

UNIVERSITY OF SOPRON



ISTVÁN SZÉCHENYI

ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT

DOCTORAL SCHOOL

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

Approved by:

the University Doctoral and Habilitation Council (EDHT) on 7/2024. (03.08). the Doctoral School's Council on 2/2024. (01.31.) and the Scientific Doctoral Council of Doctoral School (TDT) DI/5/2024.

SOPRON
2024

Contents

Introduction	3
1. General quality assurance criteria	3
<i>1.1. Quality assurance policy</i>	3
<i>1.2. Structure and approval of training programs, continuous monitoring and regular evaluation</i>	4
<i>1.3. Student-centered learning, teaching and assessment</i>	4
<i>1.4. Admission of students, progress, recognition of their studies and awarding of qualifications</i>	5
<i>1.5. Lecturers, thesis topic proposers and topic leaders</i>	6
<i>1.6. Learning support and student services</i>	7
<i>1.7. Information management</i>	7
<i>1.8. Public information</i>	8
ATTACHMENTS	9
Attachment 1a.....	10
Attachment 1b	11
Attachment 2	12
Attachment 3	13
Attachment 4	14
Attachment 5	16
Attachment 6	17
Attachment 7	18
Attachment 8	20
Attachment 9	21
Attachment 10	22
Attachment 11	26



QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

István Széchenyi Doctoral School (ISDS)

Introduction

The Quality Assurance System of István Széchenyi Doctoral School (ISDS) of the University of Sopron is based on the next provisions of the government decree: CCIV of 2011 on national higher education, the Act on National Higher Education, CCVI of 2015, the order of doctoral procedures and habilitation 387/2012. (XII. 19.).

It follows the regulations of the Hungarian Higher Education Accreditation Committee regarding the accreditation procedure of doctoral schools, the basic principles of modern quality assurance, with particular regard to the European Higher Education Quality Assurance Standards and Guidelines based on the PDCA principle developed by the ministers of the European Higher Education Area in coordination with ENQA (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education) (European Standards and Guidelines, ESG 2015).

1. General quality assurance criteria

In addition to taking into account the requirements of the institutional quality assurance plan, the ISDS ensures the fulfillment, control and continuous development of the quality assurance criteria of the activities carried out in the doctoral school. The flowchart of the training and quality assurance activities of the Doctoral School (DS) is shown in Attachment 1a. The quality assurance process of ISDS based on the PDCA cycle is shown in Attachment 1b.

The operational quality assurance tasks of the DS are organized, coordinated and supervised by the head of the DS, who, together with the heads of the discipline, is responsible for introducing the quality policy to all internal and external stakeholders, as well as for setting the annual quality goals, and also monitors the fulfillment of the quality goals, ensures the feedback of survey results into operational processes for continuous improvement. The head of the DS reports annually to the EDHT on the operation of the doctoral school's quality assurance system, the implementation of the quality policy and quality goals, and the results achieved during development.

The doctoral school's quality assurance basically covers two main areas. On the one hand, it continuously monitors the doctoral school training, and on the other hand, it monitors the fulfillment of the quality assurance requirements related to the doctoral degree process, during which it follows and fulfills the ESG 2015 guidelines as follows.

1.1. *Quality assurance policy*

DS ensures that it has a public quality assurance policy (Attachment 2), in the design and implementation of which it involves both internal stakeholders (students, lecturers and non-teaching staff) and external stakeholders (users, employers, partners). The quality assurance policy reflects the close relationship between research and learning and teaching. The quality assurance policy is a part of the institutional quality culture, a document with a formal status and publicly accessible.

The ISDS quality assurance policy is prepared by the DS Academic Council and submitted to the EDHT for opinion, and after approval, it is submitted to the Senate for approval. The quality assurance policy is made available to all interested parties on the DS website and in the usual manner and places in the institution.

1.2. Structure and approval of training programs, continuous monitoring and regular evaluation

DS already has well-proven and applied processes for the design and approval of its training programs. During the development of the training programs, the primary goal is for PhD students to be able to perform high-quality scientific work. To this end, they acquire the ability to plan and carry out primary and secondary research and analyze and synthesize the literature. Another requirement is the acquisition and use of scientific methodology and its application during research work. The doctoral student must prove these skills and abilities by preparing and defending the doctoral dissertation. The course, which is revised every year and the descriptions of the subjects, which clearly record the expected learning outcomes, help to master these skills. The opinions and feedback of instructors, current and graduated students are also taken into account during the development and annual revision of the Training Plan. The student feedback is collected and processed by the DS in a planned manner - in the framework of questionnaire surveys (attachments 3 and 7). In addition to the questionnaire survey, in the framework of the Workshops - once a month - students can express their opinions, problems and suggestions regarding the training, training program, education, instructors and supervisors.

When developing the Training Plan, the primary consideration is to compile the course offerings in such a way that the smooth progress of the students can be ensured and the expected student workload is clearly recorded, also expressed in credits. The Training Plan is approved by the DS Academic Council. The Training Plan is published on the DS website. Research topics are reviewed annually, and DS applies a uniform procedure for their announcement. The announcement takes place in January of each year. Regarding the design and approval, continuous monitoring and regular evaluation of the training program and research topics of the DS, 1a. annex contains information.

