MP has been announced in October 01, 2018 ( : <http://fae.epoka.edu.al/news-professional-master-in-civil-engineering-study-program-under-the-k-force-project-20-scholarships-offered-by-epoka-university-4254.html>), following the University timeline.*

*The competition ended with 20 students enrolled.*

*More than 12 of them already held Master degrees from other technical fields.*

*They come from Civil engineering, mechanical, electrical and Environment engineering bachelor program.*

Epoka University conducts student's survey each semester to evaluate the teaching performance of the academic staff.

The university allocates an e-mail address to each student. This email address is the official communication within the university. The University creates an account for each student and allocates a username and a password. Academic information such as course registration, courses taken or not taken, examination places and results are announced to these addresses.

## TEACHING AND COURSES EVALUATION MECHANISM

- *Approved student survey*

The University evaluates each course at the end of each semester, using the *survey* for the evaluation of courses and teaching.

The University uses an Instructor/Course Evaluation Survey, which is consistent with the University's commitment to continuous quality improvement in teaching and learning.

- *Teaching Evaluation Form, accessible in this link:*

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bwl\\_QkbaNe5IZHAtd0VoSWkxSUK/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0Bwl_QkbaNe5IZHAtd0VoSWkxSUK/view?usp=sharing)

# Survey

- *Questionnaire course based.*
- Question are related to *class performance/ objectives/ English level/ motivation and dialogue/ used course material/ fair grading*
- 14 questions are asked to the students
- 0.00 – 4.00 grading system (*highest evaluation grade given to the professor for each question*)
- *Overall question for the course- 2(1;13)*
- *Questions about the instructor-10 (2-11)*
- *Question about methods and materials 2 (12;14)*
- *Comments of the Students*



Welcome Mr. Sokol Dervishi



- Home
- Profile
- My Courses
- Quick Links
- Forms

Home

My Profile  
VIEW MORE

My Courses  
List  
VIEW MORE

Student  
List  
VIEW MORE

Advisor  
VIEW MORE

Admission  
Undergraduate  
VIEW MORE

Admission  
Graduate  
VIEW MORE

Survey  
My Results  
VIEW MORE

Reports  
VIEW MORE

Survey  
Exam survey  
VIEW MORE

All Survey  
Results  
VIEW MORE

Reports  
VIEW MORE

Form  
Staff Application Forms  
VIEW MORE



## Survey Results



[Home](#) > [Survey](#) > [My Courses Results](#)

### All Courses Result

[Back](#)

Academic Year / Term

2018 - 2019

Spring

Show

No.	Code	Name	Program(s)	Enrolled	Completed	Participation	Result	
1	ARCH 500	MASTER THESIS	DIND ARCH,MSc ARCH	6	2	33.33 %	-Not Finalized	N/A
2	ARCH 428	EVACUATION CALCULATION MODELING	PM DRM & FSE,MSc ARCH	17	15	88.24 %	-Not Finalized	N/A
3	ARCH 280	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL STUDIO	DIND ARCH	43	41	95.35 %	-Not Finalized	N/A
4	ARCH 500	MASTER THESIS	DIND ARCH	2	1	50.00 %	-Not Finalized	N/A
5	ARCH 477	ARCHITECTURE IN CONTEXT	DIND ARCH,MSc ARCH	16	15	93.75 %	-Not Finalized	N/A
6	ARCH 302	ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN IV	DIND ARCH	13	13	100.00 %	-Not Finalized	N/A

Quick Links

Forms

25 records

Search: 

No.	Question	Result
1	The instructor was well prepared for the lectures.	
2	The instructor was available to give help outside the class.	
3	The instructor used the language of instruction effectively.	
4	The outline and objectives of the course were presented clearly in the syllabus.	
5	The instructor engaged and motivated the class very well.	
6	The instructor attended the classes regularly.	
7	The instructor came to class on time.	
8	The instructor had effective dialogue with the students during the class.	
9	The instructor demonstrated concern regarding my progress.	
10	The course increased my knowledge and interest in the subject matter.	
11	The instructor made appropriate use of course materials (textbook, supplements, etc.) to subject matter.	
12	The textbook and/or reading materials were helpful for understanding the subject matter.	
13	The methods of teaching in this course were appropriate.	
14	The instructor graded my work fairly.	



<b>N</b>	<b>o. Question</b>	<b>Result</b>
1	The course increased my knowledge and interest in the subject matter.	3.71
2	The instructor attended the classes regularly.	3.86
3	The instructor came to class on time.	3.86
4	The instructor demonstrated concern regarding my progress.	3.86
5	The instructor engaged and motivated the class very well.	3.86
6	The instructor graded my work fairly.	3.86
7	The instructor had effective dialogue with the students during the class.	3.86
8	The instructor made appropriate use of course materials (textbook, supplements, etc.) to subject matter.	3.86
9	The instructor used the language of instruction effectively.	3.86
10	The instructor was available to give help outside the class.	3.86
11	The instructor was well prepared for the lectures.	3.86
12	The methods of teaching in this course were appropriate.	3.86
13	The outline and objectives of the course were presented clearly in the syllabus.	3.71
14	The textbook and/or reading materials were helpful for understanding the subject matter.	3.71

# Survey for evaluating the teaching staff/ courses

---

< 2.0	Level 1 (U): Unsatisfactory	Performance was consistently below expectations in most essential areas of responsibility, and/or reasonable progress toward critical goals was not made. Work output is low and fails to meet required outcomes,
< 2.5	Level 2 (I): Improvement needed	Performance did not consistently meet expectations – performance failed to meet expectations in one or more essential areas and/or one or more of the most critical goals were not met. Employee at this level displays inconsistency in the performance of the job factor under review and output frequently falls below acceptable levels.
< 3.0	Level 3 (ME): Meets expectations	Performance consistently met expectations in all essential areas of responsibility, at times possibly exceeding expectations, and the quality of work overall was very good. Research output achieves desired or required outcomes or expectations
< 3.5	Level 4 (EE): Exceeds expectations	Performance consistently exceeded expectations in all essential areas of responsibility, and the quality of work overall was excellent. Annual goals were met. Employee displays a high level of factor related skills, abilities, initiative, and productivity
< 3.8	Level 5 (E): Exceptional	Performance far exceeded expectations due to exceptionally high quality of work performed

## The result of the survey

### *The Fall semester-*

- *Very satisfactory in terms of the students' perception of new courses. 3.91/4.00*
- *The courses are deemed relevant form the study programme with high overall course grades.*

- **ASSESSMENT OF ATTAINMENT OF PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES IN TERMS OF STUDENT RESULTS:** Program Learning Outcomes are assessed in terms of successful completion of specific coursework. After each academic year, the Department reviews the results of students on assessments designed to measure student achievement of the program learning outcomes.
- **ASSESSMENT OF THE CONTINUED VALIDITY OF PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES:** On an annual basis, the Career Planning and Alumni Office administers the Alumni survey to find out about the applicability and practicality of the knowledge, skills and competencies gained as a result of the study program. The Alumni Survey is run annually. The summary report is sent to the respective Departments to review results. If after reviewing these inputs, the Department determines there is a need to modify either or both of the outcomes and objectives, it drafts the proposed changes.
- [https://docs.google.com/forms/d/14fYBaMvZJ9w30GFTaHvW9N4rFWDcW-U3OdYL\\_sln8FM/viewform?edit\\_requested=true](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/14fYBaMvZJ9w30GFTaHvW9N4rFWDcW-U3OdYL_sln8FM/viewform?edit_requested=true)



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



Thank you  
for your attention  
*Contact info about the presenter:*

**Knowledge FOr Resilient soCiEty**