1.3. Student-centered learning, teaching and assessment

During the design and implementation of the training programs of the DS, the conditions for the implementation of student-centered learning, teaching and evaluation are in the center. In doing so, DS takes into account the diverse needs and wants of the students. It enables them to have flexible learning paths in such a way as to encourage the student to complete an independent task in the direction of individual research work. It encourages autonomous learner self-awareness while providing appropriate instructor guidance and support. If possible, he uses different teaching methods, flexibly uses several pedagogical methods and regularly evaluates and refines them. It has appropriate procedures for dealing with student complaints and strives to create a student-centered timetable. Regarding the evaluation of the studies, the DS ensures that the instructors use varied examination methods whenever possible. The evaluation criteria and methods are made public in advance. The evaluation should objectively reflect the extent to which the student solved the set tasks.

During evaluations, if possible, DS tries to have the evaluation performed by more than one examiner; apply the assessment consistently and fairly for all students in accordance with the pre-established procedure and provide the student with the possibility of a formal appeal.

1.4. Admission of students, progress, recognition of their studies and awarding of qualifications

DS consistently applies the pre-defined and published procedure covering the entire student life cycle regarding the admission, progress, recognition of their studies and awarding of qualifications.

The Academic Council of DS constantly evaluates the progress of PhD students in their doctoral training and the performance of the supervisor. At the end of the semester, the supervisor will make a written statement about the doctoral student's annual performance and research progress (Annex 5). They receive credits for the completed publication activity and the research work required to write the thesis. The supervisor sends the partial report on the student's academic performance to the DS in electronic form, where the student reports are evaluated and archived. Both the student and supervisor will receive electronic feedback from the Academic Council of DS on the results of the evaluation and any necessary development proposals. Depending on the results of the periodic evaluation, the Academic Council will, if necessary, make a proposal to change the person of the supervisor or to reclassify the state-supported/state-scholarship doctoral student into reimbursement/self-funded training. The results of the doctoral student's work are reported annually at a public workshop discussion. The other doctoral students, the supervisors, the program managers and members of the DS Academic Council take part in this. The function of participating in the conference is to assess the student's progress.

The Academic Council of the DS places special emphasis on the verification of the scientific performance necessary for the initiation of the PhD students' degree process. Successful completion of the complex exam is a prerequisite for starting the graduation procedure. The student can demonstrate his research performance through his publication activity, the management of which is primarily the responsibility of the supervisors. Before the complex exam, the supervisor declares that the PhD student has completed his time-proportioned tasks, supports his participation in the doctoral training based on his scientific activities so far, and successful completion of the training is expected (Annex 6).

The publication requirements are summarized in the Operating Rules of the DS. The Academic Council of the DS and EDHT also check their fulfillment when applying for a degree and when appointing the public debate committee. Registration in the Hungarian Science Library (MTMT) and the uploading of scientific publications are also mandatory for SOE PhD students, just as for lecturers.

As part of quality assurance, we regularly ask for the opinions of committee members during complex exams and public defenses (Attachment 9)

The condition for starting the graduation procedure is the submission of the relevant application and its annexes to the DS. Based on the request, the Academic Council of DS decides on the acceptance of the request. As part of the decision, students will be provided with appropriate documentation describing the qualification they have obtained, including the learning outcomes achieved and the context, level, content and status of studies undertaken and successfully completed.

1.5. Lecturers, thesis topic proposers and topic leaders

DS places special emphasis on the appropriate competence of the lecturers, topic writers and topic supervisors. The suitability and publication activities of the DS's lecturers, subject writers and supervisors are checked and reviewed annually by the DS's Academic Council. DS instructors can be instructors and researchers with at least the title of university associate professor or an equivalent academic achievement, who are engaged in continuous high-level publication activity (they publish in scientific journals every year, participate in conferences), and who are deemed suitable by the DS Academic Council for a given period within the framework of teaching, research and supervision tasks.

The instructor of the DS can be a full-time employee of a foreign research center, university, company or other institution (external instructor) for the realization of the domestic training objectives of the doctoral cooperation agreement recorded in writing with the DS. The lecturers of the doctoral school appear in the school's ODT database, but if a given lecturer or supervisor is involved in several doctoral schools, he declares on the ODT data sheet which percentage he belongs to. The measurement and evaluation of lecturer satisfaction is carried out at the university level.

In order to check the quality of the educational activity in the DS, a questionnaire survey of the students' opinions on the teaching work is carried out every academic year, in order to get to know the student opinions to contribute to the quality of education in the DS, as well as to the improvement and development of the training's efficiency (Attachment 3). Assessing the work of instructors to reveal errors and eliminate deficiencies. The right to evaluate and give an opinion on the teaching work is a doctoral student who has a student relationship with DS and who participated in the training, and the latter can be the instructor responsible for the subject of DS. The evaluation of the doctoral students who have a student relationship with DS and who participated in training gives an objective picture of the level and quality of traditional education at DS. The reviewer's anonymity is guaranteed in the review process. The reviewer cannot be penalized for his qualification as an instructor, this is guaranteed by the head of the DS. The student evaluation of the teaching work covers:

- a) the level and quality of education;
- b) for the taught curriculum;
- c) scientific methods of education;
- d) the material and technical conditions of education;
- e) the relationship between instructors and students;
- f) other aspects determining the quality of education.

The questionnaires are processed by the DS student representative, coordinated by the DS secretary, who forwards the results to the DS head. The head of the DS feeds back the results of the evaluation to the lecturers and, if necessary, takes action. All lecturers in charge of subjects who have received an opinion have the right to inspect all the results of the evaluations concerning them with the head of the DS.

In order to check the quality of supervisor activities in the DS, a questionnaire survey should be carried out every academic year, in order to learn the opinions of students to contribute to the evaluation of the work of the supervisors in the DS, as well as to improve and develop the effectiveness of the training (Annex 4).

Assessment of the leader's work to explore the topic and eliminate deficiencies. A doctoral student who has a student relationship with DS and who participated in the training is entitled to evaluate and comment on the supervisor's work, and the doctoral student's supervisor is entitled to comment. The reviewer's anonymity is guaranteed in the review process. The reviewer cannot be penalized in any way for the supervisor's qualification, this is guaranteed by the head of the DS.

1.6. Learning support and student services

DS has adequate funding sources for learning and teaching activities, and provides adequate and easily accessible learning support conditions and student services for its students.

DS constantly strives to offer various modern background support for learning in order to make the student's study time feel successful. These are partly infrastructural services, from the library to learning facilities to IT systems, and partly human services, from tutors to consultants and study administration to other support professionals. From the point of view of the provision of services, the preparation of the support and administrative staff plays a fundamental role, therefore DS pays special attention to employ employees with appropriate training and language skills.

DS promotes the international mobility of students, and also offers its students various scholarships, conference participation opportunities, and publication opportunities, about which information is provided through the various internal communication channels used by the institution (e-mail, intranet, website, notice board, etc.).

Every November, the Alexandre Lamfalussy Faculty of Economics organizes an International Scientific Conference in Hungarian, German and English on the occasion of the Science Festival. Students are encouraged to give a presentation at the conference on their scientific achievements in their research topic. PhD students publish the materials of the highest quality lectures in domestic or foreign scientific journals. Former doctoral students who obtained a degree at the Doctoral School are also invited to the Conference, which means that the academic event is also connected to an alumni meeting. DS pays a lot of attention to maintaining relations with graduates within the framework of the alumni program. The life course of the graduates is monitored in the form of a questionnaire survey (Attachment 8).

Students are also provided with the means of handling student requests and complaints, the guidelines for this are contained in the University Doctoral Regulations. Any scientific ethics issues that may arise must be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Ethics of the University of Sopron. DS provides supporting activities and its facilities to its students using the conditions and conditions provided by the University's infrastructure.

1.7. Information management

DS regularly collects, analyzes and evaluates relevant information in order to manage its training programs and other activities. In Attachment 10, the Quality Objectives document, the specific objectives related to each ESG criteria have been summarized, which also serve as a source of information on the indicators that can be used to evaluate DS's performance (Attachment 11).

For fact-based decision-making and to check the effectiveness of individual processes and to take the necessary interventions, reliable data is needed. Effective information collection and analysis processes related to programs and other activities are part of the internal quality assurance system, which represent the following sources of information:

- basic performance indicators;
- the composition of the students;
- student progress, achievement and dropout rates;
- students' satisfaction with training programs and instructors;
- the available learning background support and student counselling;
- the career path/life path of the graduated PhD students;
- teacher satisfaction;
- satisfaction of non-teaching staff;
- external partner opinions, satisfaction.

DS uses various methods to collect and process data as described in the previous chapters. Students, teaching staff and non-teaching staff are included in the data collection. The management, analysis and feedback of the available data to the appropriate points of the operational processes is the responsibility and authority of the DS manager.

1.8. Public information

The availability of information about DS's activities is also important for future, current and graduated students, the persons concerned and the public. To this end, DS provides information on its activities, training programs, admission requirements, expected learning outcomes, obtainable qualifications, teaching, learning and assessment procedures, and success rates. DS basically ensures the publication of clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date and easily accessible information, as well as DS documents, via its website. In addition, the National Doctoral Council publishes the information prescribed for it on the public interface of the doktori.hu website.

Sopron, 31 January 2024.

Prof. Dr. Csilla Obádovics PhD m.p.
Head of the Doctoral School

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1a: Flowchart of DS's training and quality assurance activities

Attachment 1b: The chronological PDCA process of quality assurance

Attachment 2: DS quality assurance policy guidelines

Attachment 3: Student evaluation of teaching work

Attachment 4: Student evaluation of the supervisor's work

Attachment 5: Evaluation form for PhD students

Attachment 6: Supervisor evaluation sheet for complex exam

Attachment 7: Evaluation of training (graduated students)


Attachment 8: ALUMNI questionnaire (graduated students)

Attachment 9: Opinion of the Examination Committee

Attachment 10: Quality objectives

Attachment 11: Quality assurance indicator system

FLOWCHART OF THE TRAINING AND QUALITY ASSURANCE ACTIVITIES OF DOCTORAL SCHOOL



THE CHRONOLOGICAL PDCA PROCESS OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

No.	Plan	Date or Period	Contributor, document, action (Do)	Check	Act
1.	Recruitment advertisement	1 March – 31 May	Topic announcement on doktori.hu, topic announcements with the approval of the SDC - minutes on this	DS head, SDC	
2.	Admission application	Deadline: 31 May and 30 November	DS coordinator, Application form and attached documents	DS head, DS secretary	
3.	Reviewing applications for admission	1-2 June	DS leader, DS secretary	DS head	
4.	Admission interview	10-20 June	DS leader, program leaders, student representative. The future supervisor may be invited. Report of admission.	DS head	
5.	Submission of candidates recommended for admission to the UDHC	20-25 June.	SDC's submission to UDHC, decision of the UDHC	SDC, UDHC	
6.	Notification of students after UDHC decision	up 30 June	DS leader, DS secretary, Admission decision	DS head	
7.	Sending information letters to admitted students	up 15 August	DS coordinator, Information letter about training and enrollment	DS head	
8.	Registration, enrollment	end of Aug. – beginning of Sept.	DS coordinator	DS head	
9.	Education, training and research phase	Semester 1-4			
	<i>consultation with the supervisor</i>	every month	Student reviews of teaching work (every semester), Student review of supervisor's work (yearly)	DS head, Vice dean of Education, DS secretary	Necessary Action based on the SDC decision
	<i>workshops</i>	3-4 times per semester	Program leaders, Supervisors are invited, DS coordinator, Student evaluation sheet (at the end of the semester, certification of the teaching activity, conferences, publications and scientific and professional activity)	DS head	Necessary Action based on the SDC decision
	<i>application for a complex exam</i>	Deadline: 10. April, or 10 November	DS coordinator, Application form for a complex exam	DS head	
10.	Complex exam	at the end of the 4th semester	committee, Report of the Complex exam	DS head	
			Supervisor evaluation sheet for complex exam, Opinion of the Examination Board	DS head, DS secretary	Necessary Action based on the SDC decision
11.	Research and Dissertation Phase	semester 5-8			
	<i>consultation with the supervisor</i>	every month	Student reviews of teaching work (every semester), Student review of supervisor's work (yearly)	DS head, DS secretary	Necessary Action based on the SDC decision
	<i>workshops</i>	3-4 times per semester	Program leaders, Supervisors are invited, DS coordinator, Student evaluation sheet (at the end of the semester, certification of the teaching activity, conferences, publications and scientific and professional activity)	DS head	Necessary Action based on the SDC decision
12.	Theses upload for internal defense	decision: at the end of Aug., Oct. Jan., March., May	Supervisor + Organizer institute, 2 suggested opponent SDC suggest the chair of the Committee and accept the opponents, SDC minutes	SDC	
13.	Internal defense		committee, 2 opponents, minutes of the internal defense	DS head	
14.	Theses upload for the public defense	Deadline: 20 Aug., 20 Oct., 20 Jan., 20 March.	2 opponents requested + committee, member of the SDC vote, SDC meeting minutes	SDC	
15.	Public defense	1 Nov – 15. Dec.. and 1 March. – 31 May.	Committee, 2 opponents, Report of the public defense	DS head	
			Opinion of the Examination Board, Evaluation of training (graduates), SOE Alumni Registration Form	DS head, DS secretary	Necessary Action based on the SDC decision
16.	Award of degree	Graduation Ceremony: Feb. or June.	SDC Report, SDC's submission to UDHC, decision of the UDHC	SDC, UDHC	
17.	ALUMNI	yearly	ALUMNI questionnaire (graduates)	DS head, DS secretary	Necessary Action based on the SDC decision

green: Report

grey-blue: quality assurance evaluation with a questionnaire or evaluation sheet

University of Sopron
István Széchenyi Doctoral School
Quality Assurance Policy Guidelines

The quality assurance system of the István Széchenyi Doctoral School of the University of Sopron is based on CCIV of 2011 on national higher education, in law, and on doctoral schools, the order of doctoral procedures and habilitation 387/2012. (XII. 19.) is based on the provisions of the government decree, fitting into the institution's quality assurance system. It complies with the requirements of the Hungarian Higher Education Accreditation Committee regarding the accreditation procedure for doctoral schools, its operational processes are based on the steps of the PDCA quality assurance model, and the European Higher Education Quality Assurance Standards and Guidelines developed by ENQA (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education), applied and recognized in the European Higher Education Area (European Standards and Guidelines, ESG 2015) are regulated.

The István Széchenyi Doctoral School considers the achievement of the following goals to be a priority task:

- by establishing a close relationship between education and research, we ensure that students can actively get involved in the research activities taking place at the institution and can carry out high-quality independent scientific (Ph.D.) research;
- the new research results achieved are communicated in the form of scientific publications in the widest domestic and international circle;
- the staff involved in the doctoral training should continue their teaching, research and supervision activities at a high scientific level, with a student-centered approach, using modern teaching and research methods;
- the management of DS, with the support of UDHC, provides all the conditions that enable the maintenance and continuous development of the quality management system;
- regular and active participation in quality improvement activities should be ensured for all DS students and instructors, as well as external and internal contributing staff;
- the infrastructural conditions of education and research should be continuously modernized;
- all interested parties should be provided with the Quality Policy;
- support of academic integrity and freedom, decisive action against abuse, fraud, plagiarism;
- providing protection against all forms of intolerance and discrimination affecting teachers, non-teaching staff and students.

The management of DS evaluates the fulfillment of the goals contained in the Quality Policy Guidelines every year in the framework of a self-evaluation activity, and then determines the goals for the period ahead based on this.

The István Széchenyi Doctoral School is committed to making its name a guarantee for its domestic and foreign students participating in its doctoral education.

Sopron, 2024. június 30.

dr. Obédovics Ágnes

.....
 Head of DS

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING WORK

Please note that the questionnaire is handled anonymously as part of the Doctoral School's quality assurance system.

Name of the evaluated lecturer:
 The tough subject:

What percentage of classes did you attend?

- 0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%

Please rate the following questions and specific aspects on a scale of 1-5! (1 if not typical at all and 5 if very specific to the instructor or the subject being taught. Please mark 0 if you cannot decide, have no opinion or if the question is not relevant.)

Question / Aspect	1	2	3	4	5	0
1. Instructor's preparedness, professional credibility and up-todateness:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. How do you consider the instructor's explanatory skills and logical outlines: were the lessons interesting and exciting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. How helpful is the instructor: what is his/her attitude towards student requests?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. To what extent did the given subject provide a higher level of knowledge in the PhD training than the subject with the same title or similar content in your previous studies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. To what extent did the instructor address the research characteristics of the given scientific field during the teaching of the subject?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. To what extent did the teacher provide the curriculum (aids, notes, etc.) needed to complete the course?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Feasibility of the requirements: if there was a written exam, to what extent were the questions asked in accordance with the syllabus submitted or highlighted?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Feasibility of the requirements: to what extent were the questions asked in the oral exam in accordance with the submitted and highlighted curriculum? (Was the instructor focusing on what the student knew or rather what he or she did not know?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The general atmosphere of the oral exam: human, emotional factors.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. To what extent can the curriculum be used in the researcher's / teacher's work?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. To what extent were the defined exam requirements, the exam itself and the obtained grade consistent?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. What is your overall impression of the subject being reviewed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. What is your overall impression of the instructor being reviewed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other comments and additions:

STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE SUPERVISOR'S WORK

Please note that the questionnaire is handled anonymously
as part of the Doctoral School's quality assurance system.

Name of the evaluated supervisor:

1. The supervisor to whom you are completing the questionnaire:

sole supervisor

co-supervisor

2. Number of finished active semesters:

....

3. Form of study:

full-time

part-time (correspondence)

4. You chose your supervisor because:

a national/internationally recognised expert in your chosen research topic

a recognised expert within the research institution of your choice

appreciates you as a human being

nominated by the Doctoral School

other: ...

5. Feature of the choice of topic and supervisor:

I was looking for a supervisor for my planned topic

I was looking for a topic for the selected supervisor

the topic and supervisor came together

6. What was the nature of your relationship with your supervisor prior to enrolling in the doctoral programme?

previously, previously, I had a thesis and/or dissertation supervisor and we planned the continuation together

I chose a supervisor for my topic via the Hungarian Doctoral Council (doktori.hu) interface

I was contacted by recommendation

the Doctoral School recommended a supervisor for my topic

other: ...

7. How often do you consult your supervisor?

once a week

at least once a month

at least once per quarter

at least once per semester

less often than half a year

occasionally

8. What characterizes your personal relationship with your supervisor?

formal, official
direct, helpful, friendly
authoritative but useful
explicitly unpleasant to cooperate with
other: ...

9. How effective do you feel your supervisor's contribution to your own progress is?

very helpful, supportive and motivating
supports me, but does not strictly monitor and hold me to account for my work
supports me, follows my work very closely and holds me to account
less supportive
does not support

10. Student evaluation by your supervisor:

realistic, based on my real performance
excessive, valuing you more than the work you invest
undervalues you, lasts less than the work you put in
not used to assess

11. Feedback from the supervisor:

helps my further development, because it gives me concrete guidance on areas for improvement
I only get a general assessment without identifying areas for improvement
I do not receive feedback

What do you consider the most positive about your supervisor's work?

...

What do you consider the most negative about your supervisor's work?

...

Thank you for your answers.

EVALUATION FORM FOR PHD STUDENTS

Name of PhD Student:	
Year (1 st , 2 nd , ...):	
Name of the PhD programme:	
Title of research topic:	
Name of the supervisor:	
Academic year/Semester:	
1. Publishing activity in the respective semester (according to MTMT database):	
2. Presentations on national/international scientific events in the respective semester (name of author(s), title, date and place)	
3. Evaluation of scientific research work in the respective semester:	
The evaluation (text review) of the student's supervisor:	
4. Evaluation of the work with supervisor:	
The dates of the consultations with the supervisor in the respective semester:	
5. Professional science activity:	
Participation in conferences, public defense, internal defense or other scientific program at least two times.	1. 2.
Signature of the Head of Doctoral School: _____	
6. Teaching activity (optional):	
Name of the taught course:	
Educational programme (BA,MA, etc.)	
Number of classes taught:	
Signature of the Head of Institute: _____	
Declaration of the supervisor:	
PhD student has completed the requirements of Research work and Work with the supervisor and Professional science activity in the/..... acedemic year, semester. On the basis of his/her scientific work proved until this date I declare the student competent to carry on his/her doctoral studies and research work.	
Place and date: _____, dd/mm/yy	
Signature of the Supervisor: _____	

SUPERVISOR’S EVALUATION FOR THE COMPLEX EXAM

Evaluation made by the supervisor for for the 4th semester doctoral students applying to the complex exam.

Name of the PhD student:

Doctoral program:

Title of research topic:

Supervisor(s):

Overall evaluation of the student’s research work and evaluation of the submitted research summary:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Other remarks:

.....
.....
.....

DECLARATION

PhD student has fulfilled his/her tasks according to the PhD research schedule. Considering his/her research work done during the first 2 years of the PhD programme I support the continuation of the PhD studies, the successful finish of the programme can be expected.

Date: Sopron,

.....
Signature of supervisor(s)

EVALUATION OF TRAINING (graduated students)



FACULTY: LKK
STUDY PROGRAM: Doctoral School

LEVEL: PhD
FORM: full time/correspondence
SEMESTER:

1. General questions

1.1 Why did you choose that study program? (multiple choice)

- graduated students recommended parents/friends recommended the doctoral degree is needed for my profession
- gives knowledge to my interests gives a marketable knowledge I graduated from university here

2. How do you rate the following characteristics regarding of the study program? (You can express your satisfaction on a scale of 1-5; 1=least appropriate, 5=excellent)

2.1 Organization of the study program? 1 5

2.2 What is the social recognition of the study program? 1 5

2.3 Degree of difficulty of the study program? too easy too difficult

3. Satisfaction with the education (1=least appropriate, 5=excellent)

3.1 How satisfied are you with the sample curriculum of the study program? 1 5

3.2 To what extent are the subjects in the program built on each other? 1 5

3.3 How satisfied are you with the quality of the lessons? 1 5

3.4 Did the range of optional courses satisfy your professional interest and orientation? 1 5

3.5 How appropriate do you think the ratio of the mandatory and optional courses? 1 5

3.6 If the ratio of the mandatory to optional courses is not appropriate, which one do you think should be used more? there would be more *optional* courses more *compulsory* courses would be needed

3.7 What is the possibility of satisfying an individual professional interest? poor excellent

4. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the education?

Thank you for your answer.

**UNIVERSITY OF SOPRON
ALUMNI REGISTRATION FORM**

Dear Student,

We are delighted to welcome you to our graduates and congratulate you on your successful state examination!

Although an exciting period of your life has drawn to a close, the University of Sopron remains a part of your life. Please fill in the short registration form below to stay in touch and keep informed about alumni events and gatherings, to share the University's successes, to raise awareness of our upcoming courses, and to invite you to join the Graduate Career Tracking System.

We will inform you through occasional electronic newsletters, so please provide relevant information!

Before registering, please read our privacy notice regarding your personal information, which can be found at the link below: <https://international.uni-sopron.hu/downloadmanager/index/id/20075/m/1626>

The personal information you provide will be used exclusively in the context of the ALUMNI program and will not be disclosed to unauthorized third parties. You can withdraw your consent at any time by sending an e-mail to alumni@uni-sopron.hu or by requesting the personal information stored about you at any time by sending an e-mail to the same address. Your consent will be processed for as long as you wish to remain part of ALUMNI.

REGISTRATION

By signing below, I agree that the University of Sopron's designated alumni coordinators will process my personal information provided during the ALUMNI registration process in accordance with the University of Sopron's Privacy Policy, and my data will be stored per the Data Management Policy. I acknowledge that my personal information will not be disclosed to unauthorized third parties.

NAME: _____

NEPTUN CODE: _____

FACULTY: (circle the appropriate one):

Benedek Elek Faculty of Pedagogy - BPK

Faculty of Forestry - EMK

Faculty of Wood Engineering and Creative Industries - FMK

Alexandre Lamfalussy Faculty of Economics - LKK

DEGREE PROGRAM: _____

E-MAIL ADDRESS: _____

I declare that I have given the above consent freely and voluntarily under no influence and that I am aware of the University's Privacy Policy and Privacy Notice.

Sopron,daymonth 20.....year

signature

OPINION OF THE EXAMINATION COMMITTEE



FACULTY: LKK
STUDY PROGRAM: Doctoral School

LEVEL: PhD
FORM: full time/correspondence
SEMESTER:

Dear Committee Chair/Dear Committee Member!

As part of the Doctoral School's quality improvement program, we would like to know your opinion on the preparedness of students and the complex examination/defense process. We respectfully ask that you contribute to the improvement of the quality of education with your opinion and suggestions. The evaluation is made on a scale of 1-5 (1 = I disagree with the statement; 5 = I completely agree).

1. Evaluation of the complex exam / defense

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 1.1 The chosen topic deals with current issues. | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 1.2 The elaboration of the dissertation/thesis is demanding. | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 1.3 The formal requirements were followed when developing the topic. | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 1.4 The content of the presentation reflected the chosen topic well. | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 1.5 The student/candidate's presentation skills and reasoning were adequate. | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 1.6 The opinions of the opponents/committee members were constructive. | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 1.7 The assessment system is clear and transparent. | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |

2. Results achieved in complex exam/defense

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 2.1 The student/candidate's answers to the theoretical questions/theoretical knowledge are adequate. | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 2.2 The student/candidate's answers to the dissertation questions are adequate. | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 2.3 The student/candidate can independently apply the acquired knowledge. | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 2.4 The research plan/dissertation contains new results. | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |

3. Organization of the complex exam/defense

I received sufficient information in advance:

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 3.1 - the process of the complex examination / defense | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 3.2 - the evaluation system of the complex examination / defense | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 3.3 - the requirements of the training | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 3.4 How do you assess the conduct and organization of the complex exam / defense? | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 3.5 In what capacity did you participate in the work of the Committee? | | | | | | | |

committee chair

internal committee member

external committee member

4. Comments, suggestions?

Thank you for your reply.

QUALITY OBJECTIVES¹

István Széchenyi Doctoral School (ISDS)

ESG 2015 Part 1: Institutional internal quality assurance standards and guidelines	Quality objectives		
	Task	Responsible	Planned date
<p>1.1. Quality assurance policy Institutions should have a public quality assurance policy that is part of strategic management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revision of the DS Quality Policy Guidelines. 	Head of the DS	Every 3rd year, 30, June
<p>1.2. Development and approval of training programs Institutions should have processes for developing and approving their training programs. Training programs must be designed to achieve their stated objectives, including expected learning outcomes. The qualification that can be obtained through the program should be clearly defined and communicated, with reference to the appropriate level of the national qualification framework, and thereby to the qualification framework of the European Higher Education Area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical and evaluative review of the training plan; Checking the content and availability of subject data sheets; Check topic descriptions on online interfaces (DS website, ODT website); Review of the adequacy and topicality of the Operating Regulations; The report on the execution and evaluation of the task contains the strengths and weaknesses associated with the execution of the task, as well as the proposed measures. 	Head of the DS Secretary of the DS	Every year 30, June

¹ Based on the European Standards and Guidelines 2015 (ESG 2015)

ESG 2015 Part 1: Institutional internal quality assurance standards and guidelines	Quality objectives		
	Task	Responsible	Planned date
<p>1.3. Student-centered learning, teaching and assessment Institutions should ensure that their training programs are implemented in a way that encourages students to play an active role in creating the learning process. Student assessment should reflect this approach..</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating a student-centered timetable. • Student academic results, evaluation per subject, per semester. • Student reclassifications based on academic results (self-funded/state education). • Review and evaluation of the types of student requests and their completion. • Dropout prevention and examination of its causes. • The report on the execution and evaluation of the task contains the strengths and weaknesses associated with the execution of the task, as well as the proposed measures. 	Head of the DS Secretary of the DS	Every year 30, June
<p>1.4. Admission of students, progress, recognition of their studies and awarding of qualifications Institutions consistently apply their pre-defined and published policies covering the entire student life cycle, such as student admission, progression, recognition of studies and awarding of qualifications.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of admission results. • Analysis and evaluation of the supervisor's assessments of the progress of the doctoral students. • Comprehensive evaluation of the academic performance of doctoral students. • Evaluation of the extent and types of credit approvals. • Evaluation of the success of the student complex exam. • Evaluation of workshop debate performances. • Evaluation of workplace debate performances. • Evaluation of public debate performances. • Evaluation of performance indicators. • The report on the execution and evaluation of the task contains the strengths and weaknesses associated with the execution of the task, as well as the proposed measures. 	Head of the DS Secretary of the DS	Every year 30, June

ESG 2015 Part 1: Institutional internal quality assurance standards and guidelines	Quality objectives		
	Task	Responsible	Planned date
<p>1.5. Lecturers Institutions must ensure that their instructors have the appropriate competence. Apply fair and transparent procedures for the recruitment and further training of their instructors.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of DS management criteria every five years; • Annual review of tribal membership criteria; • Evaluating supervisor suitability and effectiveness; • Evaluation of the academic performance of DS teachers; • Evaluation of the results of the student feedback survey of teaching work and feedback to teachers; • Measuring and evaluating the satisfaction of DS instructors. • The report on the execution and evaluation of the task contains the strengths and weaknesses associated with the execution of the task, as well as the proposed measures. 	Head of the DS Secretary of the DS	Assessment of the DS leader after 5 years, the other task every year 30 June.
<p>1.6. Learning support and student services Institutions should have adequate funding sources for learning and teaching activities, as well as provide adequate and easily accessible learning support conditions and student services.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in scientific conferences and evaluation of their effectiveness; • Evaluation of student mobility activity; • Evaluation of OMHV performance; • Increasing the completion rate of student satisfaction surveys among doctoral students • Evaluation of the results of the student review (OMHV) of the class work of doctoral students; • Measurement and evaluation of external partners' satisfaction (questionnaire surveys conducted among external committee members). • Evaluation of the types and handling of student complaints; • Evaluation of the results of student satisfaction measurement; • The report on the execution and evaluation of the task contains the strengths and weaknesses associated with the execution of the task, as well as the proposed measures. 	Head of the DS Secretary of the DS	Every year 30, June

ESG 2015 Part 1: Institutional internal quality assurance standards and guidelines	Quality objectives		
	Task	Responsible	Planned date
1.7. Information management Institutions should collect, analyze and use relevant information to guide their training programs and other activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented management and registration of the activities and their results defined in points 1.2-1.9 of the ESG. 	Head of the DS Secretary of the DS	Every year 30, June
1.8. Public information Institutions should publish clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date and easily accessible information about their activities, including their training programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring that the ISDS website and the ODT interface are up-to-date and checking the data content. 	Head of the DS Secretary of the DS	Every year 30, June
1.9. Continuous monitoring and regular evaluation of training programs Institutions should continuously monitor and review their training programs at regular intervals to ensure that they achieve their goals and meet the needs of students and society. These evaluations should result in continuous improvement of the programs. The measures planned or taken as a result of this must be communicated to all interested parties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical and evaluative review of the training plan; Checking the content and availability of subject data sheets; Check topic descriptions on online interfaces (DS website, ODT website); Review of the adequacy and topicality of the Operating Regulations. The report on the execution and evaluation of the task contains the strengths and weaknesses associated with the execution of the task, as well as the proposed measures. 	Head of the DS Secretary of the DS	Every year 30, June
1.10. Regular external quality assurance According to ESG, institutions must be subject to external quality assurance at regular intervals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiation of an accreditation procedure at MAB at intervals according to the provisions of the MAB's accreditation decision. 	Head of the DS Secretary of the DS	On MAB regulation.

INDICATOR SYSTEM OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

The evaluation of the student's academic and scientific progress is continuous, in which, in addition to the supervisor, the lecturers related to the topic and other interested PhD students also participate. The DS provides an opportunity for the preliminary presentation and discussion of upcoming conference presentations and publications, in which interested teachers and PhD students participate. This opportunity was also given in the process of writing the thesis.

These quality assurance goals are evaluated annually by summarizing the fulfillment of the indicators, which is accepted by the DS council and determines the necessary changes. The DS initiates the discussion of the aggregated quality assurance annual evaluations before the UDHC.

The individual indicators follow the process of doctoral training and are related to the activities and stages of the students, lecturers and DS during the training.

The process of doctoral training	Achievement	Measurable indicators
I. Educational (training) stage I	Completion of compulsory subjects on time and their quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proportion of subjects successfully completed on time - The instructor(s)' assessment of the students
	Completion of elective subjects and their quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proportion of subjects successfully completed on time - The instructor(s)' assessment of the students
	Lecturers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See students' evaluation questionnaire of the lecturers work. The goal is to increase the completion rate - target value 80%.
II. Scientific activity	The supervisor's evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - evaluation of the work of the PhD student(s) in every semester
	Publication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - timely fulfillment of publication requirements - over-performance, performance, non-performance ratios, goal: increasing the on-time performance rates - feedback received from scientific conferences
	Research progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation of PhD students' annual reports - evaluation of the supervisors - evaluation of participants at the annual presentation
III. Complex exam	Complex exam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grading of the complex exam, evaluation of the committee

IV. Thesis	The process of preparing the thesis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of the theoretical and methodological results of the thesis at workshop discussions. Evaluations and proposals formulated in the discussion - a summary evaluation of the proposals, deficiencies, and positives made in the institute (workplace) debate. - The supervisors' assessment of the PhD student - Evaluation of the PhD students' cooperation with the supervisor, increasing the questionnaire completion rate (target value 100%)
V. Evaluate of the Thesis	Final evaluation of the thesis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Committee evaluation of the public debate - The proportion of qualified participants in the debate
VI. Work of the Doctoral School	Performance evaluation of the DS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Student evaluation - Self-assessment completed - Reducing student dropout rates - The teachers were evaluated every six months - Timely sending of necessary notifications - Access and updating information documents and regulations as necessary - Increasing the availability of regulatory and informational documents in all languages of the doctoral school on the doctoral school's website (metric: percentage of accessible documents in %; target value: 100%) - Preparation and transmission of aggregated quality assurance assessment material to the UDHC. - Increasing the proportion of full-time PhD students in the doctoral school who obtained a degree by the deadline in a given academic year (target value 100%) - Number of full-time students whose PhD thesis submission deadline has expired in the given academic year (person)